

UZI SHAVIT

---

**David Fogel and Hebrew Free Verse:  
Is There a Fogelian *Nusah*  
in Hebrew Poetry?**

1

DAVID FOGEL WAS NOT THE FIRST to introduce free verse into Hebrew poetry—David Frischmann (*Mashiah*, 1896), Ch. N. Bialik (*Davar*, 1904), and Avraham Ben-Yitshak (*Horef bahir*, 1908) preceded him in writing Hebrew free verse. Fogel, however, was the first to publish a collection of poems written, with the exception of two sonnets, entirely in free verse (*Before the Dark Gate*, 1923). Moreover, Fogel's poetry served in the fifties and sixties as the paradigmatic example for the superiority of free verse over a mechanical rhythm based on regular meter. It is no accident that the first poet to have introduced Fogel as a model in the 1950s was Nathan Zach, the central figure in the struggle against regular meter and the chief ideologue of Hebrew free verse.<sup>1</sup>

The free verse that took Hebrew poetry by storm in the later half of the fifties and altered its stylistic course, however, was not actually a direct continuation of Fogel's free verse. Neither, for that matter, did it have direct links with the free verse of Frischmann, Bialik, and Ben-Yitshak or with any of the other free-verse styles prevalent in Palestine during the twenties, such as Uri Zvi Greenberg's "rhythm of expansiveness," Shlonsky's "wild poem," or the rhythms of Asher Barash, Esther Raab, J. Z. Rimon, and Mordecai Temkin. The free-verse style of the Statehood Generation was in fact created anew through the group's affiliation with Anglo-American modernism and, to some extent, with German free-verse styles as well.

Nevertheless, free verse did not completely disappear from Hebrew poetry during the 1930s and 1940s, a period marked by the dominance of the cohesive poetics and prosody of the Shlonsky-Alterman school in the Hebrew poetry of Palestine. Several poets of the twenties continued to write in this vein, including Mordecai Temkin and J. Z. Rimon, and they were joined later by younger poets, including Abraham Regelson, Baruch Katzenelson, and Gabriel Preil (and later Noah Stern) in America, Berl Pomerantz in Poland, and Anda Pinkerfeld in Palestine.

Is there a connection between the appearance of Fogel's *Before the Dark Gate* in 1923 and this small wave of new Hebrew poets writing in free verse during the twenties and thirties? And did the "rediscovery" of Fogel during the fifties and sixties influence the free-verse poetics that was developing in Israel at the time?

This paper attempts to answer these questions by examining the uniqueness of the Fogelian prosody, its departure from that of its precursors, and its possible affinities with the works of other poets.

## 2

It is generally known that the common denominator of all free verse is an abandonment of the three basic elements of traditional versification: "absence of pattern, absence of rhyme, absence of metre."<sup>2</sup> However, as two of the masters of free verse, T. S. Eliot and William Carlos Williams, have asserted, "there is no freedom in art" (Eliot, 1917); and "there is no such thing as free verse! Verse is a measure of some sort" (Williams).<sup>3</sup>

If Yuri Tynyanov was indeed correct, as I believe he was, in naming rhythm as the constitutive or "dominant"<sup>4</sup> principle of every poetic text, that is, rhythm is the element that determines the "poeticness" of the text,<sup>5</sup> then what determines the special character of each poetic text written in free verse is its basic repetitive unit, the unit whose repetition produces the particular rhythm of the poem.

This element of repetition, which creates rhythmic movement, gains a particular emphasis in the poetics of the imagists, for whom the principle of *vers libre* is of central importance, as Amy Lowell explains in the 1916 introduction to the second of the three anthologies entitled *Some Imagist Poets*:

It is the very fact of "cadence" which has misled so many reviewers, until some have been betrayed into saying that the Imagists discard rhythm, when rhythm is the most important quality in their technique. The definition of *vers libre* is—a verse form based upon cadence. Now cadence in music is one thing, cadence in poetry quite another, since we are not dealing with tone but with rhythm. It is the sense of perfect balance of flow and rhythm. Not only must the syllables so fall as to increase and continue the movement, but the whole poem must be as rounded and recurring as the circular swing of a

balanced pendulum. It can be fast or slow, it may even jerk, but this perfect swing it must have, even its jerks must follow the central movement.<sup>6</sup>

Free verse does not *invalidate*, therefore, the element of repetition, “repetition that it seems no rhythm can give up, in some shape or another, without running the risk of losing its musicality and sliding into prose.”<sup>7</sup> Repetition merely has a different character in free verse: “It is not the identical [sound pattern] that repeats itself but rather a similar one,” in Zach’s precise rendition (p. 57). And in my own expanded version, from an earlier article:

The main difference between meter-based rhythm and free verse is that the reiterated unit in metered rhythm is identical, whereas the recurring unit in free verse is merely similar. The underlying principle of regular meter is therefore *symmetry*, the repetition of equivalent units: the stable metered line, or the identical strophe in strophic verse. The underlying principle of free verse is the principle of *asymmetry*, related to various “prohibitions” that a priori invalidate the possibility of anticipating the repetition of preordained, regular units. Nevertheless, the principle of repetition is in essence preserved in free verse as well, and the positive point of departure for describing any poem or group of poems written in free verse is the presence of the repeating element and the tracing of its limits.<sup>8</sup>

The first Hebrew poets to write in free verse—Frischmann, Bialik, and Ben-Yitshak—each undoubtedly held consciously or semi-consciously a latent poetic code of “thou shalt not”s, akin to “A Few Don’ts by An Imagist” that Ezra Pound published in *Poetry* in March 1913. These directions included the following basic “prohibitions”: no regular meter, no regular rhyme scheme, and no identical strophes (Jones 1988: 130–34). Yet what determined the uniqueness and difference of the rhythm of each of these poets was not their shared prohibitions but the reiterative element that was different for each of them.

Bialik’s free verse can be divided into two distinct categories, each of which has a special rhythmic base: The first is equal-lined poems such as *Kir’u lanehashim* and *ehad ehad uve’eyn ro’e*, in which the repeating unit is a line of six primary stresses, on the model of biblical poetry (and perhaps also of classical hexameter); every such line tends in most cases to be divided into two approximately equal hemistichs. The second category consists of poems with differing line lengths, such as *Davar* and *Yada’ti beleyl arafel*, in which the reiterative element is the free-verse couplet, consisting of a fixed combination of one long and one short line.

In Frischmann’s poetry, the repeating element is an *unfixed* combination of long and short lines, which repeat in variations throughout the text, as Frischmann himself describes in his letter of November 30, 1896 to Aḥad Ha’am:

The special quality of this rhythm is based on the line breakup (unrhymed lines with no regular and fixed number of vowels) in a way that grants them

musical harmony: it is enabled by the alternation of lengthening (*ha'arakhot*) and shortening (*haktsarot*) or by several frequent lengthenings with one shorter [line] in the middle, or the reverse; or several lengthenings parallel to a number of shortenings following them; or shortenings that precede the lengthenings; and all of these engender musical harmony.<sup>9</sup>

It is more difficult to define the reiterative unit in Ben-Yitshak's poetry, since it varies from one poem to another and even within the same text. The general description appropriate to the free verse of these poems is possibly that which T. E. Hulme uses to describe Gustave Kahn's *vers libre*:

It consisted of a denial of a regular number of syllables as the basis of versification. The length of the line is long and short, oscillating with the images used by the poet; it follows the contours of his thoughts and is free rather than regular; to use a rough analogy, it is clothes made to order, rather than ready-made clothes.<sup>10</sup>

The repeating element in Ben-Yitshak's poetry is not generally the same throughout the poem; each part of the poem exhibits its own special kind of free verse. The entire rhythm of the poem is usually a complex assemblage, created by the opposition between the two parts of the poem, so that a circular, reiterative rhythmic motion is perceptible only when the poem is viewed as a whole.

