UFR Langues, Littératures et Civilisations Étrangères
Département d'Études du Monde Anglophone

Margins of the Margins: Women Poets of the Beat Generation

Manon PEEL

Mémoire de Master 2 Recherche – Études Anglophones

Sous la direction de:

Professeure Marie BOUCHET

Année Universitaire: 2024-2025

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Marie Bouchet for her unbelievable support, but also for her patience and her kindness, for always being there despite her tight schedule, for the interest she showed in my study and for her help in structuring this study.

I would like to thank my parents and my grandmother for the emotional support, for the interest in my study despite not understanding all of it, and for always being on my side through these two years of research for this study.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The research conducted for this master's dissertation focused on female poets of the Beat Generation, through a double perspective, since this study approaches these marginalised figures and their work with a feminist viewpoint, while studying feminism within the poems they produced. The Beat Generation emerged as a movement in the 1950s. In *Girls Who Wore Black: Women Writing the Beat Generation* (2002), Ronna Johnson and Nancy Grace reveal that

> what is distinctively Beat is the historical moment and social context in which its iconoclasms were practices, and the specific communities from which Beat praxis took shape: the way denizens of postwar – that is, post-Hiroshima, post-Auschwitz – Beat bohemian enclaves in Boston, New York, and San Francisco rejected cold war paranoias, button-down corporate conformities, consumer culture, sexual repression, and McCarthy-era gay bashing when it was far from common or safe to do so openly. (Grace, Johnson 2)

This movement was particularly centred on three big figures: Allen Ginsberg, Jack Kerouac and William Burroughs (Johnson and Grace 1). The movement was part of the American counterculture and as such, it influenced the American literary scene for several decade but specifically the 1950s, 1960s and also the 1970s. Their counterculture lifestyle was made of experimentation with drugs, exploration of their sexuality, travelling, and a study of religions and spiritualities especially Buddhism. They were also activists for the most part, who were politically committed to different causes.

Yet, in this movement there were women who have been ignored and written out of the Beat Generation for a long time (Johnson and Grace 4). Beat women were excluded from the movement as Beat men did not see them as talented or worthy enough of their support. (Johnson and Grace 4). Johnson and Grace write that Beat women were "accessories for cool hipster men, indispensable to the scene, but meant to be unseen and unheard as they render their essential but subsidiary functions" (Johnson and Grace 6). They were seen as sexual objects, mothers or wives. Despite this rejection, the women were "integral to Beat's development and indispensable to expressing its signature disdain of and challenge to establishment culture and conventions" (Johnson and Grace 6). Indeed, "Beat women's version of American individuality was a revolt for personal freedom enacted by and in their writing. This revolt led to a body of women-centred Beat literature that anticipated second wave feminism" (Johnson and Grace 6-7). They advanced "from silent to Beat to revolutionary" (Johnson and Grace 6) as feminism rose again in the 1960s. Johnson and Grace

highlight that ‘in addition to broaching mainstream fifties social constraints, women Beat writers had to reckon with Beat’s masculinist assumptions” (Johnson and Grace 7).

Johnson and Grace reveal that “women writers who contributed to and participated in the Beat movement form a three-generational cohort” (Johnson and Grace 12). Women of the first generation were “contemporaneous with the first male Beat writers – were, like them born in the 1910s and 1920s” (Johnson and Grace 12). They were “Madeline Gleason (1903-1979), Helen Adam (1909-1992), Sheri Martinelli (1918-1996), ruth weiss (1928-), and Carol Berge (1928-)” (Johnson and Grace 12). The second generation were born in the 1930s and “shared community and the cultural zeitgeist most directly and fully with the established male Beat writers” (Johnson and Grace 13). They include “Joanna McClure (1930-), Bobbie Louise Hawkins (1930-), Lenore Kandel (1932-), Elise Cowen (1933-1962), Kyger (1934-), di Prima (1934-), Hettie Jones (1934-), Johnson (1935-), and Brenda Frazer (Bonnie Bremser) (1939-)” (Johnson and Grace 13). The third generation was born in the 1940s and includes “Janine Pommy Vega (1942-) and Anne Waldman (1945-)” (Johnson and Grace 14). Denise Levertov was not included in this anthology yet can be considered as part of the first generation since she was born in 1923.

My work aims at rendering the invisibilised Beat women more visible. Five Beat women will be studied in my master’s dissertation: Diane di Prima (1934-2020), Joanne Kyger (1934-2017), Denise Levertov (1923-1997), Lenore Kandel (1932-2009) and Anne Waldman (1945-). I chose these poets to portray Beat women from the three different generations. I chose Denise Levertov to portray the first generation of Beat women, Diane di Prima, Joanne Kyger and Lenore Kandel to portray the second generation and Anne Waldman for the third generation. Since the second generation of Beat women was more involved with the first male Beats, and also more numerous, I decided to include more of them. While my primary sources for Kandel, Kyger and Levertov are selected or collected poems, and as such represent their entire works, my primary sources for Di Prima and Waldman were more selective. Reading about Beat women’s feminist writings, I found that *Loba* for Di Prima and *Fast Speaking Woman* would be more interesting as both contain these poets’ maybe most feminist writings about women’s empowerment. In addition, my choice to study two collections by Diane Di Prima, namely *Loba* and *Revolutionary Letters*, was out of a special interest in this poet, and also because she is the only one woman in the Beat Generation which men actually recognised as talented (Johnson and Grace 4).

Thus, it is crucial to know more about these poets. In *Women of the Beat Generation: the Writers, Artists, and Muses at the Heart of Revolution*, Brenda Knight writes that Diane di Prima’s poetry was influenced by her maternal grandfather, Domenico Mallozi, “a very political and diehard

freethinker" (Knight 123). She became a student of Buddhism in 1953 and "in 1957, Diane finally met Allen Ginsberg and his companions Jack Kerouac, Peter Orlowski and Gregory Corso in New York" (Knight 125). Throughout her life and in her poetry, di Prima never ceased to fight against gender norms, conformism. She was an activist, and was part of the Diggers, an anarchist group in San Francisco and participated in many protest movements including feminism, or the anti-war movement (Knight 126). Denise Levertov, was born in England, "her father, a highly productive writer in German, Hebrew, Russian, and English […] was a Russian Jewish immigrant who converted to Christianity before moving to England to become a priest" (Knight 207). She started writing as a child, and was part of the Black Mountain School and the San Francisco Renaissance, two poetry movements close to the Beat Generation. Due to the close relation between the movements, she is therefore associated with the Beat Generation (Knight 208). Levertov wrote poems on nature, religion, but "remained vocal in her protests against nuclear arms and the United States' role in El Salvador" (Knight 210) and against the Vietnam war. Joanne Kyger moved to San Francisco in 1957 and "became immediately immersed in the city's blooming poetry movement, meeting among others, Gary Snider" (Knight 197) whom she married in 1960. She wrote about women's right, ecology, Buddhism, and participated in several protest movements. Lenore Kandel "moved to San Francisco and met Beat poets" (Knight 279) in 1960. She had been a Buddhist since her childhood and was also an activist who was a member of the Diggers like Diane di Prima (Knight 280). Her poetry includes activist poems, explicit poems about sexuality and love written from the point of view of a woman, Buddhist and other religious poems. Anne Waldman "is a relative latecomer to the Beat scene, but her influence on the poetry world has been significant" (Knight 287). Her poetry was influenced by her feminism, and her activism in the anti-war, environmentalist movements among others as well as by Buddhism, Shamanism and Native American myths.

Before launching into this study, it is necessary to contextualize the subject with the history of American feminism and the context of women's conditions from the 1950s to the end of the 1970s. What is called "first-wave feminism" started before the Industrial Revolution. The struggle culminated in the first national Women's Rights Convention at Seneca Falls, New York in 1848 as recalled by Betty Friedan in *The Feminine Mystique*: "The women who formally launched the women's rights movement at Seneca Falls met each other when they were refused seats at an anti-slavery convention in London" (Friedan 108). Shulamith Firestone clarifies in *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*: "From its very beginning, the feminist movement posed a serious threat to the established order, its very existence and long duration testifying to fundamental

inequalities in a system that pretended to democracy" (Firestone 17). A feminist movement was absolutely crucial as women's conditions were terrible (Firestone 17). As Friedan writes, woman was:

> confined to the home, a child among her children, passive, no part of her existence under her own control, a woman could only exist by pleasing man. She was wholly dependent on his protection in a world that she had no share in making: man's world. (Friedan 105)

These feminists had to face abuse and extreme criticism for speaking up. They were seen as man-eating monsters who were going to make men slaves. The movement then focused on getting women's suffrage which they finally obtained over the course of the late 19th and early 20th centuries[1].

Yet as Firestone puts it, "the granting of the vote to the suffrage movement killed the Women's Rights Movement" (Firestone 22). This affirmation is also shared by Friedan who declares that "to women born after 1920, feminism was dead history" (Friedan 123). This study on Beat women will thus clarify their position towards that statement. After the granting of the vote, women had the vague impression of being emancipated because they could vote but in reality, power was still in men's hands (Friedan 123). Feminism was no longer seen as needed and thus feminists were perceived as ridiculous (Friedan 123).

Furthermore, the post-WW2 era was a period of economic prosperity marked by an increase in the standard of living but also by the baby boom in the 1950s. Yet, it was a period of confusion as well in regards to the place of women. In the chapter "Postwar America: Cold War Politics, Civil Rights, and the Baby Boom 1945-1961" in *A People and a Nation: History of the United States, Volume II: Since* 1865, William M. Tuttle Jr explains that despite more and more women entering the workforce, women's place was seen as in the home, taking care of both her children and her husband "with little regard to her own needs" (Tuttle 835). Published in 1946, the manual entitled *The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care* by Dr Benjamin Spock was a best-seller in the 1950s (Tuttle 835). It urged women to think of their children first and gave almost no responsibilities to fathers in the education and care of their children (Tuttle 835). Women were heavily encouraged to not pursue their dreams and careers for the sake of marriage and motherhood in accordance with the wishes of the society of the time (Tuttle 836). Fewer women were graduating from college than before (Tuttle 836). Popular culture in the 1950s glorified marriage and motherhood by portraying women on TV and in advertisement as housewives (Tuttle 836). Women were heavily criticised if they expressed the desire to have something else or to lead a different life

1 The first state of the United States of America was Wyoming in 1869.

(Tuttle 836). This was the case for Beat women who were criticised for living the Beat lifestyle, but also criticised for their writings. As Tuttle puts it,

> if they pursued a life outside the home, [women] were accused of being 'imitation men', or 'neurotic' feminists. Echoing psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, critics of working mothers contended that a women could be happy and fulfilled only through domesticity. (Tuttle 836)

Due to the veneration of motherhood and marriage, women's sexuality was perceived as a threat to the family and its values (Tuttle 837).

In addition, in the chapter "Reform and Conflict: A Turbulent Era, 1961-1974", Tuttle writes that the 1960s were a period during which a lot of things changed for women (Tuttle 944). As Tuttle explains: "in the 1960s, feminism was reborn" (Tuttle 944). The birth control pill appeared in 1960 as many young people started to explore their sexuality further (Tuttle 940). The 1963 publication of *The Feminine Mystique* by Betty Friedan put words on a problem that had been long felt by women in America (Tuttle 944). They felt empty and incomplete as they had been taught to devote their lives only to marriage and motherhood (Tuttle 944). In the 1960s, "wherever they went, [..] they were still only 'chicks', invisible as people" (Firestone 28). In 1966, the National Organisation for Women (NOW) was founded and lobbied for laws (Tuttle 944). After the creation of NOW, a new generation of radical feminists started fighting the law, cultural assumptions and traditions with direct action and a new notion: personal politics with its famous slogan "The personal is political" (Tuttle 944). Many of them joined other political movements "to champion the cause of a more conspicuous underdog is a euphemistic way of saying you yourself are the underdog" (Firestone 29). These feminists were, however, mostly white women who were educated (Tuttle 944). They fought for equality in employment and education, equal pay for equal work, abortion and non-stereotypical depiction of women in the media, among other things (Tuttle 944). In 1973, the Supreme Court historically ruled Roe v. Wade[2], making abortion legal in the USA (Tuttle 945). While women obtained more rights in the 1970s, the struggle continued. In the same period, anti-feminist groups were formed, as more and more conservative people rose against abortion rights for example (Tuttle 945).

This research grew out of a special interest in the Beat Generation, American counterculture, and women's poetry. Reading about the Beat Generation, I discovered the treatment of Beat women in this movement and thus wanted to study the lesser known, and marginalised Beat women poets. After discovering their poetry, I automatically felt connected to it and immersed myself in this study. Thus, my approach will be a feminist one, as I will explore Beat women's exclusion from the

2 Roe v. Wade was overturned in June 2022 by the Supreme Court.

Beat Generation, the influence of second-wave feminism in their poetry as well as how their poetry portrays their life as Beat women, and especially as women, since their poetry is feminist and displays their response to the feminist movement. This dissertation will explore Beat women poets and their works in four chapters. The first chapter will be dedicated to life and US society in the eyes of Beat women. I will develop aspects of the counterculture Beat lifestyle with travel, hippie communities, drug use, and in addition I will address mental health in this period, with psychiatric institutions. I will then explore the treatment of Beat women in the Beat Generation and their marginalisation, and their denunciations of misogyny. The second chapter will address marriage and love for Beat women. It will showcase how Beat women depicted marriage as a prison, wrote about domestic chores and being housewives. It will also develop freedom through divorce and living alone, and on dependency upon love. The third chapter will be focusing on Beat women writing the body, as they write about women's body and sexuality with the aim of breaking societal taboos and also criticise beauty standards for women, and therefore denounce patriarchy. The fourth chapter will explore the re-empowering that is present in their poetry, with the use of female mythical figures to write women empowerment poems, and the development of female agency in ars poetica poems and poems framing them as writers.

I/ Life and the US Society in the Eyes of Beat Women

A. Living the Beat Lifestyle

The lifestyle that is described in Beat women's poetry is one that is in clear opposition to the lifestyle of women of mainstream America in the 1950s. Being part of the counterculture, they led a life of travel, wander and lived in communities on the margins of society. These poems form an account and a celebration of the countercultural way of life.

In the article "Hippies and the Mystic Way: Dropping Out, Unitive Experiences, and Communal Utopianism", Morgan Shipley evokes the counterculture and hippie communities, their ethos and lifestyle and the philosophy behind it. It implied getting out of mainstream society, living in a community, sharing, believing in mysticism and psychedelic consciousness. Shipley explains that one of the popularisers of this utopian will to "drop out from the […] restraints of modern society" (Shipley 233) was Allen Ginsberg, mostly expressed in his article 'Public Solitude' published in 1966 (Shipley 233). The realisation of unity in the communities "relies both on establishing fundamental counterpoints to modern tendencies and, as key hippie mystics demonstrate, even more so on actively living out the experience of community – experiences steeped in mystical illuminations of altruism and love" (Shipley 236). Shipley reveals that "dropping out signalled a growing recognition among 1960s youth that […] love, responsibility, and community always already exist, without conditions or modern prerequisites of ethnicity, religions, skin tone, or citizenry" (Shipley 236). By "dropping out" (Shipley 237), hippies protested against "the destructive tendencies" (Shipley 237) of modernity, "refusing to accept that freedom, equality, and democracy must result in racial violence, increased poverty, and dehumanization in favor of corporate rights" (Shipley 237). Indeed, Shipley notes that mystic hippies dropped out "to embrace a mystical ethos of community antithetical to the systems of exchange, consumption, and exploitation dominating […] 1960s liberal society" (Shipley 244).

A poem which portrays the hippie lifestyle is 'Our Morning is Afternoon' (1959) in which Lenore Kandel describes the lifestyle of the communities and people that she lived with during the 1950s, namely the Beat Generation, among others. Kandel writes:

1 Our morning is afternoon,

- and we emerge in twilight.

- Bedtime is daytime,

- and we come into bloom

5 after midnight.

[…]

10 Like seasonless fowl we migrate…

- from East Coast to West Coast

- and back and forth again,

- for a job,

- for a friend,

15 for a change,

- for a kick.

[…]

38 Your bed is my bed,

- loan me your shirt?

40 Borrow your shower (Kandel 95-96)

The first and second stanzas are written with several antitheses, for example “morning is afternoon” (l. 1) and “bedtime is daytime” (l. 3) which clearly demonstrate a difference and opposition between their lifestyle and most people’s lifestyle and what is commonly seen as the average day. The other antithesis “we emerge into twilight” (l. 2) and “we come into bloom / after midnight” (l. 4-5) carry the idea of coming into life during the night instead of the day which portrays the fact that through their lifestyle, they go against mainstream culture and ideas thus emphasising their being part of the counterculture. Another thing to note is the use of the first-person plural voice “we” (l. 2, l. 4) especially highlighted in the anaphora in the first and second stanzas of “and we” (l. 2, l. 4), also used in the fourth stanza. The use of this pronoun shows a will to give an account of the lifestyle of countercultural communities and of the period, not just hers. It also shows the importance of community living in the counterculture.

In addition, Kandel compares them with migrating birds: “like seasonless fowl we migrate...” (l. 10), depicting their travelling lifestyle. Indeed, the word “seasonless” (l. 10) highlights their nomadic life and especially the absence of order and rules dictating their life as seasons are like a distinctive order of nature ruling the life of its beings. The following lines “from East Coast to West Coast / and back and forth again” (l. 11-12) with its mirroring effect and its emphasis on “again” (l.

12) at the end of the line highlight even more this notion of endless travelling. This with the comparison to “fowl” (l. 10) portray the lifestyle of the counterculture with a clear opposition to the sedentary lifestyle of the American culture of the 1950s with its suburbs and its mass consumption. The anaphora “for a job, / for a friend, / for a change, / for a kick” (l. 13-16) puts all these things on an equal footing, thus again going against American culture and especially its capitalism, which would make work more important than anything else. Moreover, this constant travelling for the reasons which Kandel states explicitly in her poem and this nightlife create an impossibility of creating a life according to societal standards: career, or being a housewife and maybe a mother for women of the 1950s. Without even mentioning politics or values, Kandel frames this opposition of time and place to the average American lifestyle as the basis of the lifestyle of counterculture communities in absentia.

With “for a kick” (l. 16) she also mentions drugs as an element of this way of life, which will be studied in more detail in the next section of this study. Then, in the final stanzas, there is a shift from the first-person plural to the first and second persons singular which depicts a shift from a somewhat more communal account to a more personal one. Kandel writes “your bed is my bed, / loan me your shirt? // borrow your shower” (l. 38-40) showcasing the importance of sharing and the community. The use of “your” (l. 38, l. 39, l. 40) conveys the idea of property which is very present in American society and culture. Yet, Kandel goes against property as she writes “your bed is my bed” (l. 38) thus taking the property of someone else which nullifies the notion and highlights the value of sharing in counterculture. The notion of sharing is also present with “loan me” (l. 39) and “borrow” (l. 40). Indeed, Kandel is the one asking the other to share thus emphasising the fact that she goes against the mainstream American notion of property, not just by her having no property of her own and by her asking to share the property of others.