Fogel's free verse is entirely different from that of Frischmann, Bialik, and Ben-Yitshak. For Fogel, as for his predecessors, those same "prohibitions" generally characteristic of free verse also obtain: no regular meter, no regular rhyme scheme, and no identical strophic units. However, the repeating element is different: the *strophe*. In this context, Amy Lowell's account in the introduction to *Some Imagist Poets* of 1916, an account that Fogel, of course, could not have been familiar with, is uniquely apt:

The unit in *vers libre* is not the foot, the number of the syllables, the quantity, or the line. The unit is the strophe, which may be the whole poem, or may be only a part.<sup>11</sup>

For Fogel, the strophe never constitutes an entire poem, and the rule of strophic structure is inviolable in Fogel's poetry; all seventy-two poems in *Before the Dark Gate* (the book contains seventy free-verse poems and two metered, rhymed sonnets) are strophic, generally four to five strophes per poem (in the entire book, there are only two poems made up of solely two strophes).

The basic rhythmic principle of all of Fogel's free-verse poems is the principle of asymmetry. This underlying principle, as I have noted in an earlier article (Shavit 1992: 95), is subject to a series of implied prohibitions and restrictions, which can be reconstructed as follows:

- a. Prohibition against the use of identical strophes: all poems, except for two (XXV and XXVIII) are divided into strophes that are not identical in their number of lines.
- b. Prohibition against the use of lines of equal length: each poem includes long and short lines, which freely and irregularly alternate among themselves.
- c. Prohibition against a regular rhyme scheme.
- d. Prohibition against strong enjambment.
- e. Limitation on line length: from one to five stresses.
- f. Limitation on strophe length: from one to nine lines, the most common strophe length being two to three lines.

Rhythmic movement is based on the following principles:

- a. Tension between lines of varying length, which correlates with sentence fragments of unequal length (asymmetrical syntax).
- b. Similarity and difference between strophes.
- c. Irregular reiteration of words, phrases, lines, or rhythmic-syntactical patterns.
- d. Local tonal elements (alliteration, incidental rhyme, incidental tonal-syllabic lines, etc.).

If we compare Fogel's free verse to a line of metered tonal-syllabic verse, we can observe the following fundamental differences:

- a. The poetic "atom" of the accentual-syllabic line is the foot; that of Fogel's line is the word.
- b. In metered verse, a fixed combination of feet constitutes a line; in Fogel's poetry, an unfixed logical combination of words constitutes a line.
- c. In metered strophic verse, a fixed combination of lines constitutes a strophe; for Fogel, an unfixed combination of lines on a dual syntactic/imagistic basis constitutes a strophe.

On the basis of this account, any comparison of Fogel's poems to those of Avraham Ben-Yitshak, by which Fogel was presumably influenced,<sup>12</sup> will show that the rhythmic resemblance between them, beyond the initial common principle of free verse, is not great. Only a single poem of Ben-Yitshak's is written in a prosodic structure that even slightly recalls Fogel's *nusah*, wherein the reiterative unit is indeed the strophe; however, the anaphoric technique of this poem (each strophe begins with the same word: *ashrey*) is not Fogelian. At any rate, given that this poem was first published in 1930 in the *Mitspe* almanac, if there is any sense in speaking of influence in this case, it seems that Ben-Yitshak in this poem was influenced by the Fogelian prosody, and not the other way around.

Having examined the uniqueness of Fogelian free prosody, we can return to the basic question posed in the title of this article: Is there a Fogelian *nusah* in Hebrew poetry? In a certain sense the answer, without a doubt, is affirmative: One can clearly discern a Fogelian *nusah* that is entirely different from the prosodic styles and codes of Frischmann, Bialik, Ben-Yitshak, and Uri Zvi Greenberg. We could even describe this *nusah* in structural, formal, and objective terms. However, did Fogel actually influence other poets, not only in terms of the general "poetic climate" of *Before the Dark Gate* and the poems that followed it, but also in the specific "rhythmic formula" of his poetics?

The initial step in examining the question could be made by a process of elimination; one may easily ascertain that as far as one unifying prosodic style is concerned, there are no apparent ties between Pomerantz, Regelson, and Preil on the one hand, and Fogel on the other. Each of them has a free-verse style that differs from that of the other poets, and all of them together are saliently different from Fogel.

Pomerantz formulated a clear and even explicit poetics of free verse. Like Fogel, Pomerantz also rejects meter and rhyme; the repeating element in his poems, as in Fogel's, is the strophe. However, the majority of Pomerantz's poems are structured around identical, equal-lined strophes, as opposed to the Fogelian strophes, which are never identical in structure.

The difference is even clearer in the case of Regelson, whose poetry bears no resemblance whatsoever to that of Fogel, either in terms of poetic climate or form. Significantly, the first section of Regelson's second book, *El ha'ayin venivqa'* (1945), is a special section dedicated to, in Regelson's definition, "unmetered" poetry; it contains ten poems, including *Shir hatiqun*, one of the most central of Regelson's work (pp. 22–39), as well as *Hageshem* (pp. 45–46), perhaps the most accomplished of his poems. Though these poems are neither metered nor rhymed and have an irregular verse pattern, they reveal no obvious link to Fogel's work. Regelson's poetic roots, as well as his prosodic sources, stem not, it seems, from the intrinsic tradition of Hebrew poetry but rather from Anglo-American poetry: the free-verse, epic-visionary poems of William Blake, and the work of Walt Whitman.<sup>13</sup>

It is also difficult to locate a direct connection between Preil and Fogel, whether regarding poetic climate or prosodic patterns, despite that all of Preil's work, from its inception, is written in free verse. It seems, too, that Preil's stylistic and prosodic roots stem from American, English, and Yiddish poetry: the legacy of Whitman, directly and indirectly through Carl Sandburg; the imagist and objectivist legacy, apparently through the initial mediation of the modernist Yiddish poets of the *Inzikh* school,

Glatstein and Teller; and the introspectivist legacy that Preil received from the Yiddish works of these poets.<sup>14</sup>

## 4

The only poet among the American Hebrew poets whose work possibly has a certain affinity with Fogel's poetry is Baruch Katzenelson, who even dedicated one of the poems in his first volume, *Le'or haner* (*By Candlelight*), to David Fogel.<sup>15</sup> Katzenelson's is the first book of American Hebrew poetry written mainly in free verse (fifty-eight out of seventy poems). Another fifteen years were to pass before the 1945 appearance of Gabriel Preil's first work, *Nof shemesh ukhfor* (*Landscape of Sun and Frost*), which was entirely in free verse.<sup>16</sup>

Baruch Katzenelson, like nearly all the Hebrew poets in America, was of Russian origin. He was born in Slutsk, White Russia, in 1900 and received a traditional Jewish education and something of a secular one as well. Katzenelson arrived in the United States in 1922 and had completed his studies at City College of New York by 1926. At thirteen, he began writing Yiddish and Hebrew poetry, and from 1919 to 1926 he published poems and criticism in Yiddish. In 1925 he returned to Hebrew and his Hebrew poems subsequently appeared in most of the literary venues in the United States.

The first critic who linked Katzenelson with Fogel (leaving aside the poet's own dedication to Fogel) was Menachem Ribalow, in his introduction to Katzenelson's book:

He is of the family of muted poets, like Mordecai Temkin and David Fogel, who abstain from the corporeality of the poetic line and yearn to evaporate into halftones and cryptic phrases. Silvery threads that wander in the late summer air appear in his poetry, as in Fogel's.<sup>17</sup>

Ribalow fails to explicitly define the correspondences between Katzenelson and Fogel, but he suggests that the similarities are not only a matter of tone and poetic atmosphere but also of *form*. Later in the introduction he even wonders whether it might be appropriate to talk about a *nusah* in this context.

It is possible that this *nusah*, if we can call it that, may deepen and become even more refined, and turn into the poetry of the new religiosity of modern man.<sup>18</sup>

From the other camp of the modernist Hebrew literary battlefield, Yitshak Norman, the militant critic of *Ketuvim*, also noted the connection between Katzenelson and Fogel in an article entitled "Maneuvers of Poetry by Candlelight," a sharp critique of Katzenelson's first book of poetry:

Virtually every living creature has the spiritual need of gazing at something that resembles it, and this is certainly true of the young poet, for whom poetry has yet to become a fixed principle in the makeup of his soul. *B. Katzenelson* also needs something in order to come into his own; first of all, he needs creatures that resemble him, which is why he tries to peer into the gloom of flickering, dark "candlelight." As one can see from his mood, from the personal sorrow that is expressed in fragments of voices, he seems to be yearning to join the circle of poets like *M. Temkin, David Fogel, Y. Bat-Miriam, A. Pinkerfeld*—a little flask of oil, the whispering and dim embers of vitality, the orchestrated emotional confusion, and a light zephyr from the falling leaves of poetry, a cult of miniaturism for its own sake, the snail's-eye view and a poetry that is measured in the footsteps of a child.<sup>19</sup>

Norman links Katzenelson with the other poets he lists by evoking the poetic atmosphere they share, which in Norman's view is characterized primarily by narrowness, smallness, individualism, and the lack of a sweeping vision, either because of the inherent limitations of these poets' talents or through their adoption of a counterfeit poetic ideal. Norman never explicitly mentions the rhythmic element of their poetry, but it seems no coincidence that the four poets with whom Norman links Katzenelson all wrote in free verse—that is, free verse is the dominant mode in each of their poetry, with the exception of Bat-Miriam, who used free verse only in *Merahoq (From Afar)*, the opening cycle of her volume of the same title (pp. 5–56). This shared prosodic characteristic may be suggested by the phrase Norman coins to describe an aspect of the work of these poets, "fragments of voices" (*shivrey qolot*).

The critic who explicitly read Katzenelson in the context of the "Fogelian tradition," if only in part, was Hillel Bavli, in an essay on David Fogel published in 1949:

It is not solidity and cohesiveness that are primary here but rather the hinted and symbolic that hovers over reality, which is revealed as an abstract and visionary existence living out its own life. In this regard, the poetry of Fogel was preceded in our literature by that of Avraham Ben-Yitshak, in his imagistic poems that are sparse in words but rich in echoes; the poetry of Katzenelson (long may he live) also somewhat resembles Fogel's in the subtlety of its grasp and the pithiness of its phrase.<sup>20</sup>

But Bavli also does not explicitly mention free verse as one of the elements of a poetic genealogy linking these three poets into a literary tradition by their shared prosodic methods among other similarities. Instead, he emphasized the impressionist-symbolist principles of their work and their minimalism. The rhythmic aspect is, at the very most, implied by the words "It is not solidity and cohesiveness that are primary."

By the beginning of the 1950s, the connection between Katzenelson and Fogel had already become standard in descriptive and typological



critical work, as evidenced by Ben-Or's (Urinovski) concise summary in the first volume of his synthetic work *The History of Contemporary Hebrew Literature*:

Baruch Katzenelson is one of those elegiac poets whose uniqueness lies in their hearts, and whose philosophy of pain and sadness is expressed with tight-lipped muteness, with a few simple and innocent words. His partners in this poetry are Avraham Ben-Yitshak, David Fogel, Mordecai Temkin, and others like these.<sup>21</sup>

This analysis, too, does not point to free verse as the poetic characteristic common to this group of poets, noting instead shared elements such as an elegiac tone, minimalism, and simplicity. The prosodic criterion is present only as a latent aspect of the stylistic similarity of these poets.

Thus, it remains to us to translate the impressionistic evaluations of effects of the Fogel legacy on Katzenelson into a formal analysis of the free-verse style common to the two poets. It seems logical to begin with the poem Katzenelson dedicated to Fogel, *Asirey hayim* ("Prisoners of Life"):

אָסירי חַיִּים	PRISONERS OF LIFE
(לדוד פּוֹגֵל)	(To David Fogel)
אָסירי חַיִּים,	Prisoners of life,
נְתַאֲבֵק בְּעַפְר אָבוֹת	let us roll in the dust of forefathers
וְנוֹרִישׁ חֵידת־יְעַד לְבָנִים.	and bequeath the eternal riddle to sons.
מְדַהְרוֹת הַיָּמִים	From the galloping of the days
יַעַל אֲבָק נְשִׁיָּה	the dust of oblivion will rise
וְחַתַּל אֶת הַדָּם.	and swaddle their echo.
בְּהַצֵּל עֶרֶב	With the shadowing of evening
נִאֲוִין צְהֵלַת יְלָדִים.	let us listen to the cheers of children.
נַחֲוִךְ עֲלוּבִים.	Miserable we will smile.
בְּמוֹרְדִים לֹא נִחָד,	Among the rebels we won't be counted
כִּי יִפּוּ הַלַּיְלוֹת	for the nights have become beautiful
עַל שִׁבְתַּת הַשֶּׁלֶג.	on the layer of snow. <sup>22</sup>

When we compare the prosodic structure of this poem to that of Fogel's poetry, the similarities are immediately apparent. As in Fogel's poems, this poem has no fixed meter or rhyme; the lines are short, but not identical in value (in this poem, each line has either two or three stresses, but these stresses follow no pattern: 2,3,3; 2,3,2; 2,3,2; 2,2,2); and the poem contains no strong enjambment, that is, all the line breaks can be fully actualized. Most important, the primary unit of repetition that organizes the rhythm by its dominance is the strophe. This feature, however, is also important in distinguishing between this poem and those of Fogel. In Fogel's poetry the recurring rhythmic unit, the strophe, has no fixed length, while in Katzenelson's poem the recurring rhythmic unit is the

tercet and each strophe contains the same number of lines. This, of course, is a substantial difference. Traditional strophic verse is structured around repetitions on three levels: a regular pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables within the line; a fixed number of metrical units in each line; and a fixed number of lines within each strophe. While the primary rhythmic principle in Fogel's poetry is asymmetry *on all poetic levels* (irregular distribution of intonational rises and falls, unfixed number of stresses in a line, irregular number of lines in a strophe), Katzenelson broke this rule on the very level that was dominant in his poem, the strophic level. Fogel's prosodic license apparently struck Katzenelson as too far-reaching, and he felt the need for at least one level of the text to repeat identical poetic units, and not merely similar ones, as in Fogel's work. The organizing principle of Fogel's poetry is similarity, but not identity, on each of these three levels; in Katzenelson's poem, the strophic structure remains regular, while the two other rhythmic levels, the pattern and number of stressed units on a line, are unfixed.