Another poem about lifestyle and here about travel is ‘Grant Avenue’ (1964) in which Lenore Kandel celebrates “wandering” (l. 1) as a lifestyle. She writes in the first and second stanzas:

1 they say there’s this city ordinance against wandering

- I’m guilty

- ignorance of the law is no excuse but I’ve seen

- NO PARKING signs

5 NO SPITTING signs NO SMOKING signs lots

- of other NO signs

- but I’ve never seen a NO WANDERING sign

- yet

- thank god (Kandel 147)

The first stanza is quite striking because of its legislative lexical field with “city ordinance against wandering” (l. 1), “the law” (l. 3), and the multiple examples of “NO […] signs” (l. 4-6). Indeed, this terminology frames Kandel’s lifestyle as possibly illegal and thus creating a defensive reaction on her part as the repetition of “but I’ve seen” (l. 3) and “but I’ve never seen” (l. 7) work as argumentation against the interdiction. Kandel writes “I’m guilty” (l. 2) expressing through the language of law that it is her lifestyle, but in addition the use of this term points towards the idea of her being in opposition to societal values portrayed here by the law. Thus Kandel is framed as an outcast just like a criminal would be, which clearly affiliates her to the counterculture and depicts, at the same time, a judgement which US society carries against people who do not conform to mainstream expectations of lifestyle. This idea of judgement is also present in the first line with “they say” (l. 1), which shows a certain universality and anonymity in this “they” (l. 1). Indeed, “I’m guilty” (l. 2) can be read as both her claiming her guilt but also as the society claiming her as “guilty” (l. 2). The word “yet” (l. 8) stands alone in the final line of the first stanza. The line break and it being on the next line emphasises the fact that it is indeed not illegal to wander but to Kandel it maybe will be one day. The expression “thank god” (l. 9) which stands alone as well in a second stanza, expresses an obvious relief at her lifestyle not being deemed criminal because of negative societal opinion.

Moreover, in the third stanza, Kandel writes:

10 the dictionary says wandering is: roaming at will,

- travelling

- I say it’s also a way of lifestyle

- open to the world like a sea anemone to a rich green wave

- I absorb the flowers the faces and the words

15 I devour the multitude

- I swallow the universe

- and all and everything of it becomes myself

- the wonder of the world is my most essential food

- and my most absolute and alchemical body

20 would starve without it

- I am a sea creature, a star creature, a human creature

- no man can legislate my being (Kandel 147)

In the first four lines of this third stanza, Kandel clearly writes about “wandering” (l. 10). While previously she wrote “they say” (l. 1), this time it is “the dictionary says” (l. 10) and “I say” (l. 12) thus showing a shift from an exterior and societal notion of “wandering” (l. 10) to an opposition between an academic, normative notion and a personal definition. Indeed, Kandel describes “wandering” (l. 10) as “a way of life” (l. 12) which clearly comes in opposition to the negativity carried by the notion of law. Here, “wandering” (l. 10) inspires openness and freedom as shown in the comparison “open to the world like a sea anemone to a rich green wave” (l. 13). The comparison with nature comes in opposition to the previous depictions of “NO […] signs” (l. 4-6) which points to the city and thus to a lack of freedom.

In the rest of the stanza, Kandel develops an extended metaphor of “wandering” (l. 10) as eating. The lexical field of eating is first present with the anaphora “I absorb […] / I devour the multitude / I swallow the universe” (l. 14-16). The lexical field of the universe and wonder is linked to that of eating as Kandel writes “the wonder of the world is my most essential food / and my absolute and alchemical body / would starve without it” (l. 18-20). With this extended metaphor, Kandel describes “wandering” (l. 10) as her “food” (l. 18), her essence. Indeed, this aspect of “wandering” (l. 10) as her essence is seen not just through the metaphor itself of eating everything but also in the terminology that is used to describe her being and her body. There is a clear emphasis on Kandel with the use of the first-person singular “I” (l. 2, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21) and possessives associated “my” (l. 18, 19, 22) and “myself” (l. 17). The terms used to describe herself for example “and all and everything of it becomes myself” (l. 17) and “my absolute and alchemical body” (l. 19) show the importance of the fusion between Kandel and what she discovers when “wandering” (l. 10).

Finally, the most striking description of herself is “I am a sea creature, a star creature, a human creature / no man can legislate my being” (l. 21-22). The asyndeton creates the enumeration of descriptions portraying her as several beings at the same time. Indeed, Kandel is “a sea creature” (l. 21), she is “a star creature” (l. 21) which is linked her eating the “universe” (l. 16) and finally she is “a human creature” (l. 21). Kandel writing herself as also a “human creature” (l. 21) highlights the fact that being a human she has to be free while “creature” (l. 21) points to her being more than human. Something interesting to note is that in the final line she writes “no man can legislate my being” (l. 22). This “no man” (l. 22) can be interpreted as meaning “man” (l. 22), thus human male, or as meaning human. Both interpretations show Kandel’s opposition to US society and the law and

Kandel's feminist affirmation as a woman rejecting patriarchy. Both highlight, with the resurgence of the lexical field of law, that no one will rule her, and especially deprive her of her right to wander. This poem as well as the following one are poems which represent what is called nowadays ecofeminism.

In the poem 'REVOLUTIONARY LETTER #4' (1971) in the collection *Revolutionary Letters*, Diane di Prima writes about life in a community outside of society. In the first stanza, she writes:

1 Left to themselves people

- grow their hair.

- Left to themselves they

- take off their shoes.

5 Left to themselves they make love

- sleep easily

- share blankets, dope & children

- they are not lazy or afraid

- they plant seeds, they smile, they

10 speak to one another. (Di Prima 11)

The anaphora in "left to themselves" (l. 1, 3, 5) is a clear emphasis on the idea of going back to nature, to the simple human life which is of importance in counterculture and hippie communities. The lexical field of the connection to nature is thus present with quotes such as "people / grow their hair" (l. 1-2), "they / take off their shoes" (l. 3-4), and "they plant seeds" (l. 9). Indeed, all these elements point towards a return to nature as in the beginnings of human life and its simplicity. The lines "people / grow their hair" (l. 1-2), "they / take off their shoes" (l. 3-4) with the line breaks emphasising "grow their hair" (l. 2), "take off their shoes" (l. 4) show the importance in this lifestyle of less interventions on the body as a form of connection to nature.

Additionally, the lexical field of sharing is present as another element of the hippie lifestyle with "share blankets, dope & children" (l. 7), "they speak to one another" (l. 9-10) and "they make love" (l. 5) since sexuality was an important element in the American counterculture. Moreover, the lexical field of happiness and peace is present with "sleep easily" (l. 6), "they are not lazy or afraid" (l. 8) and "they smile" (l. 9). The long enumeration of all these elements in the poem is a description of the lifestyle of countercultural hippie communities. It is an obvious opposition to the lifestyle of the average American who is no longer connected to nature, who has to deal with mental health issues (sleeping problems), and for whom drug and sex are taboo. It is also an opposition to the

consumer society which has stopped sharing. Indeed, this poem is a depiction of a somewhat utopian lifestyle of people living off the grid, outside of society and its expectations, as "left to themselves" (l. 1, 3, 5) suggests. The use of the term "people" (l. 1), and the third-person plural "they" (l. 3, 5, 9) and its associated pronouns points towards this poem being an account of the lifestyle of some communities as well as a universal depiction of the effects of such a lifestyle on people.

In the second stanza, the anaphora "we return" (l. 13, 14) is linked to the anaphora of the first stanza. It evokes going back to nature, the origins of a simple human life. It also expresses a return to the essential, the absence of tyranny and societal obligations in this lifestyle. The lexical field of nature is present again with "we return with the sea, the tides" (l. 13) showing a clear association to nature in a maybe spiritual way. There is also a comparison with nature with "we return as often as leaves, as numerous / as grass, gentle, insistent" (l. 14-15) which emphasises this idea of going back to the beginning of human life and its communion with nature. The comparison also draws a parallel between nature and humans, portraying them as equals sharing characteristics as the quote "gentle, insistent" (l. 15) reveals. Indeed, these characteristics in the line are attributed to "leaves" (l. 15) and "grass" (l. 15) and to humans. Moreover, the alliteration in "s" in "we return with the sea, the tides / we return as often as leaves, as numerous / as grass, gentle, insistent" (l. 13-15) is reminiscent of the sea or the wind creating a musicality linked to nature.

Furthermore, while in the first stanza "people" (l. 1) and "they" (l. 3, 5, 9) are the subjects, the second one uses the first-person plural "we" (l. 13, 14, 15). This shows a shift from a broad account to a more personal one in which Di Prima is obviously included. While the first stanza describes the Beat lifestyle and its effects, the second stanza seems to be a personal, poetic and even maybe spiritual account of the connection to nature that this lifestyle brings. The final line of the poem "our babes toddle barefoot thru the cities of the universe" (l. 17) draws a parallel between this lifestyle and "children" (l. 7) as "children" (l. 7) are the beginning of life just as this lifestyle aims at being at one with the origin or essence of human life. Thus, the quote "we remember / the way" (l. 15-16) reveals that the persons who choose this lifestyle go back to the simple life of "children" (l. 7) that they experienced, walking "barefoot thru the cities of the universe" (l. 17). It is a life without obligations and connected to nature.

These poems reflect what Shipley explained: "in embracing such idyllic utopianism, the hippies set themselves apart from projects of modernity / modernization, challenging the artificial barriers erected between progressive civilization ("Man") and intuitive or archaic principles and practices ("Nature") (Shipley 236-237). Shipley also notes that mystical hippies "developed an antimodern sentiment necessary to overcome the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of corporate capitalism and

liberal consumerism in order to actualize the lost values promised within the American project" (Shipley 237).

B. Drugs

An important element regarding the lifestyle of the Beats, men or women, is their drug use, either to reach a certain state of altered consciousness in relation to psychedelics or religion, or just as part of their daily life. The period from the 1950s to the 1970s is thus well-known for its experimentation with drugs but also for mental illnesses and the treatments of them in psychiatric institutions, especially for the Beats, among other movements in the counterculture, and for women.

In the article 'Cults and Cosmic Consciousness: Religious Vision in the American 1960s', Camille Paglia evokes religions and drug use in the 1960s. Paglia argues that in terms of religions, "the American sixties brought East and West together" (Paglia 57). As Paglia explains the members of the counterculture sought out religious and spiritual consciousness at the same time as political change (Paglia 58) yet Paglia reveals that "one problem was that the more the mind was opened to what was commonly called 'cosmic consciousness' (a hippie rubric of the sixties), the less meaningful politics or social structure became, melting in the Void" (Paglia 58). A way to reach this "cosmic consciousness" (Paglia 58) was drugs, as Paglia shows: "alteration of consciousness – 'blowing your mind' – became an end or value in itself in the sixties" (Paglia 58). Yet, "the neurological risks of long-term drug use were denied or underestimated" (Paglia 58).

In the poem 'Dope Poem' (date unknown), Lenore Kandel gives an account or testimony of drug use. Kandel writes:

1 one of the things about dope is
- you can never take a piss because
- the bathroom is always full of people
- shooting up
5 and you can't stir your coffee while you
- wait
- because all the spoons are gone
- and when you find them hidden
- behind the bathtub
10 you have to wash the soot off and
- they don't taste right anyway

- and if you take your turn and

- sit on the john and

- roll up your sleeve

15 it's only a hot flash

- in a cold world (Kandel 195)

To begin, Kandel uses the second-person singular "you" (l. 2, 5, 8, 10, 12) which here is quite general. This pronoun includes others, herself but in a form of distance through the use of the second-person singular, as if judging herself, watching herself do things, as if looking at herself in the mirror. It can also include the reader, thus it gives a multidimensional aspect to the pronoun which creates the impression of a testimony. It anchors the reader in the story as if they knew about it as well, and it gives the impression of a universal truth being told. It is of course an account of the experience of the writer and shows the reality of drug use. The fact that the poem is written in free verse and the presence of a polysyndeton with "and" (l. 5, 8, 10, 12, 13) create an enumeration of descriptions throughout the poem which make it seem like direct speech, thus again emphasising the idea of a testimony. The use of a colloquial register with "take a piss" (l. 2), "sit on the john" (l. 13) or "shooting up" (l. 4) highlights this impression of direct speech and of a first-hand account.

Additionally, the lexical field of drug use is present with terms and lines such as "dope" (l. 1), "because all the spoons are gone" (l. 7), "you have to wash the soot off" (l. 10), and "roll up your sleeve" (l. 14). Something interesting is the line breaks, as they highlight the line and its meaning. The choice of line breaks by Kandel is quite striking with for example "because / the bathroom is always full of people / shooting up" (l. 2-4) which highlights the last word of the line and the following line that is "people / shooting up" (l. 3-4) which is a clear description of drug use. Another example is "wait / because all the spoons are gone / and when you find them hidden / behind the bathtub" (l. 6-9). The line breaks here put the emphasis on "spoons are gone" (l. 7) and "hidden" (l. 8) which both are at the end of the line. This highlights Kandel's will to portray drug use putting the emphasis on important notions and objects with "shooting up" (l. 4), "spoons are gone" (l. 7) and "hidden" (l. 8).

Moreover, the line breaks in "and if you take your turn and / sit on the john and / roll up your sleeve" (l. 12-14) emphasise "and" (l. 12, 13, 14) as it is at the end of the line each time. This highlights the repetitiveness of drug use. She draws a parallel between the "people / shooting up" (l. 3-4) at the beginning of the poem and herself doing the same thing at the end of the poem. Thus she provides a testimony both of drug use by others and by herself as highlights the line "and if you take your turn" (l. 12). Finally, the antithesis in the last two lines of the poem "it's only a hot flash /

in a cold world" (l. 15-16) expresses the reality of drug use. Indeed, the terms "only" (l. 15) and "flash" (l. 15) highlight the idea of it being for a moment. Drug is described as a "hot flash" (l. 15) thus something quite positive in opposition to the "cold world" (l. 16). Drug can be interpreted as something which helps Kandel escape from the reality of society for a moment. This poem is not a denunciation but rather a testimony of drug use. It is neither neutral nor positive.

Drugs, the communities and the spiritual quest were all at the essence of the counterculture lifestyle, as described by Paglia:

> the most fervent of the decade's spiritual questers followed Timothy Leary's advice to 'Turn on, tune in, and drop out' and removed themselves from career tracks and institutions, which they felt were too corrupt to reform. The testimony of those radical explorers of inner space has largely been lost: they ruined their minds and bodies by overrelying on drugs as a shortcut to religious illumination. (Paglia 68)

Indeed, "sex, drugs and rock and roll" (Paglia 84) was the credo and the reality for many individuals of the 1960s generation (Paglia 84). Drugs created a "momentary sense of unity with mankind and the world" (Paglia 84). Writing specifically about the drugs used among the Beat Generation, Paglia notes: "the Beats used peyote, derived from mescal buttons. […] 'Magic' mushrooms […] containing psychotropic psylocibin were also used by the Beats. […] The sixties' premiere drugs, however, were marijuana and LSD" (Paglia 86). Regarding LSD, Paglia explains that it started being used in Greenwich Village in 1961, in 1962 it was on both US Coasts, and it was popularised nationally in 1964 by Timothy Leary and Richard Alpert's book *The Psychedelic Experience* (Paglia 88). Paglia notes that "drug taking was also a gesture of rebellion against Western commercialism" (Paglia 88).

Another poem about drugs is 'Junk/Angel' (1967) in which Lenore Kandel discusses drugs through the metaphor of a "junkie angel" (Kandel 55). First of all, Kandel creates an extended metaphor of the "junkie angel" (l. 1) as representing drugs. The anaphora "I have seen" (l. 1) demonstrates that Kandel's poem is an account of the reality of drug use during the 1960s as this poem is part of her collection *Word Alchemy* which was published in 1967. Yet, it is not just a mere account, it is also a denunciation as the lexical field of the evil and negative influence of this character shows. The oxymoron "junkie angel" (l. 1) reveals an association of negative and positive notions. The "junkie angel" (l. 1) despite being an "angel" (l. 1) in the first place, is described as a fallen "angel" (l. 1) and a demon as Kandel writes "I have seen the junkie angel winging his devious path over cities" (l. 1) and "I have seen him plummet to earth" (l. 3). His bad influence is revealed with the synesthesia

“he exudes the rainbow odor of corruption” (l. 7) associating sight and smell with “corruption” (l. 7) thus making his bad influence even more striking as it is felt through the senses and not just noticed. It is also revealed with “caressing the shadow of the man / with love and avarice” (l. 17-18) in which the antithesis “love and avarice” (l. 18) again demonstrates the ambivalence of this character between good and evil. While “caressing” (l. 17) seems to be a positive term, here it is used in “caressing the shadow of the man” (l. 17). The “shadow” (l. 17) and the character touching it points towards yet again the bad influence of the “junkie angel” (l. 1).

In addition, this hybridity of positive and negative terminology is also present with Kandel writing that “his footstep is precise, his glance tender” (l. 10), which depicts his qualities despite the rest being utterly negative as in the description of his wings. The line “his greenblack pinions parting the air with the sound of fog” (l. 2) is quite striking as the colour black is culturally associated with evil and green is in pop culture the colour which represents radioactivity and chemicals; thus even with the colour of his wings, negativity is still present. His wings are also depicted as “his feathered bat wings” (l. 4) and the term “bat” (l. 4) reminds of demons thus even more framing this “junkie angel” (l. 1) as something evil. The character is also depicted with the comparison “unfurls his wings and rides the sky like an / enormous Christian bat” (l. 19-20) which also contains the mention of “bat” (l. 20) yet here it is put in an oxymoron “Christian bat” (l. 20). Indeed, just like the first line’s oxymoron “junkie angel” (l. 1), this one has one term that is negative and another one that is religious and positive. The association of a religious terminology with drugs or demonic depictions is crucial to understand Kandel’s account of drugs. Drug as the “junkie angel” (l. 1) is depicted as appearing as loving to some while terribly destructive in general, which is what Kandel seeks to denounce.

Moreover, in the line “pausing to share the orisons of some ecstatic acolyte” (l. 5), the religious term “orisons” (l. 5) can be interpreted as the prayers to the “junkie angel” (l. 1) serving as a metaphor for drug use. Another religious term is “blessing” (l. 16) in “he extends his hollow fingered hands / blessing blessing blessing” (l. 15-16) which is another antithesis as the character is depicted as a demon yet being touched by him is supposedly a “blessing” (l. 16). Maybe this term is taken out of its positive religious context and used in the context of the actions of a bad “angel” (l. 1) which would bless people with drug, here “blessing” (l. 16) is written three times which can be a way to reflect the repetition of drug use. Moreover, the description of the “junkie angel” (l. 1) is reminiscent of the appearance of drug addicts.

Aditionally, one also notices an emphasis on the thinness of his body with “his narrow flesh” (l. 4), “the bone shines through his face” (l. 6), “his hollow fingered hands” (l. 15) and “his ichorous hollow fingers” (l. 17). This malnourished appearance reminds of drug addicts, but also of the

depiction of demons in culture. Kandel also writes about his face, and especially his eyes “his eyes are spirals of green radioactive mist” (l. 8), “he has no mouth nor any other feature / but whirling eyes above the glaring faceless face” (l. 11-12). His eyes being described as “spirals” (l. 8) are reminiscent of the depiction of people’s eyes when they take drugs in pop culture: it can point to a hypnotising effect of the character which would portray the addictive effect of drugs. As mentioned before, the colour green in pop culture is associated with radioactivity and chemicals, thus “green radioactive mist” (l. 8) clearly points to something chemical and toxic which perfectly represents drugs. The fact that he has no “feature” (l. 11) and is “faceless” (l. 12) reveals either a willingness to create an allegory of drug and its absence of face would be logical or through the “faceless face” (l. 12) it seeks to portray drugs as being something that can affect anyone, as drug use has no specific look, gender, class or ethnicity.

Finally, analysing again the colours, Kandel describes him with the polyptoton “Radiant with a black green radiance” (l. 14) which emphasises light, which seems positive except with its association to colours representing evil and radioactivity in “black green radiance” (l. 14). This again frames him as demonic. Kandel writes that “he never speaks and always understands he answers no one” (l. 13) and that he is “voiceless” (l. 20). The “junkie angel” (l. 1) does not speak as he represents drug yet he “understands” (l. 13). This understanding points to the idea of the “junkie angel” (l. 1) as understanding drug addicts who want more, thus the drug “always” (l. 13) comes back in their life. This voicelessness can also represent the taboo surrounding drug.

Kandel also denounces drug addiction and gives a testimony of the reality of drug use in the poem ‘Blues for Sister Sally’ (1967). This poem is written in four different parts. Here is the first part:

1 moon-faced baby with cocaine arms
- nineteen summers
- nineteen lovers

- novice of the junkie angel
5 lay sister of mankind penitent
- sister in marijuana
- sister in hashish
- sister in morphine

- against the bathroom grimy sink

10 pumping her arms full of life

- (holy holy)

- she bears the stigma (holy holy) of the raving christ

- (holy holy)

- holy needle

15 holy powder

- holy vein

- dear miss lovelorn: my sister makes it with a hunk

- of glass do you think this is normal miss lovelorn

- I DEMAND AN ANSWER! (Kandel 56)

First of all, this poem being a blues, the anaphoras create a rhythm as in a song which could be a celebration of drugs if the description of drug use was not particularly sad. It is important to note that blues is a music that expresses sadness in general and deep emotions, but it can be religious as well. In this poem, Kandel creates an extended metaphor for drug addiction or use as a religion. Indeed, in the first part of the poem, "sister Sally" (Kandel 56) is described with religious terms as it is written in the first two lines of the second stanza: "novice of the junkie angel / lay sister of mankind penitent" (l. 4-5). Kandel uses again the metaphor and oxymoron of the "junkie angel" (l. 4) to describe drugs. Kandel describes the girl as "novice" (l. 4) which both means a simple beginner in something and is also the term used to described new nuns. In the line "lay sister of mankind penitent" (l. 5), the "lay sister" (l. 5) can have two meanings: first, Kandel inscribes the girl as an atheist or secular in regards to Christianity as "mankind penitent" (l. 5) refers to; second, a "lay sister" (l. 5) is also a member of a religious order that has not been ordained yet. Thus, the girl in the extended metaphor of drug as a religion, is not religious in the Christian sense, but is religious in the drug addict sense. In the first stanza, the girl is described as a "moon-faced baby with cocaine arms / nineteen summers / nineteen lovers" (l. 1-3). The expression "moon-faced" (l. 1) refers to her pale skin tone which can be seen as a result of her being an addict as "with cocaine arms" (l. 1) shows. Kandel describes the girl's youthfulness with terms like "baby" (l. 1), "nineteen summers" (l. 2) and "pumping her arms full of life" (l. 10). This description of her youthfulness is in opposition to her drug use which is slowly killing her as shown in the description of her arms:

“cocaine arms” (l. 1) and “her arms full of life” (l. 10). Moreover, in the third stanza, the extended metaphor of drug as a religion is made clearer with the anaphoras with “(holy holy)” (l. 11, 12, 13) and more especially with the anaphoras “holy needle / holy powder / holy vein” (l. 14-16). Obviously “holy” (l. 11-16) is a religious term which here creates a celebration of drug with the terms used with it, as well as elements providing rhythm for the blues song. This rhythm with anaphoras is also present in the description of the relationship between the girl and Kandel: she is a “sister in marijuana / sister in hashish / sister in morphine” (l. 6-8) which can highlight the drugs that they both use.

In addition, Kandel denounces the situation of the girl, especially its sadness with “she bears the stigma (holy holy) of the raving christ” (l. 12). The oxymoron “raving christ” (l. 12) is part of the metaphor of drug as a religion as Kandel uses “christ” (l. 12). With “stigma” (l. 12), Kandel addresses the way society views drug users and addicts and with “she bears the stigma […] of the raving christ” (l. 12), Kandel refers to the marks and blemishes on the skin produced by the repeated injections. The denunciation is also present with the lines “dear miss lovelorn: my sister makes it with a hunk / of glass do you think this is normal miss lovelorn // I DEMAND AN ANSWER!” (l. 17-19). These lines are written in direct speech and explicitly denounce drug use as “do you think this is normal” (l. 18) expresses.

Then, in the first stanza of the second part of the poem, something striking is the line breaks which emphasise the end of the line as with “weep / for my sister she walks with open veins” (l. 20-21). This is a denunciation and a sort of call for help. While “weep” (l. 20) refers to sadness and asks for pity, “she walks with open veins / leaving her blood in the sewers of your cities” (l. 21-22) refers both to drug use and death. The mention of “her blood” (l. 22) going to “the sewers” (l. 22) is a particularly powerful image, since her blood is cast as something worthless because being an addict means being an outcast and having a low status hence “the sewers” (l. 22). The use of the possessive in “your cities” (l. 22) shows Kandel’s aim to denounce the problem of drug by calling to people to see the situation and act on it. The girl here is portrayed as a victim that people should care about. With the anaphoras and epiphoras of “from east coast / to west coast / to nowhere” (l. 23-25) Kandel either points to the girl as travelling around the country or as the girl “sister Sally” (Kandel 56) being after all an allegory of the drug addict, a sister who is everywhere just like addicts are to be found everywhere.

In the following stanza, Kandel comes back to a religious terminology with “how shall we canonize our sister who is not quite dead” (l. 26). The use of “canonize” (l. 26) is to make someone a saint because of miracles and being an example who strictly follows religion or because the person is a martyr. Kandel creates an antithesis with “canonize our sister who is not quite dead” (l. 26) as

canonisation happens only after the death of the person, here it emphasises the idea of the girl as being a martyr. This also denounces the ravaging effects of drugs and how it causes death. The description of the girl with "her bloodless face" (l. 30) also points to the results of drug addiction as she is described as almost "dead" (l. 26) and her skin tone is associated with that of a corpse. In addition, the description of the girl with anaphoras in "who" (l. 26-29) in the lines "how shall we canonize our sister who is not quite dead / who fornicates with strangers / who masturbates with needles" (l. 26-28) in association with the idea of canonisation reveals as well that these are reasons for her to be canonised. She is both a martyr and at the same time someone who follows the lifestyle and the metaphoric religion of drug, thus an allegory of an addict which would become a saint in that drug religion. The use of the first-person singular "we" (l. 26) reveals that they are a community to which Kandel belongs, and for which the "sister" (l. 26) is a form of idol.

C. Psychiatric Institutions

In addition, to writing about drugs and the countercultural lifestyle, Beat women also wrote about mental health issues and about psychiatric hospitals to which a number of Beats men and women were sent. The period of the 1950s and 1960s for women was a period of struggle, and trying to live outside the housewife and mother norm has proved to be difficult for women, their families sending them to psychiatric hospitals and such institutions.

In "A Fleeting Moment in a Floating World: The Women of the Beat Generation Through Allen Ginsberg's Eyes", Katie Oates quotes Beat poet Gregory Corso who declared in a 1994 interview:

> There were women, they were there, I knew them, their families put them in institutions, they were given electric shock. In the 50s if you were male you could be a rebel, but if you were female your families had you locked up. There were cases, I knew them, someday someone will write about them. (Knight 1996 141)

One of these women was Elise Cowen. She was a poet, writing in secret. She is mostly remembered for her friendship and love for Allen Ginsberg, but she was more than that. Some of her works were published posthumously, after she committed suicide at 28, throwing herself out of an apartment's window. Her parents were against her writing dreams and burned almost all of her poems after her death (Oates).

One poem addressing these issues is 'Telephone From a Madhouse' (1967), in which Lenore Kandel evokes visiting someone, a woman, who is in an asylum, which in the 1950s and 1960s was referred to as a "madhouse" (Kandel 60). This is a long narrative poem which is an account of that visit from the poet's point of view. First of all, the description of Kandel's reaction to the phone is very

different from the description of the “voice” (l. 8). While Kandel was calm just a moment before, this phone call completely changes her attitude as at the beginning, Kandel writes “my carelessly hello-ing mouth” (l. 7) gradually, line after line, Kandel becomes agitated and stressed as the “voice” (l. 8) and “the anxiety of it cutting my calm” (l. 11), she writes “rubbing my sweaty fingers” (l. 16) which is a sign of stress, and “my tense muscled / thigh” (l. 21-22) which is also a bodily reaction to stress. The woman that Kandel talks to and visits is first described as “this voice from a million miles away, from a treeless plain, / from a gray wet dank abyss” (l. 8-9). The succession of metaphors for the location of the “voice” (l. 8), each one introduced by an anaphora of “from” (l. 8-9) depicts not the actual location, but the mental state of the woman. Indeed, this exergasia, starts with “from a million miles away” (l. 8) highlighting the physical distance and the difference in mental state. The expression “from a treeless plain” (l. 8) on the other hand depicts the infinity and the nothingness of the “plain” (l. 8) thus representing her life as numb, with nothing, and seemingly eternal. Then, the final “from a gray wet dank abyss” (l. 9) suggests a mental prison as “abyss” (l. 9) is a place with no escape route, the colour “gray” (l. 9) suggests numbness of life and “wet and dank” (l. 9) suggests sadness.

Moreover, the woman is described as anxious (“the anxiety of it” (l. 11)), “it” (l. 11) being her “voice” (l. 8) – and as sad – (“the soft and / desperate tears” (l. 17-18)). Moreover, the anaphora and repetitions of “are you there” (l. 11, 13, 14) reveal, through the use of direct speech, the despair of this woman who is locked in a psychiatric hospital and who is so psychologically unwell that she does not know who exists and who does not. The anaphora in the poet’s direct speech “Yes, I murmur, yes yes yes” (l. 15, 17, 23) shows Kandel’s will to comfort the woman, and also the fact that she does not know what to do and that it seems impossible to comfort her.

Then, in the second stanza, Kandel describes her visit to the woman. The “voice” (l. 28, 35) is a synecdoche standing for the woman. It is seen especially with “the voice lies waiting” (l. 28) and “the voice sobs at me” (l. 35). The description of the woman emphasises her sadness and her tears as the lines “her / feral eyes break at me / among the tears” (l. 29-31), “sobs” (l. 35) and “tears / blossom reblossom” (l. 39-40) reveal. The repetition of “blossom reblossom” (l. 40) highlights the never-ending crying which is present throughout the poem. The woman’s dialogue written in direct speech “oh i / can’t go on i can’t / i don’t want to live / any more” (l. 36-39) gives us access to her emotions and thoughts rather than just having a description of it. The line breaks of “oh i / can’t go on i can’t” (l. 36-37) create an epanalepsis which highlights even more the negativity of her speech. The fact that her “i” (l. 36-38) are all written in lower case in comparison to Kandel’s which are in capital letters suggests that Kandel tried to portray her complicated mental state visually. Kandel’s reaction again shows that she is unable to comfort her: “WHAT AM I / GOING TO DO” (l. 44-45).

The capital letters portray the urgency and emotions created by the situation. The description of her actions also shows her inability to help the woman ("i wiggle up onto the thin / and high and narrow bed / utterly wordless" (l. 46-48)). The polysyndeton with "and" (l. 47) to depict the "bed" (l. 47) suggests as well that Kandel is "utterly wordless" (l. 48) as she describes more the "bed" (l. 47) than she actually speaks.

Additionally, Kandel continues to depict the situation. The capital letters for "SCREAMS" (l. 53) provide a visual depiction of the scream, the line break setting it apart also highlights this description of the woman's emotions. The repetition of "I whisper it's all right" (l. 56, 67-68, 73-74) again portrays the fact that she is does not know how to react to the situation. Her whispering "it's all right" (l. 56, 67-68, 73) is completely paradoxical in this situation. The woman's answer definitely shows this paradox "it *is* all right I / whisper and / thank you she / whispers back / but is it? And / I am speechless" (l. 73-78). Something interesting is that Kandel is either whispering or silent throughout the poem. The woman on the other hand, speaks more, and she "SCREAMS" (l. 56).

Finally, in the end of the second stanza and in the third one, the woman talks about her emotions, showing the awful reality of psychiatric institutions:

106 how are
- you
- Terrible, she nods
- terrible
110 i don't think i'll
- ever get well
- i'm afraid
- they want me to get HELP a voice
- out of bed calls piteously
115 and i can't help help
- i smell bad help
- the world is
- disintegrating and
- i don't have
120 anything to hold

- on to

- and she is trembling
- in the terrible wind
- the tears are
125 gobbling her eyelids help
- nobody will ever
- love me she sighs
- i am afraid i am
- afraid of everything
130 terrible she nods
- terrible
- I kiss her tears like VISITING HOURS
- january sleet touch
- my mouth and ARE NOW
135 I go away
- OVER (Kandel 63)

Something striking here, is the presence of other stanzas on the right side of the poem, which describe what is happening outside the woman's room. Here the cry "HELP a voice / calls piteously / help help / help / help" (l. 113-116) shows the reality of the "madhouse" (Kandel 60) and can be interpreted as a parallel to the woman's speech which is suicidal and is also a cry for "help" (l. 113, 115, 116). The anaphoras "terrible she nods / terrible" (l. 108-109, 130-131) in direct speech emphasise her struggling mental state, thus depicting the reality of mental health and psychiatric institutions. The repetition of "i'm afraid" (l. 112, 128-129) also depicts her mental state. The line breaks underscore negative terms, either in the beginning or at the end of the line like for example "i don't think i'll / ever get well" (l. 110-111), "and I can't / I smell bad / the world is / disintegrating and / I don't have / anything to hold / on to" (l. 115-121) and "nobody will ever / love me" (l. 126-127). Kandel has no answer to the woman and she leaves: "I kiss her tears […] / I go away" (l. 132-135). The "kiss" (l. 132) is a gesture of "love" (l. 127) which is something that the woman is persuaded to never receive. Yet, Kandel is obliged to leave, as the right side poem reveals: "VISITING HOURS / ARE NOW / OVER" (l. 132-136). This poem portrays the reality of

psychiatric institutions to which a lot of women were sent during the 1950s and the 1960s by their parents because of their mental health but also because of their nonconformity to the American societal ideals.

In the tenth chapter of *The Beat Generation Writers*, entitled “I Say My New Name: Women Writers of the Beat Generation”, Amy L. Friedman explains that Beat women had to face “threats that were legal, parental, economic and psychological” (Friedman 1996 213). Friedman quotes Diane di Prima who declared in an interview which was published in *The Beat Road: The Unspeakable Visions of the Individual*:

> I can't say a lot of really great women writers were ignored in my time, but I can say a lot of potentially great women writers wound up dead or crazy. I think of the women on the Beat scene with me in the early '50s, where are they now? [...] I don't want to rant on about individual cases, but the threat of incarceration or early death in one form or other was very real. (Knight 1984 31)

Beat women wrote about the Beat lifestyle, but they also criticised mainstream US society.

D. Criticising US Society

Beat women also wrote poems which criticise US Society. They criticise its consumerism, its housewife and suburbs ideals, its media, its capitalism and its pro-military and pro-war attitude. Regarding the criticism of the US society and the revolutionary stance of the Beat Generation, William Nesbitt wrote “Echoes of the Revolution: Diane di Prima and the Beat Generation” posted on the website Beatdom. Using the definition of Beat given by Allen Ginsberg in 1982, Nesbitt writes that as Ginsberg explained, Beats fought: for liberation, namely spiritual, sexual, gay rights, civil rights, women’s rights – though this one is a bit paradoxical viewing their attitude towards women of the movement; against censorship; for the decriminalisation of drugs; for ecology; against the military and industries; for indigenous rights; against consumerism; against fascism; for the spread of eastern thought; and for the end governmental secrecy with CIA or KGB (Nesbitt).

In the poem ‘First They Slaughtered the Angels’ (1967), Lenore Kandel uses an extended metaphor for US society as a dystopia in which hope is represented by “angels” (l. 1) who are however “gone” (l. 12). To begin, in this extended metaphor of US society that is a dystopia, the people who are identified by the third-person plural “they” (l. 1, 15) are the ones who have taken control of the society and who “have slaughtered the angels” (l. 1). The “angels” (l. 1) represent the hope, the spirituality or the utopia of which people are deprived. The lexical field of violence is omnipresent in this poem, and especially through the idea of killing. Violence is present in the first stanza with

“first they slaughtered the angels / tying their thin white legs with wire cords / and / opening their silk throats with icy knives” (l. 1-4). The lines “we watched from the underground / from the gravestones / the crypts” (l. 7-8) is interesting as the “we” (l. 7) and the “they” (l. 1, 15) are opposed, with the poet being part of this group or community. The mention of “underground” (l. 7), “gravestones” (l. 8) and “crypts” (l. 8) suggests that being under the earth, they are metaphorically of a low social status thus showing the opposition of us, the people, to them, the authority or the powerful people. The lines “the seraphs and the cherubim are gone […] / and now they walk the rubbled streets with / eyes like fire pits” (l. 12-16) depict this “they” (l. 1, 15) as demons as suggests “eyes like fire pits” (l. 16). Now that the “angels” (l. 1) are no more, these demons representing authority in US society are able to “walk the rubbled streets” (l. 15), meanwhile the people of low social status have to hide. This is a criticism of the 1950s and the 1960s, with McCarthyism, capitalism, and patriarchy among others.

Then, the criticism of US society becomes clearer in the second part of the poem. Violence is still present, in a sexual form here with “who raped St. Mary with a plastic dildo stamped with the / Good Housekeeping seal of approval” (l. 24-25). Here, the sexual violence is done to a woman, God’s mother, who thus represents every woman and mother to whom sex is not only imposed through rape, but this rape in a metaphorical sense represents the life of the housewife imposed by patriarchy in the 1950s and 1960s on women. The “plastic dildo” (l. 24) here can be interpreted as depicting the sexual urge of that period as well. The lines “our knees sprout credit cards / we vomit canceled checks” (l. 30-31) is again a metaphor humanising “credit cards” (l. 30) and “canceled checks” (l. 31) thus criticising capitalism and consumerism in US society. The lines “the bellies of women split open and children rip their / way out with bayonets” (l. 38-39) is a metaphor criticising the violence of the world in which “children” (l. 38) are brought up, here in this dystopian metaphor, “children rip their / way out with bayonets” (l. 38-39) thus even as they are born, they already bear arms. The lines “the penises of men are become blue steel machine guns, / they ejaculate bullets, they spread death as an orgasm” (l. 42-43) are a metaphor which gives fire arms characteristics to humans here to “the penises of men” (l. 42). Indeed, through this metaphor, Kandel gives to humans’ sexual characteristics fire arms and violence characteristics – “blue steel machine guns” (l. 38) and “bullets” (l. 39) – thus associating both the sexual revolution and the pro-military aspects of the US society as the line “they ejaculate bullets, they spread death as an orgasm” (l. 39).