Only in a few poems did Katzenelson write in a prosodic structure that can be described, from a formal standpoint, as truly "Fogelian," that is, as constructed according to a strophic asymmetry as well as a metrical one. Only seven out of seventy poems are written in this way, and even in these, Katzenelson does not achieve the prosodic freedom characteristic of Fogel: in five of them (pp. 23, 40, 45, 67, and 75), all the strophes are identical, with the single exception of either the first or last of them; one contains a fixed strophic structure of 4,2,4,2; and the last one contains only two strophes, one with four lines and one with ten.

Nevertheless, what gives rise to the partially misleading impression of a Fogelian prosodic structure is Katzenelson's clear preference for the *terzina* structure in his free-verse poems. As is well known, the *terzina* structure, in its poetic form, has its source in Italian poetry, especially in Dante's use of the *terza rima* in *The Divine Comedy*. From the Italian, the *terzina* made its way into the Hebrew poetry of Italy and into most of the other European traditions. It achieved wide popularity in the German poetry of the beginning of the twentieth century, especially in Hofmannsthal and a few of the Expressionist poets, including Trakl, Paul Zech, Jakob van Hoddis, Else Lasker-Schüler, and Theodor Däubler. It is possible that Fogel's affinity for the three-line strophe, which seems to be most prevalent in his work, can be traced back to these poets. The *terzina* structure also was to become prevalent somewhat later in American free verse, especially in Wallace Stevens and William Carlos Williams.

Was Katzenelson particularly drawn to the *terzina* because of Fogel's example? It would be impossible to give an unequivocal answer to this question. Nevertheless, it appears that Katzenelson consciously chose a quasi-Fogelian formal path, including the use of tercets, in keeping with his affinity for the Fogelian poetic climate in general. Interesting evidence

of Katzenelson's sensitivity to the connections between rhythmic structure and the poet's poetic world as a whole can be found by comparing the poem Katzenelson dedicated to Fogel with another poem, *Ashrey ha'ish* ("Happy is the Man"), which he dedicated to Halkin:

אֲשֶׁרִי הָאִישׁ

(לש. הלקין)

אֲשֶׁרִי הָאִישׁ דּוֹמֵם יִשָּׂא חַיִּי-רְחִים,  
וְחֶסֶד נְעוּרִים כְּטֶל בְּלֵב יָצַר.  
רוּחוֹ יִשְׁקֵט אֶל כְּבוֹיֹאת אֵילָן בְּמַיִם,  
וּמְחַשְׁבֵּת הַלַּיִל אֶל כְּפוֹ יְרֵדָה אוֹר.  
הֵהָ, עַל גְּחוּזָם יִלְכוּ יָמֵי אָנוּשׁ גָּאָה  
כִּי יִצְרֵר חִילוֹ עַל בְּלִימַת אוֹן . . .  
אֲשֶׁרִי הָאִישׁ נְתִיב הָאֲחֵרִית יְרָאָה,  
וּבּוֹדֵד בְּאֵלֵהֶם יֵלֵךְ הַלֵּךְ וְרֵן.

HAPPY IS THE MAN

(To S. Halkin)

Happy is the man who carries the millstone-life in stillness,  
and will guard youthful favor like dew in his heart.

His soul will quiet toward the reflection of a tree in water,  
and from the darkness of night into his palm he'll rip light.

Oh, the days of proud man will go on their bellies  
for he will hoard his strength, his virility hanging by a thread . . .

Happy is the man who shall see the path of the end  
and, lonely as a god, will walk onward singing.<sup>23</sup>

This short poem can be read as a typical romantic ode, drawing upon characteristic romantic motifs, as befits a poem dedicated to Halkin, whose poetry, especially during the 1920s, was completely subsumed by the romantic spirit. But Katzenelson also fashioned the form of his poem to one that would have suited Halkin, i.e., not the open form of free verse, but rather the closed, cohesive, melodic form characteristic of the young Halkin as well as of romantic poetry in general. Thus, the poem has a regular meter, the iambic hexameter (primarily according to the grammatical Israeli accentuation, with a touch of Ashkenazic accentuation); and it has a regular rhyme scheme, alternating rhymes (*abab*) and three quatrains. The relationship between the prosodic structure and the poetic climate to the inscription is immediately apparent, exactly as in the poem dedicated to Fogel. This strengthens the assumption that a connection can be drawn between Katzenelson's and Fogel's use of free verse and between Katzenelson and the "Fogelian legacy" in general.

Nevertheless, it is important to stress that the link between Katzenelson's prosody and Fogel's is a limited one, and Katzenelson's specific poetic preferences can be seen not only in his choice of strophes of identical length, but in additional elements as well. Katzenelson tends to

organize and regularize his strophes by alternating short and long lines within each strophe. For example, in the poem *Rak mugey-lev* ("Only Cowards"), which is composed of two tercets, the first two lines of each tercet have six stresses while the last line of each tercet contains three stresses; and between these lines there is not only a rhythmic but also a semantic parallelism.

רק מוגי לב  
 רק מוגי לב מבכים חלומות נמקים בלילות.  
 קבי ירך. נרכין ראש בפני גורלנו הרע,  
 נשב ודומם ניהל.  
 משק גלגלים מחוץ יכריו על זמנים משתנים.  
 בזוית, כיון משמר, יעמדו ימינו מלאים  
 ודם יחכו לנו.

#### JUST COWARDS

Only cowards cry over rotting dreams in the night.  
 Give me your hand. We'll bow our head before our evil fate,  
 we will sit and quietly hope.  
 The clatter of wheels outside will announce changing times.  
 In the corner, like aged wine, our days will stand full  
 and in stillness will await us.<sup>24</sup>

The recurring unit in this poem is clearly the strophe, and it is once again the identically structured strophe so typical of Katzenelson rather than the merely similar strophe characteristic of Fogel.

A similar structure can be found in the poem *Im erev* ("In the Evening") (p. 27). This poem consists of three tercets, in which the first two lines of each has three stresses while the third has only two. The rhythmic structure of *Shiray* ("My Poems") (p. 85) is markedly similar: In this poem, the first two lines in each of the tercets have four stresses, while the third has only two, and in this case, it is the recurring line *eileh shiray* (these are my poems).