Moreover, in the third part, the repetition of “they have murdered the angels” (l. 69, 86) develops the extended metaphor of this dystopian society. The anaphora in “we have” (l. 70, 71) emphasises the consequences of US society on this “we” (l. 70, 71) which represents people of low social status

or people who are stigmatised. The lines “we have sold our bodies and our hours to the curious / we have paid off our childhood in dishwashers and miltown” (l. 70-71) and especially the terms “have sold” (l. 70) and “have paid off” (l. 71) criticise capitalism and consumerism, and frame the “we” (l. 70, 71) as victims of this system. Moreover, these lines also depict money and possessions as more important than “our bodies and our hours” (l. 70) which are “sold” (l. 70) and “our childhood” (l. 71). The terms “dishwashers and miltown” (l. 71) are reminiscent of the 1950s urge of consumerism, mental health problems and the popularisation of antidepressants and anxiolytics with “miltown” (l. 71). “We have” (l. 70, 71) is is systematically set against “they have” (l. 69, 77, 86) creating an “us vs them” type of narrative. With “they have denied both christ and cock […] / and / censored even the words of love” (l. 77-80) Kandel denounces the 1950s taboo of sex.. With “denied” (l. 77) and “censored” (l. 80), Kandel criticises the lack of freedom of speech in the 1950s and also the 1960s to some extent, as well as the will of those in power to dictate the life of the population.

Additionally, the anaphora “Lobotomy for every man! […] / Lobotomy for the housewife! / Lobotomy for the businessman! / Lobotomy for the nursery schools!” (l. 81-85) highly underscores “lobotomy” (l. 81-85) which was a form of brain surgery popularised in the 1930s and practised until the early 1950s in the US. It was thought that reaching the frontal lobe of the brain through a hole would cure several mental disorders. It was extremely controversial as some patients had worst symptoms afterwards, some died and some could no longer feel emotions. These lines not only address mental illness but especially point to “lobotomy” (l. 81-86) as something that can be used to brainwash people and reset them. By assigning it to the “housewife” (l. 83), the “businessman” (l. 84) and “nursery schools” (l. 85), and “every man” (l. 81), Kandel implies that they have been brainwashed namely, by patriarchy, capitalism and education, and by society in general, thus again suggesting that the control which these powerful people have on the population is one acquired through the violence of “lobotomy” (l. 81-86). Thus, Kandel denounces the monopoly which American society and its powerful members have on the life and the freedom of others in US society.

On another note, the poem ‘REVOLUTIONARY LETTER #11’ (1971) by Diane di Prima criticises the media and especially the way hippies were portrayed in the US media. The anaphora of “man uptight” (l. 13) and “man surly uptight” (l. 16) emphasises the reaction of the “man” (l. 13, 16) who is looking and judging them. The line break “man uptight at the / sight of us” (l. 13-14) highlights the term “sight” (l. 14) which is important in the situation described as it is through looks that he judges them and that he is taught by the media to judge them as well. The consonance in “ight” with

the terms “uptight” (l. 13, 16) and “sight” (l. 14) thus emphasise the link between these terms as one is the cause and the other the consequence of judgement. The terms “sight” (l. 14) and “hair” (l. 14, 15) are also repeated twice in the same line “sight of us, sight of Kirby’s hair, his friendly / loose face, my hair, our dress” (l. 14-15) which reveals again their importance.

Then, in another part of the stanza, Di Prima writes in direct speech as “I said” (l. 20) also shows. This highlights even more her depiction of their representation, not only the poem in itself is an access to her account of it, but the direct speech in addition gives like a double access to her thoughts and her account of it. Di Prima uses a lot of anaphoras, repetitions and line breaks to emphasise ideas. The line breaks “that cat / so uptight, what’s he / so uptight about” (l. 21-23) create an anaphora which again highlights the reaction of the man which is at the source of a discussion about the media. In addition, the line breaks “it’s not / your hair, not really, it’s just / what the TV tells him about hippies / got him scared, what he reads in / his magazines / got him scared” (l. 23-27) create anaphoras and epiphoras. The epiphora “it’s not / […] it’s just” (l. 22-23) is used to highlight the next line which is like the final revelation. The repetition of “what” (l. 21, 24, 25, 35) is also important as it represents the stereotypes told about “hippies” (l. 24) which are the cause of the reaction of the “man” (l. 13, 16).

Moreover, this “what” (l. 21, 24, 25, 35) is something that is stranger to him in the first place but that has power over him through the media as the show the lines “what the TV tells him about hippies / got him scared, what he reads in / his magazines / got him scared” (l. 24-27). The man is framed as a victim of the media as the use of the passive voice shows in “got him scared” (l. 25, 27) and “the TV tells him” (l. 24). The anaphora “got him scared” (l. 25, 27) and the repetition of “uptight” (l. 12, 16, 21, 22) depicts the real power that the media has on the “man” (l. 13, 16) as it totally brainwashed him into fear. The alliteration in “t” is also quite striking as it creates rhythm and also emphasises words with a “t” which here are very important like “what the TV tells him” (l. 24), “uptight” (l. 12, 16, 21, 22), “what” (l. 21, 24, 25, 35), and “got” (l. 25, 27). The line break “in / his magazines” (l. 25-26) highlights “magazines” (l. 26) while the alliteration in “t” underscores “TV” (Di Prima 21).

Then, the repetition of “image” (l. 28, 32, 40) highlights the idea of the stereotype, and the fake idea which the media gives to people. Di Prima writes as a solution “we got to / come out from behind the image / sit down with him” (l. 27-29). The line “come out from behind the image” (l. 27-28) clearly shows that the “image” (l. 28, 32, 40) is a barrier which the media creates between people which is what Di Prima denounces. The comparison with the epiphora in “find” (l. 30, 31), “if he / sat down to a beer with you he’d find / a helluva lot more to say that he’ll find / with the man who makes your image” (l. 29-32) highlights the difference between the real people and the people in

power. The verbs “sat down” (l. 30), “he’d find” (l. 30), “he’ll find” (l. 31) and “he’s got” (l. 33) are all in active form which comes in opposition to the passive form which is used to depict the influence of the media on the “man” (l. 13, 16). Indeed, by meeting them, he would develop his own opinion, thus would be active in his thinking, while the media keeps him passive and does not let him have his own opinion. Additionally, the anaphora “with the man who makes your image / […] with the men who run his mind, who tell him / what to think of us” (l. 32-35) underscores the men in power. The use of the passive voice again with “who makes your image” (l. 32), “who run his mind” (l. 34), and “who tell him / what to think of us” (l. 34-35) shows the “man” (l. 13, 16) and the “hippies” (l. 24) as victims of the media, of the powerful people, and of the society.

Another poem which criticises US society is “REVOLUTIONARY LETTER #19” (1971) by Diane Di Prima. It is an occasional poem written for the Poor People’s Campaign as written under the title of the poem. First of all, the anaphora “if what you want” (l. 1, 5, 14, 22, 27, 31, 32) introduces a different type of denunciations each stanza. The anaphora emphasises the new idea and is also a way to call out people each time with something new. Each stanza works as an enumeration of things which Di Prima denounces. This anaphora is also an accusation as the use of the second-person “you” everywhere in the poem directly points to the other, or someone who can potentially identify with this you, and thus who is accused. Another form of accusation is “you are still the enemy” (l. 2, 11-12, 43-44) which is repeated several times which highlights it. It is even written in capital letters in the last stanza to emphasise it. The line breaks always underscore the term “the enemy” (l. 2, 12, 44) as in “the enemy / you have” (l. 2-3) which puts it at the end of the line, or in “you are still / the enemy” (l. 11-12, 43-44) with the term being at the beginning of a line. Another thing to notice is the term “still” (l. 2, 11, 15, 32, 43) which is repeated several times and is used with the two sentences mentioned before. Di Prima reminds us of things which can “still” (l. 2, 11, 15, 32, 43) make her audience members oppressors, victims or just people who follow the system and who do not have a revolutionary stance.
Additionally, Di Prima writes in almost each stanza a few lines of accusation or a reminder of their mistake as in the final stanza: “THEN YOU ARE STILL / THE ENEMY, you are selling / yourself short” (l. 43-45), which emphasise the accusation or condemnation. The line breaks are interesting as they highlight “enemy” (l. 44) and “selling / yourself” (l. 44, 45). While “enemy” (l. 44) is an explicit accusation, “selling / yourself” (l. 44-45) is more a reminder of the fact that the people are victims of the system and the use of “selling” (l. 44) is striking as it echoes consumerism which is something that Di Prima also denounces in this poem.

Then, Di Prima denounces “clinics” (l. 23) and capitalism with “clinics where the AMA / can feed you pills to keep you weak, or sterile / shoot germs into your kids, while Merck & Co / grows richer” (l. 23-26). While Di Prima had denounced societal or systemic issues, this time, she names them clearly with “AMA” (l. 23) and “Merck & Co” (l. 25). The “AMA” (l. 23) stands for American Medical Association which in the 20th century fought against doctors helping drug addicts after WW1, or against doctors helping and making medicine accessible to poorer people. It protested and lobbied against the financing of Medicare[3] and then kept fighting for rising doctors’ salaries. The line break after “AMA” (l. 23) emphasises it. The assonance in the next line underscores the accusation “can feed you pills to keep you weak, or sterile” (l. 24). Di Prima criticises not only the association but also these “clinics” (l. 23) which are private, thus making money on people. The use of the second-person “you” (l. 24) is striking as Di Prima directly points to the effect on her audience and everyone as well as their “kids” (l. 25). With “the AMA / can feed you pills to keep you weak or sterile” (l. 23-24), Di Prima denounces the association as having a will not only to feed people “pills” (l. 24) to make money but also “to keep you weak, or sterile” (l. 24), with the line break highlighting “sterile” (l. 24). The mention of sterility is striking as the line break emphasises it and the next line “shoot germs into your kids” (l. 25) thus reasoning people by explaining the consequences it has on them and on their children with a criticism of vaccines with “shoot germs” (l. 25). This ‘care’ that is criticised as being terrible for the health of people is one way to make money, thus Di Prima denounces capitalism which is even at play with people’s health with “while Merck & Co / grows richer” (l. 25-26), “Merck & Co” (l. 25) being an American pharmaceutical laboratory. The line break again emphasises the name of the accused “Merck & Co” (l. 25) and especially underscores “grows richer” (l. 26) thus showing that while people and their children’ health is ruined, the big ones capitalise on them.

In the rest of the stanza, Di Prima criticises suburbia and the media with “if you still want a piece / a small piece of suburbia, green lawn / laid down by the square foot / color TV, whose radiant energy / kills brain cells, whose subliminal ads / brainwash your children, have taken over / your dreams” (l. 32-38). The repetition and the line break in “a piece / a small piece of suburbia” (l. 32-33) underscore “suburbia” (l. 33) while the line break at the end of the line highlights “green lawn” (l. 33). The suburbs and the “green lawn” (l. 33) are very representative of the American dream of property. Then, Di Prima criticises media in “color TV, whose radiant energy / kills brain cells, whose subliminal ads / brainwash your children, have taken over / your dreams” (l. 35-38). The repetition in “whose radiant energy” (l. 35) and “whose subliminal ads” (l. 36) underscores these terms. In the lines “kills brain cells, whose subliminal ads / brainwash your children, have taken

3 Medicare is an American health insurance program which was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965.

over / your dreams" (l. 36-38), the alliteration in "s" in "kills brain cells, whose subliminal ads" (l. 36) and the polyptoton of "brain" (l. 36) and "brainwash" (l. 37) emphasise the devastating effects of "TV" (l. 35) and media on people and their "children" (l. 37). Di Prima also highlights the effect of media on people with the line break "have taken over / your dreams" (l. 37-38) making "your dreams" (l. 38) stand alone at the end of the stanza.

In addition to criticising US society, Beat women also criticised their place in the Beat Generation.

E. Writing about their Place in the Beat Generation

The place of women in the society of the 1950s and 1960s was creating confusion regarding gender roles and was also a source of despair for them, due to their lack of freedom and independence. Living as women and as poets at that time turned out to be arduous for women of the Beat Generation. Beat women wrote about this difference of treatment and their love of poetry. Telling the story of their involvement and their place in the Beat Generation as women is of a great importance, as they wrote poems about this subject.

In the first chapter of *Girls Who Wore Black: Women Writing the Beat Generation*, entitled "Visions and Revisions of the Beat Generation", Ronna C. Johnson and Nancy M. Grace write that "most critical discussion has preserved this narrow identification of the Beat movement with its white male practitioners" (Johnson and Grace 1). While the men defined what it meant to be Beat, women brought a new vision and a more diverse idea of its definition (Johnson and Grace 2). As explained in the chapter, male Beat precursors did not identify women as members of the movement when asked, with the sole exception of Diane di Prima who was the only woman recognised by her male peers (Johnson and Grace 4). The fact that solely Diane di Prima was recognised as talented originates in what Johnson and Grace call "the patriarchal concept of the exceptional individual" (Johnson and Grace 4). This concept brings the idea of the exception to the rule. The rule was implemented by creating unjust standards of genius in order to exclude some persons who did not fit a white male norm. Johnson and Grace explain:

> Beat has [...] unexamined assumptions of women's intellectual, creative, even sexual inferiority, and, in particular, the supposition that women could neither originate nor help to advance the aesthetic and artistic breakthroughs and innovations that galvanized the schools. (Johnson and Grace 4)

One revealing poem about these assumptions is 'October 29, Wednesday' (1970) by Joanne Kyger. In the last two lines of the second stanza, Kyger writes: "The trouble, says Ted, with you Joanne, is that / you're not intelligent enough" (l. 27-28). This line is written in direct speech as "says Ted" (l. 27) shows, and highlights the different way in which Beat women's work and even being was seen

by their male counterparts in the movement. It creates a double account, not only by her writing it, but also by writing it in direct speech emphasising its reality. Moreover, the fact that Ted says “you Joanne”, doubling the subject underscores even more the accusation that Kyger receives. The line break “is that / you’re not intelligent enough” (l. 27-28) makes “you’re not intelligent enough” (l. 28) stand alone on a different line emphasising its meaning being a powerful attack on Kyger. Ted stands for Ted Berrigan (1934-1983), an American poet of the Beat Generation and the New York School of Poets. His comment in her poem perfectly encapsulates the treatment of Beat women. They were seen as less smart and talented than men and were thus relegated to the background of the movement.

Quoting Kerouac, Johnson and Grace bring a thorough explanation of the differentiation between “cool” (Johnson and Grace 6) and “hot” (Johnson and Grace 6) Beat which ultimately illustrates the place of women in the literary movement. As they put it:

> In an image that is the Beat archetype of hipster women, Kerouac's girls who 'say nothing and wear black' are accessories for cool hipster men, indispensable to the scene, but meant to be unseen and unheard as they render their essential but subsidiary functions. (Johnson and Grace 6)

While men were perceived as having the genius to write and as being “hot” (Johnson and Grace 6), women were considered as automatically not being able to write, as being “cool” (Johnson and Grace 6) and only a decoration in the movement (Johnson and Grace 6). Indeed, as Johnson and Grace put it: “in addition to broaching mainstream fifties social constraints, women Beat writers had to reckon with Beat's masculinist assumptions” (Johnson and Grace 7).

In another poem entitled “Town Hall Reading With Beat Poets” (1989), Joanne Kyger writes about a public reading with other Beat poets and the consequences of the assumptions about gender. It is written in the first-person, in free verse. This poem is important as it clearly is a poem which testifies to her presence and involvement in the Beat movement. In the first line, she describes what is happening at the reading and writes “Ed Sanders onstage telephones William Burroughs” (Kyger 271). Burroughs is one of three major male writers of the Beat canon. Ed Sanders was a Beat as well. In the fourth line, she writes “Then it's near time for me to read” (Kyger 271) which highlights the fact that she participates in a reading among other gatherings of the movement. She is clearly involved with them. In the second stanza, she writes: “Leaving I pick up some trash clogging the exit door. / It's my book, GOING ON! What I'm reading from / tonight, those / 'understated Buddhist influenced miniatures' / (says the next day's NY Times review)” (Kyger 271). She refers to

her book as “some trash clogging the exit door” (Kyger 271) at first before realising it is her book. This can be seen as the expectation that it would be “some trash” (Kyger 271) yet it is her book there, as indicated in the next line: “It's my book” (Kyger 271). The line change underscores this surprising discovery of her book on the floor. The fact that her book was put there can be interpreted as her poetry being seen as less relevant by other members of the movement despite the fact that she was a published author and a member of the movement. Indeed, instead of trash, it is her book that clogs the door, which shows the devaluation of her art. Additionally, not only she is published, but she is also reviewed by *The New York Times* as she states in “says the next day's NY Times review” (Kyger 271). She is relevant enough to have her book published and reviewed yet the same book clogs the door. This testifies to her involvement in the movement, to her being an author, but also to her different treatment.

While being silenced within the movement by male Beats, women Beats were also not esteemed by academia. Johnson and Grace reveal that “even as they did write, both privately and for publication, women Beat writers continued to be unacknowledged and excluded from historical concepts and literary considerations of the movement” (Johnson and Grace 5). Due to assumptions about gender and literary productions, women writers were suppressed from any academic accounts on the movement (Johnson and Grace 5). Their suppression puts forward men and their oeuvres yet it also results in “greatly foreshortening understandings of what is Beat” (Johnson and Grace 10). In addition, as Johnson and Grace explain, Beat women's position was also ambivalent at times, as they both resisted their own marginalisation in their life and in their writings, and participated in it, by for example following a male Beat and supporting his art instead of hers (Johnson and Grace 8).

Additionally, in the online article “A Fleeting Moment in a Floating World: The Women of the Beat Generation Through Allen Ginsberg's Eyes”, Katie Oates explains the struggles of Beat women writers, revealing that struggling Beat women forged “cross-generational bonds” (Oates), teaching each other how to survive and write, but also sharing their common experience of marginalisation. Oates claims that “the 1940s and 1950s saw women as belonging to their parents first and their husbands second, subsequently restricting their creative pursuits, and leaving their individuality limited or nonexistent” (Oates). Beat women were “trapped in the gender binaries of 1950s America” (Oates), yet they were brave enough to leave home to be writers despite their parents’ disapproval. They had to rely on part-time jobs typically given to women, such as working as a waitress or a saleswoman. They worked to earn a living to be able to pursue writing. Oates confirms:

> for instance, to help support themselves, Johnson and Elise Cowen both worked as typists for editorial firms, Diane di Prima worked part time in bookstores and as a live model for artists, and Joanne Kyger taught English and accepted small parts in low-budget, English-speaking films while living in Kyoto, Japan. However, with financial hardship threatening their independence, economic necessities left most of the women to fall dependent on the men in their lives. (Oates)

Unlike the women, Beat men refused to engage in employment and consumer culture, deciding to lead a bohemian lifestyle. To rebel against society was easier for men, whose voices were heard. For women, it was another story, as Oates notes: "at a time when the stakes for social condemnation were high, female resistance was particularly shocking, for it was more acceptable for the men to rebel, than it was for the women" (Oates). Their significant erasure from academia can be read as an erasure from cultural history, as Oates argues: "there are numerous volumes dedicated to the Beat Generation, yet the women are given minimal space (if any), and information about them is often conveyed as an aside to the men, or told from the male perspective" (Oates). Beat women were excluded from scholarship until the 1980s. Oates uses the theory of "displaced abjection" by Peter Stallybrass and Allon White to explain men's use of their masculine privilege and power over women. This theory can be defined as people from stigmatised social groups using their power against other even more stigmatised social groups instead of using it against the governing societal authority (Oates). The Beats, already a marginalised group, reproduced the marginalisation and discrimination that they were living onto the women of the Beat circle. Fighting this marginalisation, "the women have thus utilized their agency and granted themselves visibility by way of their literature. [...] They persistently, and passionately, inserted their stories into Beat history" (Oates).