In the poem *Ko ethalekh* ("So Shall I Walk") (p. 26), which contains five tercets, this rhythmic structure achieves an even more sophisticated and precise form: The first line of each tercet has two primary stresses (in the Ashkenazic accentual system), the second line is prolonged, having three or four stresses, and the last line is always abbreviated, having only a single stress (a single word). In the recurrent rhythmic movement of each strophe, the pattern begins in a moderate fashion, reaches a climax in the second line, and collapses into the abyss in the third. And again, the repetition is almost exact, i.e., a repetition of identical, rather than similar units, although the poem seems to be written in free verse, without a regular sequence of stressed and unstressed syllables, and without rhyme.

A slightly different but equally sophisticated structure informs *Harken rosh* ("Bow Your Head") (p. 23). This poem consists of three

couplets, in which each of the first lines has two stresses and each of the second lines has four. The poem concludes with a single line of two stresses.

The general rhythmic characteristics of the volume can be discerned through an examination of the pervasive recurrence of rhythmic structures. The book consists of seventy poems, of which all but eleven are in free verse. Of these fifty-nine poems in free verse, thirty-two are constructed of tercets, eight of couplets, seven of quatrains, one of sestets, and seven of strophes that are not identical; four poems are astrophic. The basic tendency of the work, then, is toward strophic regularity, in accordance with the generally strong tendency toward regularity on the strophic level within the individual poem.

It is interesting to follow the prosodic development of Katzenelson's work, and through it, the fate of Fogel's *nusah* in the 1940s. The moderate poetic modernism that characterized Katzenelson's first volume clears the way for a nonmodernist poetics, conventional and lacking in uniqueness; this process, which had already begun while Katzenelson was still in the United States, was intensified by his emigration to Erets Israel in 1934. This became evident in his second volume, *Bekhur demamah (In a Furnace of Silence)*, which was published in 1948, fourteen years after the appearance of his first book. The volume consists of eighty poems, divided into two sections: *Al neharot kvar (On the Rivers of Kvar)*, forty-two poems, and *Be'artsi (In My Country)*, thirty-eight poems. In the earlier section, there are sixteen poems in free verse, while twenty-six are rhymed and metrically regular. In the second, later section, seven poems are in free verse and thirty-one are rhymed and metrically regular. All in all, the book contains only twenty-three poems in free verse, of which fourteen have the *terzina* form, so that the connection between Katzenelson's free verse and the use of the tercet form is evident here, as well.

This direction away from free verse and modernism is even more conspicuous in Katzenelson's last volume of poetry, published in 1954, *Milev el lev (From Heart to Heart)*. The book is divided into six sections, of which the last two apparently contain the bulk of the last poems he wrote. Of the 111 poems in the volume, one hundred are rhymed and metrically regular, and eleven are in free verse. These eleven poems are, without exception, in the tercet form, and all are included in the last two sections of the work. In these poems of old age, Katzenelson embraces the poetry of his youth, and his return to the poetic atmosphere of this period also involves a regression to the semi-free prosodic forms of the early poems. In these poems, Katzenelson establishes the connection between his use of free verse and the strophic form of the *terzina* and turns the tercet into the necessary rhythmic unit of his unrhymed and metrically irregular verse. The implied partial connection to Fogel's poetics and his rhythmic *nusah* has disappeared, and we see in this poetry a different prosodic

formula, in which poetic freedom is limited to the lower levels of rhythmic form and where the very renunciation of rhyme and meter necessitates and automatically leads to a poetry organized according to recurrent tercets, repeated in orderly fashion.

## 5

Anda Pinkerfeld's first book of Hebrew poetry, *Yamim dovevim (Uttering Days)*, appeared in 1929, barely a year after the publication of her first Hebrew poem in *Davar*, in May 1928 (a previous volume of Polish poems had appeared in Lvov in 1921). The book consists of fifty-four poems, all of which are in full-fledged free verse, without meter, rhyme, or regular verse pattern. From the standpoint of the book's position in the lineage of Hebrew poetry, it can be seen as a continuation of two young traditions: that of the modern Hebrew free verse, and that of modernist Hebrew women's poetry. In the first tradition of free verse, it was preceded by only a few complete volumes, although the very act of writing in free verse was, in this decade, fairly prevalent and included not only Fogel, but also Uri Zvi Greenberg, Shlonsky, Lamdan, Barash, E. Raab, Bat-Miriam, Temkin, J. Z. Rimon, Talpir, and Sh. Shalom. These volumes were Fogel's *Lifney hash'a'ar ha'afel* (1923), Shlonsky's *Dvay* (1924), Greenberg's *Eymah gdolah veyareah* (1925) and *Hagavrut ha'olah* (1926), and Talpir's *Ligyon* (1925), *Ra'av* (1926), and *Jazz Band* (1927). In the second tradition of women's poetry, only four poets preceded Pinkerfeld: Raḥel, Elisheva, Bat-Miriam, and E. Raab, only two of whom preceded her in publishing volumes of Hebrew poetry (Elisheva's *Kos ketanah* [1926] and *Haruzim* [1928] and Raḥel's *Safiah* [1927]). These two traditions intersect in the poetry of Anda Pinkerfeld, since of the four aforementioned women poets, two, Yokheved Bat-Miriam and Esther Raab, entered Hebrew poetry as poets of free verse; Bat-Miriam, in her volume *Meraḥok*, which consists of twenty-four poems published in *Hatkufah* in 1922 and 1923; and Esther Raab, in her poems published mostly in *Hedim* from 1922 on, and which were collected in 1930 in her volume *Kimshonim*. It is clear that connections exist between these two young traditions and Anda Pinkerfeld's choice of free verse. During the years in which Pinkerfeld began to write Hebrew poetry, the second half of the 1920s, the literary climate in Palestine was receptive to free verse, and there was no need for revolutionary courage in order to write poetry in this form. Writing in free verse, then, was an unsurprising choice. If we return to the question of the connection between Pinkerfeld's use of free verse and Fogel's, we would have to say that such a connection exists, though only in part.

We can begin with negation. First, it is clear that there is no stylistic connection between Pinkerfeld's poetry and that of the women who

preceded her: There is no connection with the poetry of Elisheva and Raḥel, whose distinctive rhythmic patterns rely heavily on Anna Akhmatova; nor to the poetry of Bat-Miriam and E. Raab, who developed two rather distinct versions of free verse that nevertheless share one quality—an incessant flow. By contrast, Pinkerfeld's free verse is based on disjunction and fragmentation, as Nurit Govrin has noted.<sup>25</sup> Second, there seems to be no stylistic connection between Pinkerfeld's rhythmic style and the rhythmic models of Frischmann, Ben-Yitshak, U. Z. Greenberg, and Talpir. It is true that Pinkerfeld herself noted that it was Greenberg who encouraged her to write poetry in Hebrew and later introduced her to Bialik.<sup>26</sup> She also stressed her closeness to Greenberg in the 1920s and further claimed that he had influenced her writing. Moreover, the poem *Midbar* ("Desert") that concludes her first volume of poetry, *Yamim dovevim*, is dedicated to Greenberg. Nevertheless, as I have stated, there is no prosodic similarity between her verse and that of Greenberg's poetry of the 1920s, whether in the "rhythm of expansiveness" of *Eymah gedolah veyareah* and *Hagavrut ha'olah*, with their long lines and Ashkenazic tonal-syllabic basis, or in the more traditional rhythmic model of *Anaqre'on 'al kotev ha'itsavon*.

And back to Fogel: "David Fogel was my friend," Pinkerfeld said in a conversation with Itamar Ya'oz-Kest in the mid-1970s. "In poetry, too. We are very close in our way of writing" (*nusah haktiva*). This testimony to her affinity with Fogel, at least on a personal level, is supported by authenticating evidence from the 1930s. In her book *Gitit* (1937), she dedicates a short poem to Fogel, *Gam eyle hayim* (p. 150), which has a markedly Fogelian atmosphere.

גַּם אֱלֹהֵי חַיִּים

(לדוד פוגל)

אֲנָשִׁים עֲצוּבִים יִכְרוּ בּוֹרוֹת שְׁטוּחִים

זֶה עַל יַד זֶה,

בוֹר לְבוֹר יִשְׁוֶה.

בְּלֵילוֹת יִישְׁנוּ אֲנָשִׁים עֲצוּבִים

בְּלֵי חִלּוּמוֹת.

וּבְקִמָּם יִכְרוּ בּוֹרוֹת שְׁטוּחִים,

יוֹם יוֹם –

עַד יְמוֹתוֹ.

THIS TOO IS LIFE

(To David Fogel)

Sad people dig shallow pits  
 one beside the other,  
 one pit will be the same as the other.  
 At night sad people will sleep  
 without dreams.

And when they arise they will dig shallow pits,  
 day after day—  
                   until they die.

In the same year, Pinkerfeld writes in a letter to Fogel:

Your poems are so close to me; I love them. Oh, if I could only shine a little sun from my sun into them. . . . Good-bye to you, dear David, who creates with your bare hands the sadness of your life in order to sing it. Sometimes I hate you for your passivity. . . . But this is your poetry and nothing can change it. . . . You have no escape from yourself.<sup>27</sup>

But does Pinkerfeld, in her use of free verse, really follow Fogel's *nusah*? There is an apparent similarity, for, as Govrin notes, "[Pinkerfeld's] poems lack all formal meter and rhyme, and even their strophic division is irregular. Even the lines vary in length." Pinkerfeld, then, is faithful to the Fogelian *nusah* of asymmetry, which manifests itself in every level of the text: within the structure of the line, of the strophe, and of the poem as a whole.

Nevertheless, the rhythmic impression created as we read most of Pinkerfeld's poems is different; this impression stems from the fact that, although her poems are strophic, the rhythmic unit does not seem to be the strophe. Unlike Fogel's poems, where the strophes are similar rather than identical, Pinkerfeld's strophes appear to be completely different from one another, not similar in any way. The strophic divisions of Pinkerfeld's poems contribute more to the poem's rhetorical, dramatic, or psychological structures, responding to these various textual demands, than they do to the requirements of the poem's rhythmic structure.<sup>28</sup>

Despite the strophic structure of most of her poems, the impression that arises is that the rhythmic unit is the line, which varies in length; the strophe has a secondary function from a rhythmical perspective, and not a fundamental function as in Fogel's poems. A Fogelian rhythmic impression arises only in a small number of poems, those that are composed of relatively short strophes that are similar in length, as in the poem *Gam im ravu hayamim* ("Even If the Days Were Many") (Gitit, pp. 99–100) or in the poem *Odeni keyalda ketana* ("I Am Still like a Young Girl") (p. 30), which somewhat resembles, both rhythmically and in terms of the poetic atmosphere, Fogel's *Lifney sha'arayikh, livnat hasmalot* ("Before Your Gates, You of the White Dresses").

Thus, we can only cautiously speak of Pinkerfeld's use of Fogel's *nusah*, and then only in a few of her poems. There may be some measure of truth in Nurit Govrin's assertion that Fogel "is perhaps the closest poet to [Pinkerfeld] in his poetic methods."<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, Pinkerfeld's rhythmic style is distant from Fogel's cohesive *nusah*, although it is not impossible that this *nusah* served, consciously or unconsciously, as the foundation for Pinkerfeld's free verse.



“During his lifetime, and for at least ten years after his death,” Dan Pagis writes in his 1966 introduction to *Kol shirey David Fogel*:

Fogel remained in the margins of the mainstream of Hebrew poetry, and his influence was not evident. But now that he has been rediscovered, as it were, it is not inconceivable that what has happened with others will happen with him. Even his individualistic style can turn into a *nusah*. And indeed, it seems that Fogel now has some epigones among the youngest [poets] who took some of his original methods and carried them to the point of absurdity. This circle turns back upon itself.<sup>30</sup>

And following Pagis, Govrin writes in 1972:

The rejection of linguistic brilliance, of the meticulous and complete structure, of the well-wrought musical rhythms of the poetry of Shlonsky's generation and especially their epigones, brought this generation of readers and critics closer to Fogel's poetry and there are even a few heirs who mimic Fogel's individualistic style.<sup>31</sup>

I do not know which heirs Pagis or Govrin had in mind. Despite Zach's and his fellow critics' enthusiastic appraisal of Fogel's poems, generally it wasn't "Fogel's *nusah*" that became the exemplary model for the poets of the 1960s and 1970s; instead, it was "Zach's *nusah*," "Amichai's *nusah*," "Avidan's *nusah*," etc., or what can, in a gross overgeneralization, be perceived as the common *nusah* of all these poets.<sup>32</sup> Here I would like to mention a single, albeit salient, example of "Fogel's *nusah*": Israel Har.

Har's *Evyon lifney hanitsa* (*Pauper before a Bud*) was published in 1962, i.e., after *Before the Dark Gate* was "rediscovered" by Zach and other critics (Avneri, Ravikovitch, Grodzinski), but prior to the 1966 publication of Pagis's edition of *Kol hashirim*. Har's encounter with the original edition of *Before the Dark Gate* is immediately manifest in *Evyon lifney hanitsa*: At its core is a long cycle of poems that also bears the book's title, *Evyon lifney hanitsa*, a cycle whose poems have no titles, but rather Roman numerals, like the seventy poems of *Before the Dark Gate*.<sup>33</sup> Yet Fogel's influence exceeds the merely formal. It is manifest in a variety of ways, from the book's title, which is reminiscent of Fogel's, to the dramatic structure, which has a central male speaker and includes a number of poems with a female speaker (see poems III, VI, XX, and XXI). Like Fogel, who included two metrically regular sonnets in *Before the Dark Gate* (poems 56 and 61), Har includes a metrically regular sonnet (poem XVI) in his free-verse cycle. Moreover, the two texts are thematically similar, so much so that Pagis's description of *Before the Dark Gate* could equally apply to Har's *Evyon lifney hanitsa*:

The three fundamental subjects of his poetry—death, love, and childhood . . . determine the internal structure of his book. . . . the seventy poems of the

book marked by Roman numerals . . . portray a wide thematic cycle of life in the shadow of death. (Pagis 1975: 66–67)

And from a prosodic standpoint: Are the poems of *Evyon lifney hanitsa* indeed written in Fogel's prosodic *nusah*? A preliminary answer, in my opinion, would have to be a qualified yes. In general, Israel Har is faithful to the fundamental principles of Fogel's *nusah*. He accepts the prosodic principle of all of Fogel's poems, which is the principle of asymmetry—within the line (an irregular order of accentuated and unaccentuated syllables), within the strophe (lines varying in length, with short and long lines alternating in irregular and unpredictable fashion), and along the text continuum (strophes of different lengths). The poems are not metrically ordered nor are they rhymed (except for incidental local rhyming), and the basic unit of repetition, as in Fogel's poems, is the strophe (in the cycle as a whole there are only two exceptional astrophic poems: VI and XIV).