Moreover, in the ninth chapter of *The Beat Generation Writers*, entitled 'The Archaeology of Gender in the Beat Movement', Helen McNeil explains that the Beats were first and foremost a "boy gang" (McNeil 178). As she puts it, "the discourse, the definition and the […] lifestyle of the Beat Generation were set by the men" (McNeil 178). Yet, there were women in this movement too. In their writings, the Beat men involve a part of the dominant discourse, despite their anti-conformism (McNeil 179). This dominant discourse is that of patriarchy, as recalled by McNeil: "the Beats have never been seen as a movement engaging with women or responsive to feminist critique. […] To put it bluntly, everyone knows they were sexist, so why bother?" (McNeil 178). Therefore, the women of this movement were experiencing great difficulties to be part of the movement but also to be a woman who writes. The Beats brought with them a new stereotype for

women: the “chick” (McNeil 189), defined as a beautiful, young, dumb woman who is easy to sleep with (McNeil 189). Such a discourse was popularised in 1950s American culture. A woman in these years was perceived as a threat, as more powerful than she actually was, economically or politically (McNeil 192). As McNeil explains “much of the Beat rebellion against authority displaced male power on to the maternal/domestic, blaming the woman for controlling what she did not and could not control” (McNeil 192). The society and the Beats worked against women writers, as McNeil puts it:

> There were no female Kerouacs because external social controls of the woman functioned as silencer even before the rhetoric of the chick could function. [...] There were also no female Kerouacs because to go on the road did bring the 'chick' rhetoric into play, and ruinously. The effort to be chick, mother and creative artist led down a spiral towards madness and death. (McNeil 193)

Writing also about the stereotype and struggle of Beat women is Amy L. Friedman in “Being Here as Hard as I Could: The Beat Generation Women Writers” in which she explains that Beat women's “own words work to dispel the 1950s 'Beat chick' stereotype which accrued in the wake of the intense media attention to the Beat movement” (Friedman 1998 230). Despite the Beat Generation being a counterculture movement, women were asked to stay silent, as Beat memoirist Joyce Johnson writes in her memoir entitled *Minor Characters*, which Friedman quotes: “as a female, she's not quite part of this convergence. A fact she ignores, sitting by in her excitement as the voices of men, always the men, passionately rise and fall” (Johnson 261).

Another struggle of theirs was the assumption that they only started writing after meeting men of the Beat Generation. Friedman comments: “the commitment of these [women] writers to their work generally contests the view that they were accidental artists, or that they only gained access to writing through a connection with the men” (Friedman 1998 233). She explains that Anne Waldman had taken a vow to writing poetry at around 18 while Diane di Prima has taken it when she was young, and Joanne Kyger just like the two others had begun to write poetry in her childhood (Friedman 1998 233). Some of them did start writing after meeting Beat men, yet despite the relationship or the end of it, they focused on writing. For example, memoirist Hettie Jones did so after her poet husband LeRoi Jones left her. Similarly, poet Janine Pommy Vega dedicated herself to writing after the death of her painter husband Fernando Vega. These women writers wrote more because they had space for it (Friedman 1998 234). Friedman makes it clear that “to read the body of work they created is also to observe the transition of many of these women from supporters to creators, from audience-members to performers” (Friedman 1998 241). In fact, Beat women wholly contributed to the movement as writers but also as editors: Anne Waldman co-founded and directed

the Jack Kerouac Shool of Disembodied Poetics with Diane di Prima. Di Prima was the founder and editor of *The Floating Bear*[4] from 1961-70. Di Prima, Hettie Jones, Joyce Johnson, and Joanne Kyger were teachers in poetry and writing in prisons, homeless groups and universities such as Columbia for Johnson and the Kerouac School for Kyger (Friedman 1998 241).

Despite their rejection from the Beats, women have proven to be great writers as well. Their writings made them considered a "protofeminist vanguard" (Johnson and Grace 7) as they created a "woman-centered Beat literature that anticipated second-wave feminism" (Johnson and Grace 7). Women Beat writers raised their voices and expressed themselves about woman-centered subjects, thus echoing the life of women of the 1950s and 1960s (Johnson and Grace 8). Beat women also "display a persistent understanding of the importance of asserting themselves as women in the alternative communities in which they lived, and which denied them, during the fifties, and even to some extent today" (Johnson and Grace 13). In addition, women Beats had a great interest in activism and in religions and myths.

Finally, in the tenth chapter of *The Beat Generation Writers*, entitled "I say my new name": Women Writers of the Beat Generation', Amy L. Friedman explains that the Beat Generation was seen as a "male rebellion" (Friedman 1996 201). Beat men's writings told of their adventures and epiphanies, considering the woman as a mere sexual experience (Friedman 1996 201). As Friedman puts it: "Beat women have been considered as largely peripheral to the artistic and personal lives of Beat men" (Friedman 1996 211). Women in the movement led a life of struggles, to be writers but also simply as women in that period (Friedman 1996 213). Their struggles as writers trying to have their works published is explained by Friedman: "not getting published was traceable to being female, but Di Prima indicates that she and her contemporaries weren't aware of it at the time" (Friedman 1996 213). Later on, they realised it and were able to transmit their knowledge on writing to the next generation. (Friedman 1996 213). In addition, to these criticisms, Beat women also denounced misogyny.

F. Denouncing Misogyny

In addition, Beat women denounce misogyny not just in the Beat Generation but also in general, thus writing themselves as feminists. They address different issues such as street harassment, women's body empowering, or misogyny in religion and culture, but also prostitution[5] among other topics.

4 *The Floating Bear* was a poetry newsletter, founded, edited and published by Diane Di Prima and LeRoi Jones.
5 Prostitution is addressed in the poem "Ishtar" by Diane Di Prima.

In the chapter entitled ‘Abuse’ in *The Female Eunuch*, Germaine Greer writes about oppression and abuse against women. Evoking hatred in the language, Greer reveals that “the more body-hatred grows, […] the more abusive terms we find in the language” (Greer 295). A lot of this hateful language is directed to the vagina with “terms like *meat, pussy, snatch, slit, crack* and *tail*” (Greer 297) which are particularly degrading. Greer explains that young and pretty women sometimes do not see the amount of abuse done to other women as they escape a big portion of it (Greer 300). Greer reveals that to them “it is easy to pretend that wolf-whistles are gestures of genuine appreciation and that compliments are genuine praise, which they are not” (Greer 300). Indeed, Greer notes that “a woman has only to depart from the stereotype to find herself subjected to all kinds of discrimination and insult, although she may minimize it still for her own mental health” (Greer 300).

One poem which depicts abuse against women is the poem ‘The Mutes’ (1967) by Denise Levertov which denounces street harassment. The first stanza is a clear depiction of street harassment. There is an emphasis on sound with “those groans” (l. 1) which come at the beginning of the poem and which are a synecdoche representing “men” (l. 1) as animals and mutes because of their “groans” (l. 1). The line breaks in “passing a woman on the street / or on the steps of the subway” (l. 2-3) highlight especially the final words of “the street” (l. 2) in and “the subway” (l. 3). The second stanza “to tell her she is a female / and their flesh knows it” (l. 4-5) shows a dehumanisation of the “woman” (l. 2) who is for them “a female” (l. 4) which reminds of animals. The use of “flesh” (l. 5) and “groans” (l. 1) also points to an animalisation of the “men” (l. 1). The second stanza is also striking as Levertov showcases the possible thoughts of these street harassers. The stanzas from third to sixth “are they a sort of tune, / an ugly enough song, sung / by a bird with a slit tongue // but meant for music? // Or are they the muffled roaring / of deafmutes trapped in a building that is / slowly filling with smoke? / Perhaps both.” (l. 6-13) is a quaesitio filled with irony. Levertov ironically seeks to understand the meaning of these “groans” (l. 1) and comparing them in the form of questions to other sounds. These other sounds are also depicted as “ugly” (l. 7) as Levertov writes about the first one that it is possibly “a sort of tune” (l. 6) and “an ugly enough song” (l. 7). Levertov also compares it to them being mutes with “sung / by a bird with a slit tongue / but meant for music?” (l. 7-9) and “the muffled roaring / of deafmutes” (l. 10-11). With this quaesitio, Levertov acts as if she did not know what these sounds were. It seems as if she was writing the questions that someone who did not know about street harassment asked. Yet, she knows, and this series of questions in the context of the poem depicts a loss of innocence of Levertov and a vivid denunciation of it.

Then, Levertov writes about looks: “such men most often / look as if groan were all they could do” (l. 14-15) which again shows an animalisation of the “men” (l. 1, 14). For women, she writes about the idea of “tribute” (l. 17): “yet a woman, in spite of herself, // knows it’s a tribute / if she were lacking all grace / they’d pass her in silence” (l. 16-19). The “groans” (l. 1) are put in opposition to “silence” (l. 19) depending on the woman’s looks. This idea of “tribute” (l. 17) with “groans” (l. 1) is dehumanising just like the other lines “so it’s not only to say she’s / a warm hole” (l. 20-21). The term “warm whole” (l. 21) just like “a female” (l. 4) is very dehumanising and reveals the way of thinking of these “men” (l. 1, 14) who picture the woman only as a sexual object. The line break makes “a warm hole” (l. 21) stand out on the following line, thus emphasising the term. Moreover, “a woman, in spite of herself, / knows” (l. 16-17) shows again the loss of innocence of women who are so accustomed to being harassed that they understand the horrible meaning behind it.

Then, Levertov writes about the reactions of the “woman” (l. 2) regarding the “tribute” (l. 17, 26) “she wants to / throw the tribute away, dis- / gusted, and can’t” (l. 25-27). This shows her complete understanding of the dehumanising meaning of this supposed “tribute” (l. 17, 26). Indeed, she “can’t” (l. 27) get rid of it, the line break underscores this word, through this Levertov shows the absence of control over this as the “woman” (l. 2) is a victim of it but Levertov also depicts the impossibility to avoid street harassment as these “men” (l. 1, 14) are everywhere. Levertov thus denounces the overwhelming presence and effects of street harassment. This is also pictured with the following lines: “it goes on buzzing in her ear, / it changes the pace of her walk, / the torn posters in echoing corridors // spell it out, [...] / Her pulse suddenly / had picked up speed” (l. 28-34). The terms “buzzing in her ear” (l. 28), and “echoing corridors” (l. 30) depict the presence of the sound that is following her which reveals that she is followed, that it can happen everywhere but it also showcases the trauma that it causes to the “woman” (l. 2) as the line “it goes on buzzing in her ear” (l. 28) proves that even after it ended, the damage is done and she is traumatised and thus keeps hearing the sound.

In addition, the woman in the poem shows a physical reaction betraying her fear: “it changes the pace of her walk” (l. 29), and “her pulse sullenly // had picked up speed” (l. 33-34). The visual aspect of the poem can be seen as portraying her “pulse” (l. 33). The anaphoras in “it” (l. 28, 29) create an enumeration of her reactions, underscoring each one of them. Additionally, the line breaks after “ear” (l. 28), “walk” (l. 29), “echoing corridors” (l. 30), “her pulse sullenly” (l. 33) and “speed” (l. 34) highlight as well the effects street harassment has on her as well. The lines “the torn posters in echoing corridors // spell it out” (l. 30-31) also show the omnipresence of the sounds; they are not only heard but also written out, which emphasises the importance of two senses in this

description of street harassment: hearing and sight. The fact that she sees it written on the posters depicts the trauma of the "woman" (l. 2) who not only now hears it but also sees it everywhere.

Finally, the last stanzas show that because of street harassment, she realises something about life as Levertov writes: "while her understanding // keeps on translating: / 'Life after life after life goes by // without poetry, / without seemliness, / without love.'" (l. 36-41). Indeed, the repetition of "life after life after life" (l. 38) points to existence in general throughout the eras for women as "without poetry, / without seemliness, / without love" (l. 39-41) because of street harassment, among other things. The anaphora emphasises each term. Levertov denounces street harassment and the oppression and lack of respect for women in general.

Another poem which denounces misogyny is the poem 'Oh Man is the Highest Type of Animal Existing' (1989) by Joanne Kyger which criticises the fact that "man" (Kyger 242) is thought as superior and more important than woman. In the first stanza, Kyger writes: "'Oh man is the highest type of animal existing / or known to have existed […]' / Well when I think of men / I think of them in a sexual manner / Otherwise, I don't notice the difference, you know" (l. 1-9). In the first line, this "man" (l. 1) refers both to humans but also to gender. The term "highest" (l. 1) refers to both anatomical and mental differences with other animals, meaning humans are superior to animals, but it also can be interpreted as referring to status, thus referring to the belief that "men" (l. 7) are superior to women. Kyger's criticism of misogyny and her belief in equality is first shown with "well when I think of men / I think of them in a sexual manner / Otherwise, I don't notice the difference, you know" (l. 7-9). While the beginning of the stanza was a quote, here, it is direct speech. The use of direct speech and the pronoun "I" (l. 7, 8, 9) being in each line with twice "I think" (l. 7, 8) and "I don't notice" (l. 9) emphasise the expression of Kyger's belief in gender equality. Indeed, she writes "I think of them in a sexual manner" (l. 8) and that she does not "notice the difference" (l. 9) which shows that to her there is no superiority and inferiority but only a sexual difference in genitals. This is another proof of her feminism.

Kyger develops even more her thought on equality in the next stanzas: "being absorbed as *being* one just think 'people' / and not 'male' and 'female' so much as someone / to talk to. And how men are all // the same being born from Man and Woman and out / of a woman's body commonly known as 'Mother.'" (l. 10-14). The repetition of the term "being" (l. 10, 13) highlights it. The line "being absorbed as being one just thinks 'people'" (l. 10) shows that both genders, if considered as just beings, are "people" (l. 10). The use of "one just thinks" (l. 10) shows a shift from the first-person singular to a general "one" (l. 10) which seems to refer to Kyger and persons in a broad sense. In addition, the line breaks underline terms at the end of lines: "people" (l. 10) and "someone" (l. 11) as well as on terms at the beginning of it, such as "and not 'male' and 'female'" (l. 11) which again

reveal Kyger's expression of gender equality. The lines "and how men are all / the same being born from Man and Woman" (l. 12-13) also stress the idea of equality with the line break highlighting "men are all / the same being" (l. 12-13) thus "the same" (l. 13) as women.

Moreover, Kyger criticises misogyny in culture by using well-known quotes which highlight the belief in patriarchal culture in woman's inferiority: "And God said let us make MAN in our image, / after our likeness and let them have dominion.' // And 'Nature may stand up / and say to all the world, / 'This was a MAN!' // And then 'I pronounce you MAN / and wife'" (l. 15-21). The first quote is from the *Bible*, Genesis 1:26, King James Version. The use of a quote from the *Bible* is really revealing of the presence of misogyny in Western culture. The *Bible* is also a reference that everyone knows, thus using cultural references that everyone knows to highlight her point. The use of this quote is also striking as for centuries it was used by the clergy to justify misogyny, using the creation myth of "man" (l. 1,13, 15, 19, 20) and woman from him, as well as the myth of Adam and Eve, to vilify, demonise women and to treat them as inferior. Kyger writes "MAN" (l. 15, 19, 20) in capital letters here and in the other stanzas, thus criticising the importance that is given to "men" (l. 7, 12). The *Bible* quote is cut short at "let them have dominion" (l. 16), and there is a line break, thus showing Kyger's will to emphasise the idea of this cultural belief of male superiority. In the original quote, it is said that "man" (l. 1,13, 15, 19, 20) will have "dominion" (l. 16) over nature, and it is also implied over woman. The second quote used is "Nature may stand up / and say to all the world, / 'This was a MAN!'" (l. 17-19) which is from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Act 5, Scene 5. In the same fashion as the previous quote, Kyger quotes from Shakespeare thus using a cultural landmark which will speak to everyone. This second quote also portrays "MAN" (l. 15, 19, 20) as a superior being, especially with the capital letters. There is a prosopopoeia which gives "Nature" (l. 17) a voice and say "This was a MAN" (l. 19) which frames "man" (l. 1,13, 15, 19, 20) as superior to "Nature" (l. 17). Kyger uses this quote to showcase again the portrayal of "men" (l. 7, 12) in culture as superior and to criticise it. By using it in such a poem, this quote also suggests the superiority of "man" (l. 1,13, 15, 19, 20) over woman.

The final quote is "And then 'I pronounce you MAN / and wife.'" (l. 20-21) which is a criticism of marriage for woman, as it highlights that she becomes a property, which is highlighted by the line break and the terms "and wife" (l. 21), while "MAN" (l. 15, 19, 20) remains himself, a subject. On should note that, in this quote, man does not carry any title showcasing the fact that he keeps his independence. The use of the line break and the capital letters emphasises "MAN" (l. 15, 19, 20) thus portraying, in addition to the absence of title, the power which the "man" (l. 1,13, 15, 19, 20) has over the woman in marriage, since the woman has a title "wife" (l. 21) and it is written in small letters.

Finally, in the poem 'REVOLUTIONARY LETTER #66 TO THE PATRIARCHS' (1971), Diane Di Prima evokes the woman's body as a "weapon" (l. 1) just as man's is, to empower women and to fight against "THE PATRIARCHS" (Di Prima 83). The term "yours" (l. 1) obviously refers to men in the line "My body a weapon as yours is" (l. 1). Di Prima starts this poem by contradicting the opinion of patriarchs who believe woman's body is not powerful. It is also the beginning of a metaphor of empowerment writing woman's body as a "weapon" (l. 1, 3). Throughout the poem, Di Prima uses anaphoras with parts of her body thus emphasising each part of her body as powerful. Di Prima associates parts of her body to terms of the lexical field of strength, war or arms: "My tits weapons" (l. 3), "My strong thighs / choking" (l. 4-5), "My hips / haven & fort / place where I stand / & from which I fight" (l. 6-9), "My hands / lethal" (l. 12-13), "My cunt a bomb" (l. 14), "My teeth tear out" (l. 16), "My jaws annihilate" (l. 17).

In addition, Di Prima makes references to Christianity which she associates with patriarchy. In the lines "my tits weapons to the immaterial" (l. 3) and "my cunt a bomb exploding / yr christian conscience" (l. 14-15), the parts of her body which she uses as metaphorical arms against patriarchy and here against religion are sexual: "tits" (l. 3) and "cunt" (l. 14). The fact that she writes body parts associated with sexuality as fighting against religion is striking as it also addresses how patriarchy uses religion and especially Christianity in that context to control women's bodies and their sexuality. In religions, not just Christianity, the sexual body parts of women have for a long time being deemed obscene, just like their periods and their sexuality. Di Prima thus criticises the use of religion to control women's bodies and what they do with it by transforming these body parts as "weapons" (l. 3) and "a bomb" (l. 14) fighting patriarchal religious beliefs. In the lines "My arms/my knees embrace yr serpent / yr sin becomes my song" (l. 18-19), Di Prima continues with the Christian references. Indeed, the terms "serpent" (l. 18) and "sin" (l. 19) remind of the myth of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden and their meeting with the "serpent" (l. 18) representing temptation and evil. This myth is significant to "patriarchs" (Di Prima 83) as it was used by men to put the guilt on women for the fall of Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden. The "serpent" (l. 18) here also represents sins, and Di Prima clearly writes "my arms/my knees embrace yr serpent" (l. 18), thus Di Prima embraces temptation, which here is probably linked to sexuality. Thus, Di Prima by being free in her sexuality and with her body, writes of embracing the idea of "sin" (l. 19) which the "patriarchs" (Di Prima 83) have of sex and of the temptation of the body. Indeed, Di Prima writes "yr sin becomes my song" (l. 19) thus highlighting the fact that sexuality which is deemed evil by these "patriarchs" (Di Prima 83) is something which Di Prima makes her "song" (l. 19) thus making it part of her life. The alliteration in "s" in the lines "my arms/my knees embrace yr

serpent / yr sin becomes my song" (l. 18-19) is also striking as the sound "s" obviously reminds of the "serpent" (l. 18) which is mentioned in the poem.

Moreover, the line "my teeth tear out the throat of yr despair" (l. 16) is interesting. The prosopopoeia in "the throat of yr despair" (l. 16) underscores even more the power that Di Prima's body has, here her "teeth" (l. 16). The alliteration in "t" also highlights this power: "my teeth tear out the throat of yr despair" (l. 16). The line "my strong thighs / choking the black lie" (l. 4-5) is also striking as just like "tear out" (l. 16), "choking" (l. 5) portrays an action, it is not just a term for a "weapon" (l. 1, 3) like the others. Here, "choking the black lie" (l. 5) can be interpreted as her "thighs" (l. 4) destroying the "lie" (l. 5) of patriarchy. The "black lie" (l. 5) would thus refer to patriarchy and the beliefs on women, but the use of the colour "black" (l. 5) by Di Prima is important as this colour is associated with evil, thus accusing them back of evilness.

Beat women write about the Beat lifestyle and denounce mainstream US society, Beat men's misogyny and societal misogyny, but they also address topics such as marriage, divorce, domestic chores, mental health and living alone.

II/ What about Marriage and Love for Beat Women Poets?

As mentioned before, marriage and love were things which were central to women's lives in the 1950s and 1960s, and it was also central to the lives of Beat women. Therefore, due to the presence of poems regarding marriage and love but also of topics and issues linked to these two themes, the study of this subject is crucial. This study of marriage and love for Beat women will thus reveal their lives, experiences and more importantly their stances on primordial feminist issues.

A. Oppressive Domestic Structures

To begin, the poems to be analysed in this section of my study are testimonies of their struggle in marriage and as housewives. They write for themselves but also maybe for others to read, especially other women who would read and discover a similarity in their experience of marriage. These poems are like secrets that women would tell one another. In this way, the women poets picture the reality of their lives as women in a marriage but also to another extent the reality of women as a whole. Thus, they openly write about marriage as a prison from which they want to escape, about the difficulties in their marriage, about the burden of domestic chores for a housewife, and most importantly they write about their mental health.

Regarding Beat women's life with men and the effects of these relationships on them, the article "Being Here As Hard As I Could: The Beat Generation Women Writers" by Amy L. Friedman mentions that some of them were married or in relationships with Beat men. For example,

memoirist Hettie Jones was married to poet LeRoi Jones, and did not write for years because she was a wife and a mother and supported her husband's career (Friedman 1998 238). Also, there were Joanne Kyger who was married four years to poet Gary Snyder (Friedman 1998 242), poet Joanna McClure was married to writer Michael McClure, and Joyce Johnson lived with Jack Kerouac (Friedman 1998 242). Their commitment to writing and their relationships have proved to create some struggles. As Friedman confirms, "the progress and survival of Beat Generation women writers necessitated a series of successful navigations through social constraints – feminine, domestic, literary – which demanded reshaping along the way" (Friedman 1998 240). In addition, in her other article "I Say My New Name: Women Writers of the Beat Generation", Friedman writes that memoirist Bonnie Bremser was married to poet Ray Bremser and prostituted herself to support his career (Friedman 1996 202).

1) The Prison of Marriage

In the poem "The Marriage" (1957), Denise Levertov writes about commitment in her marriage and then in the second part of the poem, she writes of not being heard in this marriage. In the first part Levertov writes:

1 You have my
- attention: which is
- a tenderness, beyond
- what I may say. And I have
5 your constancy to
- something beyond myself.
- The force
- of your commitment charges us – we live
- in the sweep of it, taking courage
10 one from the other. (Levertov 4)

The repetition of the formulation with "you have my" (l. 1) and "I have your" (l. 4-5) and the repetition of "beyond" (l. 3, l. 6) creates a parallel between the two affirmations of commitment, thus amplifying the idea of commitment on both sides. The fact that the first one mentioned is "you have my" (l. 1), thus the poem starting with "you" (l. 1) underlines an entrapment in this marriage. It depicts union in this marriage. The use of "beyond" (l. 3, l. 6) shows that there is more to it than what she writes about. We do not know what she "may say" (l. 4) or what is beyond herself. The

commitment of the man is highlighted first with his “constancy” (l. 5), then his “commitment” (l. 8). They live in the “sweep of it” (l. 9) and it “charges” (l. 8) them both which may mean that it is his strength which makes this marriage. Indeed, due to his “commitment” (l. 8) to her and the marriage, they are “taking courage / one from the other” (l. 9-10). This emphasises the idea of the union in which they both are here for the other.

In the second part of the poem ‘The Marriage (II)’, it is another depiction of marriage which comes to light. Levertov writes:

- I want to speak to you.
- To whom else should I speak?
- It is you who make
- a world to speak of
15 In your warmth the
- fruits ripen – all the
- apples and pears that grow
- on the south wall of my
- head. If you listen
20 it rains for them, then
- they drink. If you
- speak in response
- the seeds
- jump into the ground. (Levertov 5)

The first three lines “I want to speak to you. / To whom else should I speak? It is you who make / a world to speak of” (l. 11-14) depict her desire for communication. The line “to whom else should I speak?” (l. 12) seems ambiguous in its meaning. It may mean that she can only talk to him when it comes to their marriage but it also can mean that she has only him to speak to. With “it is you who make / a world to speak of” (l. 13-14) Levertov highlights the fact that he is the reason she wants to communicate in general but also with him. With the lines “In your warmth the / fruits ripen – all the / apples and pears that grow / on the south wall of my / head. If you listen / it rains for them, then / they drink. If you / speak in response / the seeds / jump into the ground” (l. 15-24), Levertov depicts the issue of communication with her husband using the metaphor of fruits. Through this metaphor of fruits, she writes step by step how communication betters the fruits. The possible lack of

communication is emphasised with “in your warmth the / fruits ripen” (l. 15-16). The lines “if you listen / it rains for them, then / they drink” (l. 19-21) show an amelioration. Another step is “if you / speak in response / the seeds / jump into the ground” (l. 21-24). This emphasises the fact that the more they communicate, the more the plants will grow, showing maybe the happiness of the relationship. This metaphor perfectly showcases marriage as something which needs effort and communication from both persons. If there is no communication, the marriage will perish, thus the urgency of Levertov to address this topic.

Another poem which portrays the difficulty of Levertov’s marriage is “The Ache of Marriage” (1964) in which Levertov explores the idea of the pain in a marriage that does not bring any joy for the couple. In the first stanza, Levertov describes this pain in physical terms. It is “heavy” (l. 3) and “it throbs in the teeth” (l. 4). Therefore, the emotional pain of the marriage becomes a physical one. Levertov also depicts the emotional pain and the difficulty of her marriage in the second stanza “We look for communion / and are turned away, beloved, / each and each” (l. 5-7). Indeed, Levertov highlights the expectation, but also the need for communion in the marriage, yet both her and her husband do not find any. Using the pronoun “we” (l. 5) can be seen as referring to her and her husband but it can also be understood as a plural and universal “we” (l. 5). This universality of the pronoun emphasises the idea of a common notion or universal truth that Levertov exposes here. This interpretation shows the failure of her marriage and by extension possibly her loss of faith in the institution. The use of “each and each” (l. 7) also brings a sort of universality to the idea, it is her and her husband, and it can be anyone else feeling like this in a marriage.
Moreover, the lines “It is leviathan and we / in its belly / looking for joy, some joy / not to be known outside it” (l. 8-11) clearly express the pain that both feel and the failure of the marriage which knows no joy. The metaphor of “leviathan” (l. 8) as marriage is interesting. “Leviathan” (l. 8) is present in the Bible as well as in many myths and is depicted as a giant snake or crocodile that lives in the sea. In the Bible, it is associated with the apocalypse and is seen as a representation of Evil and as a demon. It is an incarnation of Evil and its mouth represents the entry to Hell. In demonology, it is identified by Peter Binsfield as one of the princes of Hell. Levertov clearly writes “we / in its belly” (l. 8-9), therefore “leviathan” (l. 8) symbolising Hell and being the metaphor for marriage, Levertov and her husband’s marriage is Hell, and they are “looking for some joy” (l. 10). The expression “joy / not to be known outside it” (l. 10-11), Levertov refers to marriage as a sort of prison in which “some joy” (l. 10) has to be found only in it and not outside. The idea of imprisonment and pain is also present in the final stanza with the repetition of “two” (l. 12) and the paronomasia of “ark” (l. 12) and “ache” (l. 13) making it even more striking. Indeed, Levertov and

her husband seem locked in their marriage, as if condemned and sent to Hell. They suffer emotionally and physically, desperately searching for happiness.

To understand better the institution of marriage and its consequences for women in history, the chapter entitled "The Married Woman" in Book II of *The Second Sex* by Simone de Beauvoir develops a study of marriage and especially its difficulty and the inequalities it produces for the woman. De Beauvoir writes that "marriage is the destiny traditionally offered to women by society" (Beauvoir 415). In the 1950s and the 1960s, it was still the case, as women were urged to be wives and mothers. Beauvoir explains that marriage had always been different for the husband and for the wife (Beauvoir 415). Indeed, while the man can "find self-fulfilment as husband and father; woman as slave or vassal […] has always been given in marriage by certain males to other males" (Beauvoir 416). She reveals that marriage becomes the only justification for her existence and creates duties: she must bear and raise children and she must satisfy her husband sexually and take care of his house (Beauvoir 416). The man is the one who has access to the society and the world while the woman stays in the house. He is the one who rules the relationship. Therefore,

> She takes his name; she belongs to his religion, his class, his circle; she joins his family, she becomes his 'half'. She follows wherever his work calls him and determines their place of residence; she breaks more or less decisively with her past, becoming attached to her husband's universe. (Beauvoir 419)

She no longer has anything for herself for she is his. Regarding this opposition between the woman indoors and the man outdoors, Beauvoir develops the idea of transcendence and immanence. Transcendence for De Beauvoir is associated with progression as the man works in the society and achieves new goals. Immanence for Beauvoir is associated with maintenance as the woman maintains the house and family life (Beauvoir 419). Thus, she reveals that maintenance and progression are implied in a marriage but solely for the man (Beauvoir 419). Thus, the woman

> Has no other job than to maintain and provide for everyday life in an orderly way; she perpetuates the species without change, she ensures the even rhythm of the days and the continuity of the home, seeing to it that the doors are locked. But she is allowed no direct influence upon the future nor upon the world. (Beauvoir 419)

She is imprisoned inside the home. While the man can find satisfaction in marriage, despite the fact that the young man fears the responsibilities of it (Beauvoir 421), the young woman on the other hand "frequently fears it" (Beauvoir 422). The woman scarcely finds satisfaction in her marriage as it condemns her to housewifery. As De Beauvoir puts it "it is implied in the very nature of the

institution, the aim of which is to make the economic and sexual union of man and woman serve the interests of society, not assure their personal happiness" (Beauvoir 423). Thus, while the man is permitted to develop his individuality through his work and marriage, the woman is deprived of her individuality by it. Beauvoir writes about the married woman that "within the walls of the home she is to manage, she will enclose her world" (Beauvoir 435). This is reflected in Beat women's poems through a depiction of the imprisonment of marriage and the desire for freedom.

Regarding the idea of being locked up in marriage, in the poem "About Marriage" (1964), Denise Levertov evokes the idea of marriage as a prison and especially her desire to not be locked in inside the house. The repetition of "lock" (l. 1) and "marriage" (l. 2) in "wedlock" (l. 1) introduces the idea of marriage as a prison from the start. The line break "I want / marriage, an / encounter" (l. 1-3) highlights both words by making them stand alone on the line. This underscores the importance of the idea of meeting in the poem. The idea and lexical field of the prison or the "lock" (l. 1) is present throughout the poem and is opposed to nature thus creating an opposition between inside and outside. Levertov expresses her desire to be outside, in nature, free. The lines "I told you about the / green light of / May // […] Saturday after / noon, long / shadows and cool // air, scent of / new grass, / fresh leaves, // blossom on the threshold of / abundance" (l. 4 – 17) depicts nature and the outside and many things which she cannot find inside. This description shows the importance of her senses in addition to nature. Indeed, there is "light" (l. 5), "air" (l. 13) but also "scent" (l. 13) which highlight the presence of sight, smell and touch as well. By being outside she does not just see things that do not exist indoors but she feels them, she smells, she touches. The presence of the senses highlights the importance of nature for her. Nature makes her feel things, it makes her live which is clearly the contrary of what marriage does to her as it locks her up inside. In marriage, she loses her freedom.

In addition, still linked to nature, Levertov draws a parallel with the birds she meets outdoors: "and the birds I met there, / birds of passage breaking their journey, / three birds each of a different species" (l. 18-20). Something important is the word "met" (l. 18). The lexical field of meeting is recurring in this poem. The parallel is drawn between the birds and her marriage through the idea of the meeting. The meeting of birds reminds of the lines "I want marriage, an / encounter" (l. 1-3). The lines "and with them the three douce hen-birds" (l. 25), highlights the fact that the birds are free, outside and with their companion. She wants her marriage to be like the birds, together, outside. With the lines "It's not / irrelevant: /I would be / met // and meet you / so, / in a green // airy space, not / locked in" (l. 33-41), Levertov explicitly reveals her desire for freedom. The lexical fields of meeting, nature and the marriage as prison are again present, showing the obvious

recurrence of these themes and their importance for the poet. Indeed, Levertov wants to "be / met" (l. 35-36) and "meet" (l. 37) her husband outdoors like the "birds" (l. 18). The line breaks "be / met // and meet you / so" (l. 35-38) emphasise the idea of meeting while the line breaks "in a green // airy space" (l. 39-40) stress the idea of nature. Levertov draws a parallel between the first and the last lines of the poem, with "not / locked in" (l. 40-41) with the line break highlighting the negation and making "locked in" (l. 41) stand alone on the final line, and "Don't lock me in wedlock" (l. 1). Levertov does not want to be indoors, she wants her freedom.

Levertov also reveals what she wants in a love relationship in the poem "Prayer for Revolutionary Love" (1975). This poem is highly structured, with numerous repetitions and anaphoras highlighting the solemnity of her prayer:

1 That a woman not ask a man to leave meaningful work to

- follow her.

- That a man not ask a woman to leave meaningful work to

- follow him.

- […] That our loyalty to one another and our loyalty to our work

- not be set in false conflict.

- That our love for each other give us love for each other's work.

10 That our love for each other's work give us love for one another.

- *That our love for each other's work give us love for one another.*

- *That our love for each other give us love for each other's work.* (Levertov 106)

In the first stanza, Levertov uses two identical sentences and just changes the gender and pronouns: "That a woman not ask a man to leave meaningful work to / follow her. / That a man not ask a woman to leave meaningful work to / follow him." (l. 1-4). This symmetry showcases the desire for equality in her love. Love and work seem to have equal importance for Levertov; this is found throughout the rest of the poem. Levertov affirms that she does not want to disturb the work of one another. With the lines "That our loyalty to one another and our loyalty to our work / not be set in false conflict" (l. 7-8), Levertov again shows the importance of love and work for her and especially

the need for the preservation of a balance between the two. The use of the expression “our loyalty” (l. 7) for love and work in that line shows again the equality of the two for Levertov. She does not want any “false conflict” (l. 8) because of their “loyalty” (l. 7) to their relationship and to their work. The fourth and fifth stanzas have a mirroring effect which emphasise the ideas of love and work. Levertov writes “That our love for each other give us love for each other’s work. / That our love for each other’s work give us love for one another” (l. 9-12). The fourth and the fifth stanzas are repetitions followed by a chiasmus. This mirroring effect thus emphasises the recurring idea of love and work needing to be equal and complementary for Levertov.

Another poem about freedom and which evokes marriage as a prison is “Lady/Poem” (1967) in which Lenore Kandel writes about a woman behind windows, a housewife who dreams. Kandel writes:

1 ladies with eyes limitless as angels
- hover behind white windows
- pale windows
- sending their minds over null-time landscapes
[…]
6 THERE IS NO ROOF TO MY HEAVEN!

- lady… lady… of iridescent dreaming
- time is the gesture of your eyelash
- dream of me,
10 lady
- my brain dances!
[…]
- THE RAINBOW!
15 it breaks against my eye

- I, rainbow,
- do salute you
- or will we giggle and serve tea

- two hundred years too late (Kandel 25)

With the lines “ladies with eyes limitless as angels / hover behind white windows / pale windows / sending their minds over null-time landscapes” (l. 1-4) Kandel introduces the idea of physical and temporal limits for the woman. She writes of “ladies with eyes limitless” (l. 1) but who are “behind white windows” (l. 2). Indeed, she illustrates the fact that women are trapped and limited in a specific space, the house. They are physically limited yet their eyes are “limitless” (l. 1) thus highlighting even more this entrapment in the house. Women can see the outside world, but only see it as they do not participate in the life of the world outside the home. They also dream of it as she reveals they are “sending their minds over null-time landscapes” (l. 4). These landscapes are timeless thus limitless. Landscapes also refer to nature and outdoors. But they are dreams only for the woman, the housewife who is indoors. This highlights the opposition to the limits, the physical ones, and the dreams which are limitless. With “THERE IS NO ROOF TO MY HEAVEN! // lady… lady… of iridescent dreaming / time is the gesture of your eyelash / dream of me, / lady / my brain dances!” (l. 6-11). The poet further uses the lexical field of dreaming and limits of time and space. The woman’s “heaven” (l. 6) is her dreams which again do not have limits as they have “no roof” (l. 6). The “roof” (l. 6) refers to a physical limit, the limit of the house which entraps the woman. The house may stop the woman in her life but it does not stop her from dreaming. The line “time is the gesture of your eyelash” (l. 8) could mean that as she dreams, time passes more rapidly but it could also mean that as time passes the woman is still not outside and freed. Thus, dreaming helps the woman breaking the limits of space but it also traps her in the limits of time.