Yet the general rhythmic impression that the poems create is different from that of Fogel's poems; this difference may be accounted for, in my opinion, by the different relation between the syntactic units (the sentence and its parts) and the poetic units (the line and strophe). In Fogel's poetry there is no tension between the syntactic and the poetic units, because strong enjambments are strictly avoided. In other words, Fogel always actualizes the poetic convention of a syntactic break at the end of a line.<sup>34</sup> Most important, the end of a strophe is always identical to the end of the sentence (yet the strophe as a whole does not always constitute a single sentence, although that is Fogel's most prevalent technique; the strophe can also include two sentences).<sup>35</sup> Israel Har, in contrast, was probably influenced by the poetics of enjambment of the Statehood Generation and thus, one can find in his poems strong enjambment not only from one line to another, but also from one strophe to the next; these enjambments are periodically accompanied by caesuras in the middle of the poetic line, which strengthen the effect of the enjambment. For example, in the lines "*ad eyn pesher. ad eyn ketz / ani mabit be'eynayikh*" (Until the end of meaning, Until eternity / I look into your eyes) (p. 31), there is an inter-strophic enjambment. In another extreme example, the concluding poem of the volume, some sentences end in the middle of the line, while the line itself ends with an enjambment: "*hayamim haḥaserim otakh, ponim nakhim / keleḥem tsar. vehaleyot kmehim, loḥatsim / kemey hayam 'al dafnot hasfina*" (The days that miss you turn melancholy / like rationed bread. And the nights yearning, pressing / like the waters of the sea against the sides of the ship.) (p. 67). This rhythmic technique is in sharp contrast with the typical Fogelian *nusah*, in which the syntactic unit and the line, on the one hand, and the strophe and the sentence or double sentence, on the other, fully coincide.

Other techniques Har utilizes, mainly for rhetorical purposes, also weaken the independent and separate character of the strophe as the unit of rhythmic repetition. For example, he sometimes uses a number of successive one-word lines as a means of rhetorically emphasizing each word separately. Such a technique can be found in Shlonsky and Alterman, but never in Fogel. Fogel's poetry indeed contains lines composed of a single word, but there is no poem that contains a series of these lines, as in Har's poetry.

It seems, therefore, that Israel Har assimilated fundamental elements of Fogel's *nusah*, along with his assimilation of the general poetic atmosphere of Fogel's work, but he did not internalize the strict poetic code latent in Fogel's *nusah*. In addition to what he absorbed from Fogel, Har added poetic qualities characteristic of, but not central to, the poetry of Shlonsky and Alterman, as well as the poetry of Zach and Avidan (the enjambment). These additional qualities differ from Fogel's *nusah*, and they serve to create a heterogeneous and eclectic rhythmic impression. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that Har's prosody is based on Fogel's *nusah* and is an interesting example of the belated absorption of this *nusah* following the rediscovery of Fogel in the late 1950s.

## 7

In his 1942 lecture in Glasgow, "The Music of Poetry," T. S. Eliot reiterated his conception of free verse:

Only a bad poet could welcome free verse as a liberation from form. It was a revolt against dead form, and a preparation for new form or for the renewal of the old; it was an insistence upon the inner unity, which is unique to every poem, against the outer unity, which is typical. The poem comes before the form, in the sense that a form grows out of the attempt of somebody to say something, just as a system of prosody is only a formulation of the identities in the rhythms of a succession of poets influenced by each other.<sup>36</sup>

No shared prosodic style of Hebrew free verse or new prosodic *nusah* developed in the 1920s, despite the widespread propensity for free verse. Apparently the distance between the distinct styles of free verse in the poetry of David Fogel, U. Z. Greenberg, Esther Raab, Gabriel Talpir, J. Z. Rimon, and others was too great to engender a mutual interaction or influence that could result in a systematic approach toward free verse. A process such as Eliot described took place at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s among a different group of Hebrew poets, which was led by Shlonsky and included Alexander Penn, Ezra Zusman, Nathan Alterman, Lea Goldberg, and others, and whose styles were shaped through the influence of the symbolist legacy in Russian modernism. The success of this group in fashioning a collective poetic style,

including a prosodic style, was among the factors that helped them seize the center of the poetic system and determine its character and direction for a period of twenty years.

When the new wave of Hebrew free verse emerged in the beginning of the 1950s, a fruitful new dynamic of mutual interaction was again established among several young poets who experimented with free verse, following the example of the Anglo-American free verse of Eliot and Pound. The major figures of this group were Nathan Zach, Yehuda Amichai, David Avidan, Yisrael Pinkas, and Ori Bernstein. The poets of the 1960s, such as Yair Horowitz and Meir Wieseltier, followed the prosodic style shared by this group rather than the free rhythms developed by the poets of the 1920s or that of those poets in the 1950s who attempted to develop their own individual prosodic styles, such as Ayin Hillel or Pinhas Sadeh.

And Fogel's *nusah*? This style, which was marginalized throughout the thirties and forties and which was rediscovered in the fifties and sixties, did not disappear from the map of Hebrew poetry in the seventies and eighties. Instead, it was interwoven into the new poetic developments, but in a unique way. As an actual model, as the basis for poetic imitation, it had a place only in the margins. As a metaphor, as a positive symbol for a precise, sensitive, and musical style of free verse, it took its place in the very center of Hebrew poetry.

Department of Hebrew Literature  
Tel Aviv University

Translated by MICHAEL GLUZMAN, BARBARA MANN, and NAOMI SEIDMAN

## NOTES

1. See Nathan Zach, "Following a Forgotten Poet" [Hebrew], *Masa*, 23 September 1954; "Reflections on Alterman's Poetry" [Hebrew], *Akhshav* 3-4 (1959): 109-22; "Night Already Dwells Black" [Hebrew], *Davar*, 11 December 1959; "Notes on the Margins of Israeli Imagism" [Hebrew], *Yokhni*, 1 (1961): 5-11; *Zman veritmus etzel Bergson uvashira hamodernit* [Time and Rhythm in Bergson and in Modern Poetry] (Tel Aviv, 1966). See also Shraga Avneri, "David Fogel's Poetry" [Hebrew], *Ha'arets*, 24 August 1956; Dalia Ravikovitch, "The Bridge" [Hebrew], *Omer*, 10 April 1958; Solomon Grodzinski, "With No Heirs" [Hebrew], *Davar*, 26 December 1959; Eddy Zemach, "On the Edge of the City I Will Sit" [Hebrew], *Gazit* 17:200 (1960): 115; Dan Pagis, "David Fogel: The Man and His Poetry" [Hebrew], *Molad* 12:189-90 (1964):191-217. See also Pagis's "Introduction" [Hebrew] in *Kol shirey David Fogel* (Tel Aviv, 1966), pp. 7-70, or in a subsequent 1975 edition, pp. 13-69.