Additionally, in the lines “THE RAINBOW! // it breaks against my eye // I, rainbow, / do salute you / or will giggle and serve tea / two hundred years too late” (l. 14-19), the “rainbow” (l. 14) is associated with the sky, “heaven” (l. 6) and thus dreams. Indeed, the “rainbow” (l. 14) is something that is outdoors, and the woman sees it as Kandel writes “it breaks against my eye” (l. 15) thus bringing up again the idea of sight and its association with dreams. The lines “I, rainbow, / do salute you” (l. 16-17) are quite ambiguous. The first interpretation would be that Kandel is the “rainbow” (l. 14), thus the metaphor for the outside world and for dreams saluting “you” (l. 17). This “you” (l. 17) would be a woman as described in the poem who would be reading this. Kandel as the metaphor of the outside goes towards the woman indoors. Another interpretation would be that the woman indoors is saluting the “rainbow” (l. 14) thus being the one who goes towards the outside world. The limit of time is mentioned again with “or will we giggle and serve tea / two hundred years too late” (l. 18-19). The woman realises her state of entrapment and the limit of time showcased by the line “two hundred years too late” (l. 19). The woman dreams of the outside world and reaches it

through her conversation with the “rainbow” (l. 14). This time limit reveals that her freedom needs to be sought or it will be “too late” (l. 19) and the woman would have spent her entire life trapped in her house. She dreams of freedom, which makes her escape her house in her mind, but she needs to escape it with her body as well.

Another poem about the desire for freedom and escape from the house and marriage is “Look the Bird is Making Plans” (1965) in which Joanne Kyger creates a metaphor of herself as a bird to express her entrapment in the house and her desire for freedom. Kyger writes:

1 Look the bird is making plans

[…]

6 Keep the house

- I’ll

- go bird you keep this place

- at the very farthest wall

10 pushing & scratching to get out

- thru the cracks in the batten

[…]

19 fix it I’m going. (Kyger 24)

The line “Look the bird is making plans” (l. 1) begins the metaphor of herself as a bird. She is “making plans” (l. 1) to leave the house. The lines “Keep the house / I’ll / go bird you keep this place” (l. 6-8) are in direct speech highlighting even more her desire to escape. The line break in “I’ll / go bird” (l. 7-8) emphasises the metaphor of Kyger as a “bird” (l. 8). The lines “keep the house” (l. 6) and “you keep this place” (l. 8) show that she leaves the home to the man as the home is a prison to her. Indeed, she will become like a “bird” (l. 1) who wants to escape a place in which it is trapped. Then, Kyger describes the bird searching for an escape route in the “house” (l. 6): “at the very farthest wall / pushing & scratching to get out / thru the cracks in the batten” (l. 9-11). Kyger, like a “bird” (l. 1) searches for “cracks” (l. 11) to “get out” (l. 10). The verbs “pushing & scratching” (l. 10) are active, thus showing Kyger’s will to flee with verbs of action. The final line “fix it I’m going” (l. 19) is also direct speech and can be interpreted as telling the man to take care of the home now that she would be gone. This shows that she was the one taking care of the home, and also that even when leaving, she still thinks about it thus showing the way she was trapped not just between walls but also in her mind. She is “going” (l. 19) and will be free, she is escaping the

house which was her trap, her prison like a “bird” (l. 1) escapes from its cage. This poem is a metaphor for the search for freedom and escape for the woman who is trapped in the house. Joanne Kyger was married to Beat poet Gary Snyder for four years from 1960 to 1964, and at the bottom of the page of this poem, “4.63” (Kyger 24) is written, but it was published in 1965. This was during Kyger and Snyder’s marriage thus making this poem about Gary Snyder.

2) Domestic Chores

In addition to writing about marriage as a prison, Beat women also write about domestic chores in the poems studied in this section. To address the topic of domestic chores, statistics will be of use. The fifth chapter entitled “Americans’ Time at Paid Work, Housework, Child Care, 1965 to 2011” in the report *Modern Parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family* by the Pew Research Center reveals statistics on the difference of time put in work, housework and child care by men and women. The time iat work in 1965 differed between men and women as “working-age men (age 18 to 64) on average spent 46 hours per week at paid work” (Pew Research Center 32) while working-age women spent 15 hours per week on average (Pew Research Center 32). In the home, in 1965, men spent four hours per week doing housework while women spent around 28 hours per week (Pew Research Center 32). This difference is simply enormous. Women spent seven times more time doing the housework. Regarding child care, in 1965, fathers spent two hours and a half per week while mothers spent a bit more than 10 hours per week (Pew Research Center 33). Then the statistics show a difference between woman and men with and without children. In 1965, women as a whole spent around 28 hours per week doing housework while “working-age mothers on average spent about 32 hours per week on housework” (Pew Research Center 35) while the time for fathers remained the same as the average for all men: four hours. In 1965, fathers’ time spent at work was 42 hours per week while mothers’ time at work was on average around eight hours per week (Pew Research Center 36). Mothers worked less on average than women as a whole. These statistics clearly show the appalling difference between men and women regarding work, domestic chores and child care.

The poem “She Comes Up” (1965) by Joanne Kyger evokes the struggles of the life of the housewife with domestic chores, her bad mental health and desire for freedom. She writes “She comes up / a long walk behind her // and all the struggle of what will happen today” (l. 1-3). Kyger expresses the difficulty of her work as a housewife with “the struggle” (l. 3). Domestic chores for the woman are everyday tasks, they are never ending. This aspect of the never-ending struggle is highlighted by the line “a long walk behind her” (l. 2) which shows the woman has been struggling

for a long time. On the next line, “what will happen today” (l. 3) showcases as well this idea of something that is happening every day, something that the housewife seems to not be able to escape. Further, Kyger describes domestic chores and reveals her inner emotions and how she feels about her life. Kyger does not just depict the reality of the housewife for others to read, she reveals her reality which is obviously echoing the life of women in the 1950s and 1960s and of women even today. She writes “The dirt laying limply / over everything / and the laundry has been soaking for two days in the bathroom sink. / I am so worried. / the angry wife screeching in the kitchen” (l. 4-8). With these lines Kyger pictures better her everyday life of domestic chores with worries for the “dirt” (l. 4) or the “laundry” (l. 6). Indeed, she reveals her emotions and feelings throughout the poem with the lexical field of emotions and feelings. Kyger uses the first-person as she writes “I am so worried” (l. 7). Kyger also describes herself as “the angry wife” (l. 8). One important thing to note is how she expresses her emotions through screaming, she is “screeching” (l. 8). This idea of the scream comes back in the poem.

In addition, throughout the poem, the lexical field of the house with the “bathroom” (l. 6), the “kitchen” (l. 8) or the “house” (l. 13) as well as the lexical field of domestic chores frames the entrapment of the woman as a housewife. Kyger is trapped in this life at the time, and re-creates this entrapment of her everyday life in her poem. In the lines “When persephone comes back in spring / there is a party / Beneath there is melancholy / and the ghosts of the house are laid to rest” (l. 9-12), Kyger uses Persephone as a metaphor for entrapment. In the Greek myth, Persephone is trapped underground with Hades and “comes back in spring” (l. 9) resulting in the creation of the four seasons. Kyger writes of a “party” (l. 10) in “spring” (l. 9) and uses the myth of Persephone to write about her “house” (l. 13) being a prison in a similar fashion to the underworld for the Goddess. With the lines “there is a party / beneath there is melancholy” (l. 10-11), Kyger creates a double meaning as the “party” (l. 10) in “spring” (l. 9) opposes the “melancholy” (l. 11) from “beneath” (l. 11) which would refer to the underworld as in the myth. With this “beneath” (l. 11), she also expresses her emotions outside the use of the myth. In her life, “there is a party” (l. 10) but what she feels is “melancholy” (l. 11) because of the state of her life. Thus Kyger draws a parallel between herself and Persephone as their respective entrapment leads to “melancholy” (l. 11) for them. The line “and the ghosts of the house are laid to rest” (Kyger 44) can be interpreted as a description of the men during the “party” (l. 10). The men in Kyger’s life are “the ghosts of the house” (l. 12), never to be found in the home like she is, because they have a life outside while the “house” (l. 12) is her trap. They “rest” (l. 12) which is opposed to Kyger who is active in the poem, she is the one doing all the domestic chores and the one doing everything while the men are resting. “Ghosts” (l. 12) can also be a reference to the dead in the underworld as in the myth of Persephone.

Then, Kyger goes further with the description of domestic chores, writing: “This is my house. / creaking and rushing through the house the others go mad / I have to mop the floors again” (l. 13-15). The line “This is my house” (l. 13) shows a sense of property and responsibility. She feels responsible for the house and its cleaning while the “others” (l. 14) do not respect her home. She ends up doing even more domestic chores because of the lack of care of the “others” (l. 14) as proved with “I have to mop the floors again” (l. 15). The use of the first-person “I” (l. 15) shows that this poem is an account of Kyger’s life. The presence of people does not bring any joy to her but only more duty further entrapping her in the cycle of the housewife labour. It is her “house” (l. 13) and her prison.

In the final lines of the poem, Kyger expresses her pain and her desire for freedom through the scream as discussed above: “Did you make me a promise? I gave a great groan / from the lungs and the stomach / bellowing to be free” (l. 21-23). The idea of a “promise” (l. 21) can refer to marriage. The scream appears twice in the poem, the first one is “screeching” (l. 8) probably out of distress or despair while this one “bellowing to be free” (l. 23) seems full of anger and highlights her desire for freedom. The line break in “from the lungs and the stomach / bellowing to be free” (l. 22-23) is also striking as the term “free” (l. 23) is the final word of the poem thus emphasising even more the need and desire for freedom felt by Kyger. The recurring mentions of emotions and screams emphasise Kyger’s description of her struggling mental health. It also expands to other housewives who may feel the same anger, distress and worry.

3) Mental Health

Mental health is an important subject which Beat women address both on its own, with Kandel’s “Telephone From a Madhouse” studied in the first part, and in relation to marriage and being a housewife, with poems studied in this section. The chapter “Misery” in *The Female Eunuch* by Germaine Greer addresses the mental health of housewives. As Greer explains “it is admitted that marriage is a hard job requiring constant adjustment, ‘give and take’, but it is not so often admitted that the husband – provider is the constant and the woman the variable” (Greer 306). The woman’s role in the relationship is seen as less important and challenging and if the woman dares to complain, “the prejudice against revolt or complaint by married women is very strong” (Greer 306). The woman is busy during the day but then she feels trapped. The role of the husband is understood as having “other more important things to do than make her happy” (Greer 307), yet it is not the case for the woman. Her entire role as wife and carer of the house is to make the husband happy and to do everything that would please him. The woman shows her discontent and nags, the husband’s

only effort can be to talk to her or to buy her something yet it does not change anything to her exhaustion (Greer 307). But this tiredness is presented by society as these women letting themselves go. For them, products are advertised to bring back their joy for life or their self-confidence yet another thing, even more insidious, that is shown to them are pills (Greer 308). As Greer writes "the subtle way in which painkillers are presented to women as form of psychotherapy, combating depression and irritability as well as pain, is full of hazards" (Greer 308). Doctors "prescribe a happiness pill, an amphetamine, an anti-depressant, a stimulant" (Greer 309) to housewives showing symptoms of discontent with their life and chronic tiredness and pain. Greer reveals the symptoms of this mental health problem and its cause:

> All these symptoms of tiredness, lassitude, 'nerves', as women are apt to call them, are neurasthenia[6] [...] No amount of direct medication can be effective, unless women can also be brainwashed into deluding themselves that their monotonous and unremitting drudgery in the home is for any purpose or doing any good. A housewife's work has no results: it simply has to be done again. (Greer 312)

Greer explains that "more women who attempt suicide than men, more women in mental hospitals than men. […] The majority of women drag along from day to day in an apathetic twilight, hoping that they are doing the right thing, vaguely expecting a reward some day" (Greer 315). Thus, this highlights the great difficulty that marriage causes to women making their mental health worse and endangering their health through the addiction to pills.

In the poem "Of All Things For You to Go Away" (1974), Joanne Kyger writes a slice of marriage life in which she, a housewife is the one doing every domestic chore. Thus this poem works as a description of the life of a housewife. As expressed in the first line of the poem "Of all things for you to go away mad on a tender morning like this" (l. 1), this poem describes a fight between a husband and a wife. The use of dialogue terms such as "you said" (l. 5) or "I asked you" (l. 3) shows it is reported speech in this poem and the description of the scene in addition to the reported dialogue from both bring an impression of reality as if we were witnessing the scene. Indeed, these lines bring light to the fact that it is the woman only here who cares for the appearances and who takes care of the domestic chores. She is the one worried "because the neckline won't come clean"

---

6 Neurasthenia is "a condition that is characterized especially by physical and mental exhaustion usually with accompanying symptoms (such as headache and irritability), is of unknown cause but is often associated with depression or emotional stress, and is sometimes considered similar to or identical with chronic fatigue syndrome" (Merriam- Webster).

(l. 4) which highlights the importance she puts in her chores but also the care for her husband's appearance. Her vivid angry reaction expressed with "I hurled the pancake turner to the floor" (l. 6) and "shouting" (l. 7) shows her exhaustion making her temper quick. Indeed, she is a housewife who has nothing else to worry about than chores and how her husband's day goes. She is putting her energy and intelligence into things that seem of no importance to her husband. The things she cares about are seen as futile matters by her husband thus making her mad but also exhausted. She is the one doing the laundry but also cooking as pictured by her proximity to the "pancake turner" (l. 6).
Further on, Kyger writes "and you got no breakfast, no pancake, forget it. I hope / you eat some lunch" (l. 10-11). These lines showcase the worry felt by the woman in this relationship. This worry is also emphasised by the next lines:

- And at 12:30 you still got no lunch which information

- via the phone I find out because I want to tell you I am sorry

- about the pancakes and appearances, grey day, the Pride of Madeira

15 fallen over in the garden. […] all show, no heart,

- heavy headed, no answer, breathe deeply. (Kyger 162)

Again, Kyger is the one who worries in this relationship thus highlighting the mental pressure that the housewife experiences. The housewife takes care of everything in the home and puts her entire energy into the relationship. Something that is also important to note is the fact that she is apologising and feeling guilty not just because of the fight in the morning shown with "about the pancakes and appearances" (l. 14) but also because of other things which have absolutely nothing to do with her like the "grey day" (l. 14) for example. Thus, this highlights the anxiety felt by the woman but also how every little thing happening seem to be making her think that she is at fault. Kyger describes her mental health as a housewife in this poem about what seems to be a random feud. The enumeration "all show, no heart, heavy headed, no answer, breathe deeply" (l. 15-16) portrays the reaction to the phone call. She feels "heavy headed" (l. 16), her husband does not answer and tells herself to "breathe deeply" (l. 16) which again shows her worry and mental state. Kyger writes "all show / no heart" (l. 15) which can be interpreted in the importance of appearances for her and "no heart" (l. 15) in the absence of emotions or understanding in him.
Regarding the importance of appearances for women as shown in the previous poem, the chapter entitled "Social Life" in Book II of *The Second Sex* by Simone de Beauvoir explores the social life of the housewife and its implications for her. The housewife's appearance and her home are on

constant display as Beauvoir reveals that “she delights in the display of her ‘interior’, even of her own appearance, which her husband and children do not notice because they are familiar with them. Her social duty, which is ‘to make a good show’, combines with her pleasure in letting herself be seen” (Beauvoir 505). Beauvoir explains that the woman cares about herself as she cares about her home. Her ego and self are showcased by the means of her looks (Beauvoir 505). Indeed, “social custom furthers this tendency to identify herself with her appearance” (Beauvoir 505) as it is “the expression of that couple’s standard of life, its financial status, its taste” (Beauvoir 505) just like her home is. In total opposition, the man considers his appearance as secondary as he puts his work and implication in the society first as “he does not normally consider his appearance as a reflection of his ego” (Beauvoir 506). Exploring another aspect of social life for women, Beauvoir reveals the community that women create together. Beauvoir explains that “women are comrades in captivity for one another, they help one another endure their prison, even help one another prepare for escape” (Beauvoir 521). Indeed, they “exchange confidences and recipes. […] Collectively they find strength to shake off their chains […] they question ironically the moral and intellectual superiority of their husbands and of men in general” (Beauvoir 518).

The poem “August 16” (1980) by Joanne Kyger evokes a prison-like relationship from which she desires to escape. She describes her life made of domestic chores, expectations and evokes her mental health. Kyger writes:

2 One sits and thinks alone

- many thoughts

6 […] Great thoughts of him, ahem!

- Say goodbye, release me!

- So I can love again

- What’s for lunch

10 What’s for breakfast

- What’s for gut stretch

- Shucks!

- Say it brother, I want

- to be free

15 and walk away

- from your smile and feel

- OK after while (Kyger 205)

Kyger writes about thinking as in the lines "One sits and thinks alone / many thoughts" (l. 2-3) and "Great thoughts of him, ahem!" (l. 6). The idea of thinking can be linked to her mental state and the fact that she thinks a lot about her relationship, her status as a housewife and her desire for freedom. Something to highlight is the fact that she is "alone" (l. 2) thinking. She feels lonely in her relationship and in her home. The lines "Say goodbye, release me! / So I can love again" (l. 7-8) showcase the idea of this relationship as a prison as she writes "release me" (l. 7). She is kept captive by the man to whom she seems to address this exclamation. She wishes to be free and to escape. The line "So I can love again" (l. 8) highlights the absence or the disappearance of love in the relationship but also her desire not only for freedom but for love as well.

Then, Kyger writes about the never-ending domestic chores and expectations with the lines "What's for lunch / What's for breakfast / What's for gut stretch / Shucks!" (l. 9-12). These lines are questions asked by the man or the family to the woman. It reveals the fact that she is the only one doing domestic chores but this repetition of "what's for" (l. 9, l. 10, l. 11) and the swearing "shucks!" (l. 12) reveals the repetition of tasks which never end and her exhaustion because of it. Indeed, she feels imprisoned, she is alone and mentally exhausted. There seems to be no longer any love in this relationship, only expectations of the chores she does and no gratification for her labour.