2. T. S. Eliot, "Reflections on Verse Libre," in *To Criticize the Critic* (London, 1978 [1917]), pp. 183-89.

3. William Carlos Williams, *Autobiography* (New York, 1967), p. 264.

4. "The dominant" is Roman Jacobson's term. See "The Dominant," in *Readings in Russian Poetics*, eds. L. Matejka and K. Pomorska (Boston, 1971), pp. 82-87.

5. Yuri Tynyanov, *The Problem of Verse Language* (Ann Arbor, 1981), pp. 31-61.

6. Cited in Peter Jones, *Imagist Poetry* (London, 1988), p. 138.
7. Nathan Zach, *Zman veritmus etsel Bergson uvashira hamodernit* [Time and Rhythm in Bergson and in Modern Poetry] (Tel Aviv, 1966), p. 55.
8. Uzi Shavit, "The Beginning of Hebrew Free Verse and Its Affiliation with Early German Free Verse: On Fogel's Rhythm" [Hebrew], *Sefer Yitshak Bakon*, ed. Aharon Komem (Beersheba, 1992), p. 94.
9. David Frischmann, "Letters to Aḥad Ha'am" [Hebrew], *Hatkufa* 29 (1936): 352–53.
10. Herbert Reed, *The True Voice of Feeling* (London, 1968), p. 102.
11. Cited in Peter Jones, *Imagist Poetry* (London, 1988), p. 139.
12. Dan Pagis, Introduction in *Kol shirey David Fogel* [Collected Poems of David Fogel], 2d rev. ed. (Tel Aviv, 1975), pp. 45–47.
13. Regelson also expressed his affinity for Blake and Whitman through his translations in the final section of *El ha'ayin venivka'*. The poetic, thematic, prosodic, and trend affiliation with Blake's mythic, visionary romantic poetry is especially conspicuous in two of the young Regelson's central works: *Cain and Abel* (1932), whose motto is taken from Blake's *The Book of Thel*; here the prosodic structure of Regelson's book also resembles that of Blake's (unrhymed lines of six iambs in Regelson's work, versus unrhymed lines of seven iambs in Blake's); and *Shir hatikun*, whose mythical character as well as free rhythmic forms are similar, to a certain extent, to that of Blake's *The Book of Urizen*. The poetic, thematic, and prosodic links to Whitman are particularly striking in poems such as "The Rain" and "On the Subway." See Abraham Regelson, *Hakukot otivotayikh* [Your Letters Are Engraved] (Tel Aviv, 1964), pp. 184–86. Abraham Epstein has already noted Regelson's links to Blake and Whitman; see his *Sofrim 'ivriyim be'Amerika* (Tel Aviv, 1952), p. 142. For a parallel from American modernist poetry of a poet who frames the prophetic apocalyptic tradition of both Blake and Whitman in his work, see Donald Pease's discussion of Hart Crane in "Blake, Whitman, Crane: The Hand of Fire," in *William Blake and the Modernists*, eds. R. J. Bertholf and A. S. Levitt (Albany, 1982).
14. Abraham Epstein and Lea Goldberg have already noted the influence of the Whitman legacy, either directly or through Carl Sandburg and Robinson Jeffers, on Gabriel Preil. Epstein had underscored the influence of Glatstein and introspectivism on Preil's poems as early as 1943, with the publication of his first book of poems. See Abraham Epstein, *Mikarov umerahok* [From Near and from Afar] (New York, 1943). See also Lea Goldberg, "Portraits in Our New Literature: Gabriel Preil" [Hebrew], *Basha'ar*, 24 March 1949. For an overview of Preil's affiliation with both Anglo-American imagism and Yiddish modernism, see Dan Miron, "Poems of Another Time: Reflections on the Late Poetry of Gabriel Preil" [Hebrew], *Bitsaron* 68 (1977): 168–81, 202. See also Yael Feldman, *Modernism and Cultural Transfer: Gabriel Preil and the Tradition of Jewish Literary Bilingualism* (Cincinnati, 1986).
15. Baruch Katzenelson, *Le'or haner* [By Candlelight] (New York, 1930).
16. Gabriel Preil, *Nof shemesh ukhefor* [Landscape of Sun and Frost] (New York, 1945).
17. Menachem Ribalow's introduction to Katzenelson's *Le'or haner*, p. 11. See "Baruch Katzenelson," in *Sofrim ve'ishim* [Writers and Personages] (New York, 1936), pp. 145–46.
18. Ribalow, introduction to Katzenelson's *Le'or haner*, p. 12. Also in "Baruch Katzenelson," *Sofrim ve'ishim* [Writers and Personages], p. 146.
19. Yitshak Norman, "In the Dovecote of Hebrew Literature" [Hebrew], from *Ketuvim*, 276/77 (1932).
20. Hillel Bavli, *Ruhot nifgashot* [Spirits Meeting] (Tel Aviv, 1958), p. 157.
21. Aharon Ben-Or (Urinowski), *Toldot hasifrut ha'ivrit bedoreynu* [The History of Contemporary Hebrew Literature], vol. 1 (Tel Aviv, 1954), p. 361.
22. Katzenelson, *Le'or haner*, p. 66.
23. Katzenelson, *Le'or haner*, p. 59.
24. *Le'or haner*, p. 58.

25. Nurit Govrin, "Submission for the Sake of Conquest: On the Poetry of Anda Amir" [Hebrew], *Moznayim* 35-2 (1972): 134-37.
26. See Itamar Ya'oz-Kest, "With Anda: A Monologue for Two" [Hebrew] in *Anda*, ed. Zehava Beylin (Tel Aviv, 1977), p. 132.
27. Quoted in Dan Pagis's introduction to *Kol shirey David Fogel* (Tel Aviv, 1975), p. 29.
28. See Nurit Govrin's description of the basic form that recurs in many of the short poems of Pinkerfeld's first volume of poetry, in *Anda*, Zahava Beylin, ed. (Tel Aviv, 1977), p. 116. In the same volume, see also Yitshak Akavyahu's analysis of *Avishag*, Pinkerfeld's long dramatic monologue.
29. See *Anda*, p. 114.
30. Pagis, *Kol shirey David Fogel*, p. 41.
31. Govrin, "Submission for the Sake of Conquest," p. 134.
32. Nathan Zach, "On the Stylistic Climate of the 1950s and 1960s in Our Literature" [Hebrew], *Ha'arets*, July 27, 1966.
33. The opening and concluding poems of *Before the Dark Gate* are the only poems in the volume that are not marked by Roman numerals.
34. See Samuel Levin, "The Conventions of Poetry" in *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. S. Chatman (London, 1971), pp. 181-82.
35. See Zvi Luz, "Before the Dark Gate" [Hebrew], *Molad* 22, 189-90 (1964): 218-24.
36. T. S. Eliot, "The Music of Poetry" (Glasgow, 1942).