Domestic chores and the mental health of housewives is explored in the tenth chapter of *The Feminine Mystique*, entitled "Housewifery Expands to Fill the Time Available" in which Betty Friedan explores the mental health of housewives and the reality of their life filled with domestic chores. She seeks the difference between women who are housewives and women who have a job. Searching to prove that women are in fact not fulfilled as housewives as psychoanalysts believe, she "went as a reporter from suburb to suburb, searching for a woman of ability and education who was fulfilled as a housewife" (Friedan 255). In a suburb in which she interviewed twenty-eight wives, Friedan notes that some had graduated from college but all were housewives at the time. They dedicated their entire life to being housewives and mothers (Friedan 256). Yet, Friedan reveals that:

> Sixteen out of the twenty-eight were in analysis or analytical psychotherapy. Eighteen were taking tranquilizers; several had tried suicide; and some had been hospitalized for varying periods, for depression or diagnosed psychotic states […] These were fine, intelligent American

> women, to be envied for their homes, husbands, children, and for their personal gifts of mind and spirit. (Friedan 256)

This plight of intelligent American women ending up being housewives was not just a loss of talent but it was also making them suffer psychologically as shown in the poems by Joanne Kyger "August 16", and "Of All Things For You To Go Away" studied in this section. This depiction of the suburb with twenty-eight wives works as microcosm showcasing the reality for American housewives throughout the country. As she further describes "their voices were dull and flat, or nervous and jittery, they were listless and bored or frantically 'busy' around the house or community" (Friedan 257). Friedan notices the same symptoms in other housewives, slowly discovering interview after interview, the same terrible conditions of the housewife and her struggling mental health. She also notices that all these women are always "so *busy*" (Friedan 258). The time that housewives put in domestic chores makes Friedan notice something peculiar. Analysing the difference between the time used by two different women – one who is a full-time housewife and the other who has a job and in addition does all the domestic chores (Friedan 259). What Friedan discovers is that the woman who works takes less time to do the chores than the woman who is a housewife and only has these to do during the entire day (Friedan 259). Friedan states that

> The glorification of 'woman's role', then, seems to be in proportion to society's reluctance to treat women as complete human beings; for the less real function that role has, the more it is decorated with meaningless details to conceal its emptiness. […] Housework […] had to become the very end of life itself to conceal the obvious fact that it is barely the beginning. (Friedan 260)

Thus, she argues that the more the role attributed to the woman is minimal in society, the more the domestic chores will expand. She reveals that "without any outside interests, a woman is virtually forced to devote her every moment to the trivia of keeping house" (Friedan 260). Friedan explains her point using "the simple principle that "Work Expands to Fill the Time Available" [which] was first formulated by the Englishman C. Northcote Parkinson. […] Parkinson's Law can easily be reformulated for the American housewife: Housewifery Expands to Fill the Time Available" (Friedan 261). Indeed, Friedan develops that notion that because of the feminine mystique domestic chores and motherhood had to become the woman's entire career, taking all her time and wasting all her energy into it. The technological advances like the washing machine for example did not help the woman but gave her more work, as the machines she has to help her wash, cook and clean, make it easy, thus the woman having these machines ends up doing more than needed, which takes

more than just the time available. (Friedan 261). These domestic chores which have no end for the housewife wasting all her creative spirit and intelligence are the source of the feeling of emptiness and uselessness that these women experience (Friedan 263). Many of these women have no idea of what to do even if they had the time. They trap themselves further more into domestic chores to forget the feeling of emptiness. Friedan writes:

> The housewife who doesn't 'have time' to take serious responsibility in the community, like the woman who doesn't 'have time' to pursue a professional career, evades a serious commitment through which she might finally realize herself, she evades it by stepping up her domestic routine until she is truly trapped. (Friedan 266)

Friedan explains these women felt tired, empty and bored. Articles in magazines started appearing trying to give women advice on such issues but "the 'cures' suggested were usually of the more-praise-and-appreciation-from-husband variety, even though the doctors interviewed in these articles indicated clearly enough that the cause was in the 'housewife-mother' role" (Friedan 270). Indeed, as reckoned by Friedan being a housewife was at the origin of their bad mental health and chronic fatigue as "the problem seemed to be not that too much was asked of them, but too little" (Friedan 271). Friedan states

> That housewifery can, must, expand to fill the time available when there is no other purpose in life seems fairly evident. […] But no one is shocked to realize that getting rid of women's creative energy, rather than using it for some larger purpose in society, is the very essence of being a housewife. (Friedan 273)

Regarding domestic chores, Beauvoir in "Married Woman" explains that they have "a negative basis" (Beauvoir 438), because it implies getting rid of something, the dirt or the mess and does not create any "affirmation of individuality" (Beauvoir 437) in the woman. Beauvoir writes:

> Few tasks are more like the torture of Sisyphus than housework, with its endless repetition: the clean becomes soiled, the soiled is made clean, over and over, day after day. […] Eating, sleeping, cleaning – the years no longer rise up towards heaven, they lie spread out ahead, grey and identical. […] Washing, ironing, sweeping […] – all this halting of decay is also the denial of life; for time simultaneously creates and destroys, and only its negative aspect concerns the housekeeper. (Beauvoir 438)

The woman's days are always the same, with never-ending domestic chores, no positive goal and no development of her individuality or use of her intelligence and contact to society only through her husband. The housewife "loses *joie de vivre*" (Beauvoir 439) as housework is "tiresome, empty,

monotonous, as a career" (Beauvoir 440). But if the woman had a job on the side, housework would represent just something part of life from which she can move on after (Beauvoir 440). Housewifery "dooms her completely to the general and the inessential" (Beauvoir 440), her goals are "only means, not true ends" (Beauvoir 440). Beauvoir states that if women "lack outside interests, they often multiply and complicate their domestic duties to excess, just to have something to do" (Beauvoir 441). Therefore, this endless labour of domestic chores in marriage entraps the woman and deteriorates her mental health as the housewife finds no meaning in her work and only gets bored and exhausted because of it.

B. Divorce, Freedom and Living Alone

In addition to writing about their marriage, their mental health struggles and the burden of domestic chores, women Beat poets write about their desire for freedom. This freedom is often and finally found after divorce as they start to live alone and discover independence away from a husband. The theme of divorce is present in Denise Levertov's poetry and reveals details about her marriage, her divorce, the emotions she felt and especially her newly found freedom. Levertov married American writer Mitchell Goodman in 1948 (Knight 1996 207) and divorced him in 1972 (Knight 1996 210).

The first poem in which Levertov evokes the subject of divorce is "Divorcing" (1975) in which Levertov writes:

1 One garland
- of flowers, leaves, thorns
- was twined round our two necks.
- Drawn tight, it could choke us,
5 yet we loved its scratchy grace,
- our fragrant yoke.

- We were Siamese twins.
- Our blood's not sure
- if it can circulate,
10 now we are cut apart.
- Something in each of us is waiting
- to see if we can survive,

- severed. (Levertov 104)

The “garland” (l. 1) is a metaphor for the union of their marriage. “One garland […] round our two necks” (l. 1-3) highlights the fact that in marriage the two were one. Yet, it can also symbolise a rope that slowly kills them (“drawn tight, it could choke us” (l. 4)) or a neck shackle thus representing at the same time union and entrapment. This idea of entrapment and of something dangerous is represented by the “thorns” (l. 2) that the “garland” (l. 1) has. While “flowers” (l. 2) evoke something positive, “thorns” (l. 2) on the other hand evoke something negative about this love. The “garland” (l. 1) representing their marriage in the two aspects of union and entrapment is clearly portrayed as a toxic and dangerous one as Levertov describes it “drawn tight, it could choke us” (l. 4). The idea of choking is interesting as it is a lack of air, thus representing a lack of space or time for themselves in their marriage. The following line “yet we loved its scratchy grace” (l. 5) evoke an acknowledgement of the duality of this marriage. This duality is seen through the use of two words which seem of opposition value: “scratchy” (l. 5) refers to “thorns” (l. 2) and can be interpreted as negative while “grace” (l. 5) seems utterly positive. This hybridity of their marriage is “loved” (l. 5) by both.

In the second stanza, the metaphor of “We were Siamese twins” (l. 7) is very powerful as it portrays the fusion and closeness of the couple, and at the same time, it is very negative because of the monstrous connotations of the image. Levertov considers that during their marriage, they formed only one being. The following lines can be interpreted in two different ways: “Our blood’s not sure / if it can circulate, / now we are cut apart” (l. 8-10). One can interpret that because they form one being, their “blood” (l. 8) cannot circulate in a normal way. As a consequence, they are cut apart, thus this would be representing the possible toxicity of their marriage as being the reason for their divorce. Another interpretation is that because of the divorce, their “blood” (l. 8) cannot circulate in a normal way any more because they used to form one being. This would mean that because of the divorce they struggle with living without one another. Finally, the lines “Something in each of us is waiting / to see if we can survive, / severed” (l. 11-13) clearly express the fact that separated, Levertov and her husband ask themselves if they can survive without one another. The emphasis is put on “severed” (l. 13) with the line break. This poem represents the hybridity of a marriage of union and entrapment. These two notions can be interpreted as a co-dependency, which is especially showcased in the final lines of the poem. The marriage is portrayed as dangerous and creating pain but so is the divorce. The co-dependency brought a toxicity in the marriage choking them and is making them struggle as they are divorcing. Their divorce is thus hybrid like their marriage, it is a survival and also a struggle for survival to be divorced.

Another poem about divorce is “Libation” (1975), though the themes are different. The latter, Levertov writes about her divorce exploring the notions of happiness and the links between her and her ex-husband. Levertov writes “Raising our glasses, smilingly / we wish one another not luck / but happiness. After half a lifetime / with and without luck, / we know we need more than luck” (l. 1-5). The term “libation” (Levertov 105) refers to drinking as a form of celebration or in honour of something. Here, Levertov and her then husband toast to celebrate their divorce. They seem to still be on good terms as they wish each other “happiness” (l. 3) and are smiling. The term “luck” (l. 2) is repeated several times in these lines but also throughout the poem. As expressed in the lines “after a lifetime / with and without luck” (l. 3-4), Levertov explores happiness and difficulties in her marriage through the notion of luck that is recurring. Luck is also something they refuse as it seems to not be enough as shown with “we wish one another not luck” (l. 2) and “we need more than luck” (l. 5). They want more than “luck” (l. 2), they want “happiness” (l. 3) which is something that maybe they did not have in their marriage.

Then, Levertov writes “It makes no difference that we’re drinking / tomato juice, not wine or whiskey – / we know what we mean, / and the red juice of those virtuous / vegetable-fruit is something we both enjoy” (l. 6-10). Making again a reference to “libation” (Levertov 105), Tomato juice is something that they agree on that they “enjoy” (l. 10). This idea of the link and the agreement is also present in the use of the pronoun “we” (l. 2) on multiple occasion as “we wish” (l. 2), “we know we need” (l. 5), “we know what we mean” (l. l. 8), “we both enjoy” (l. 10). They seem to still form a “we” (l. 2). They are celebrating their divorce, but their unity on certain things remains.

In the second stanza, Levertov writes “We agree on tomatoes, then – and happiness? / yes, that too: we mean growth, branching, / leafing, yielding blossoms and fruit and the sharp odor / of dreams” (l. 16-19). This unity and understanding is again mentioned as Levertov reveals that they also agree on “happiness” (l. 16). Levertov uses a metaphor of fruit-bearing plants to explain their vision of happiness, which is seen with the lexical field of plants: “branching” (l. 17), “leafing” (l. 18), “yielding blossoms and fruit” (l. 18). This plant could be a tomato. The description of happiness through a metaphor of a plant, a tomato, comes back to the idea that the tomato is something they “both enjoy” (l. 10). Something interesting about this association is that “happiness” (l. 16) means “growth” (l. 17) like a tomato, thus it means life and potentially freedom as the plant is free to grow how it wants. Finally, Levertov writes “We smile. / After these months of pain we begin / to admit our new lives have begun” (l. 28-30). The “smile” (l. 28) echoes the adverb “smilingly” (l. 1) of the first line and gives a sense of appeasement now that they are divorced. Levertov again reveals the

hardships of this marriage with “these months of pain” (l. 29). This poem was written and published three years after the divorce

While the two previous poems were about divorce and the emotion it made her feel, in the poem “A Woman Alone” (1978), Levertov writes about a woman who lives alone and who finally feels free. This poem celebrates loneliness. Levertov begins to write about instances which make her feel joy because she is alone. These instances are introduced by an anaphora with the term “when” (l. 1) as in the first lines “When she cannot be sure / which of two lovers it was with whom she felt / this or that moment of pleasure” (l. 1-3) this is followed by an enumeration of things which she cannot remember with who it was. Indeed, the fact that she cannot remember these things shows that she has been alone for a while but also that is does not matter any more to her. Another instance procuring her “joy” (l. 18) is “when she can sit or walk for hours after a movie / talking earnestly and with bursts of laughter / with friends, without worrying / that it’s late, dinner at midnight, her time / spent without counting the change” (l. 9-13). Something important in these lines is the “she can” (l. 9) showing her complete freedom to do these things which can be clearly opposed to the life of a housewife who cannot do the same things. Several things reveal a critique of married life like for example “without worrying / that it’s late” (l. 11-12) which refers to the freedom to eat at the hour she wants and not having to prepare dinner and wait for a husband or family. Another example is “her time / spent without counting the change” (l. 12-13) which plays with the verb *to spend* with time and money which also refers to the belief that time is money. She is free to spend time and money however she wants, which is highlighted by the lexical field of time with “for hours” (l. 9), “late” (l. 12), “midnight” (l. 12). She is free from societal and marital expectations and from anxiety.

Then, Levertov writes of another thing which brings her joy: “When half her bed is covered with books / and no one is kept awake by the reading light / and she disconnects the phone, to sleep till noon...” (l. 14-16). These lines refer to freedom found in celibacy which is expressed by “half her bed is covered with books” (l. 14) and “no one” (l. 15). Indeed, it is “her bed” (l. 14) emphasising that no one is sharing it and the other “half” (l. 14) has “books” (l. 14) on it, thus the “books” (l. 14) replacing the possible place of a husband sharing the bed. It also shows the fact that being a woman writer, now that she is alone, the “books” (l. 14) and her writing have finally taken an important place in her life. It also depicts the fact that because of the husband she maybe could not write or read as much as she wanted. Levertov reveals what these things create for the woman alone: “Then / selfpity dries up, a joy / untainted by guilt lifts her” (l. 17-19). All these instances make her feel “joy” (l. 18). She does not feel “selfpity” (l. 18) or “guilt” (l. 19) as society tries to make her feel for

being alone. Celibacy is regarded as being a negative thing for a woman as society believes a woman's life is to be married and a mother. She is totally free from any negative energy as the terms "earnestly" (l. 10), "laughter" (l. 10), "without worrying" (l. 11) and "joy" (l. 18) emphasise. Indeed, her celibacy is a freedom from society's obligations and expectations for women. Levertov also writes about divorce in the poem "Wedding Ring" in which she portrays her rejection of marriage through her desire to get rid of her wedding ring.

C. Dependency upon Love

Another theme present in the poetry of Beat women is the theme of love. The poems studied here are by Lenore Kandel. They evoke love in different aspects: true love, destructive love, love that fools you. She also writes about heartbreak and loneliness.

But to begin, one needs to understand the differences between men and women when in love. Thus, in the chapter entitled "The Woman in Love" in Book II of *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir explores the difference of love between men and women and focuses on what love means for women, what consequences it has on their life and how it makes them change. Beauvoir explains that "love has by no means the same sense for both sexes" (Beauvoir 608). The man never surrenders everything for love like the woman does. Love seems to be her whole life while for the man it is just one thing among others (Beauvoir 608). Beauvoir reveals that the man is presented to the woman as a subject and a superior being while she is viewed as an object, and being with a man is explained to her as her destiny. Her sole way of to reach humanity would be to devote herself, lose herself to the man (Beauvoir 609). Beauvoir writes:

> She [the woman] chooses to desire her enslavement so ardently that it will seem to her the expression of her liberty; she will try to rise above her situation as inessential object by fully accepting it; through her flesh, her feelings, her behaviour, she will enthrone him as supreme value and reality: she will humble herself to nothingness before him. Love becomes for her a religion. (Beauvoir 609)

Yet, few women worship their lover like a god and devote all their life to love as they devote their life to other things as well (Beauvoir 610). Psychoanalysts express that woman searches for her father in her lover but Beauvoir adds that it is more the protection of the man, just like the protection of her father when she was a little girl, which the woman seeks (Beauvoir 611). Beauvoir states that "the young girl dreamed of herself as seen through men's eyes, and it is in men's eyes that the woman believes she has finally found herself" (Beauvoir 612). Indeed, Beauvoir further argues that the woman dresses for the man's eyes, to feel seen and loved. Beauvoir writes that

“through love, […] everything she is, all that belongs to her, escape contingency and become essential: she is a wondrous offering at the foot of the altar of her god” (Beauvoir 612). Beauvoir also explains that the woman “abandons herself to love first of all to save herself; but the paradox of idolatrous love is that in trying to save herself she denies herself utterly in the end” (Beauvoir 615). The woman in love will do everything to serve her lover to feel necessary and part of his world (Beauvoir 615). The woman first searched for a “confirmation of what she was, of her past, of her personality” (Beauvoir 616) thus something related to the ego and narcissism yet to have a future, she gives up everything to put it in his hands and secure her a future. But in finding herself in her lover, she eventually loses herself in him (Beauvoir 616). She does everything he wants to make him love her and if he does not love as much as she wants, she would take it personally and feel humiliated and guilty (Beauvoir 616). She does everything like him which makes her feel happy as “when he says ‘we’, she is associated and identified with him” (Beauvoir 618). The man has to live up to the expectations of the woman for if he does not she is disappointed in him, she becomes a judge to check if he deserves her devotion (Beauvoir 620). If this comes to an end, the woman realises she has lost everything already as Beauvoir writes: “the abandoned woman no longer is anything, no longer has anything. If she is asked how she lived before, she does not even remember. She let her former world fall in ashes” (Beauvoir 630).

The poem which illustrates the idea of loving and giving everything to lose everything after, the most is “The Love I Had For You, Baby” (1959) in which Lenore Kandel writes about putting everything into love. This poem is made of two quatrains. In the first stanza, Kandel writes “The love I had for you, baby / Was like a big, fat, glassy jewel / Shiny like snow in the morning / And I was a goddamn fool” (l. 1-4). In the first line, something important to notice is the pronoun as she writes “the love I had for you” (l. 1) thus highlighting that she possibly was the only one to love in the relationship. The comparison of her “love” (l. 1) with “a big, fat, glassy jewel / shiny like snow” (l. 2-3) underscores the purity of her love as the terms “glassy” (l. 2), “jewel” (l. 2), “shiny like snow” (l. 3) represent something pure, white or transparent, and untouched. The fourth line “and I was a goddamn fool” (l. 4) showcases the reality of the relationship for Kandel. Her love was pure and she was innocent but the person in front of her was not, and she discovered she was a “fool” (l. 4) for giving everything to him.

In the second stanza, Kandel further writes about this realisation: “I walked in with my eyes wide open / Like a sheep that can’t wait to be led / I had it made, I was living / Love, like a hole in the head” (l. 5-8). The idea of her “eyes wide open” (l. 5) highlight the fact that she had no suspicion, she was trusting the person fully. In general, the expression is “with my eyes closed” to show the

person did not see what was coming; yet here Kandel had her “eyes wide open” (l. 5) thus emphasising the topos of love blinding her. The comparison “like a sheep that can’t wait to be led” (l. 6) expresses again this idea of purity of love with the sheep which is generally used to portray innocence opposed to the wolf. The “sheep” (l. 6) is also the one that is “led” (l. 6) blindly, that just goes wherever the shepherd or another sheep goes. The comparison of the “sheep that can’t wait to be led” (l. 6), reinforced with the passive form, also reveals the manipulation which was possibly used on her. The last two lines “I was living / Love, like a hole in the head” (l. 7-8) showcase the idea of putting everything into love as if there was nothing else to live for. The comparison with the “hole in the head” (l. 8) represents the fact that her “head” (l. 8) is a violent image which can be interpreted as a reference to lobotomy, which was used in the first part of the 20th century on mentally ill people, and which erased some emotions, or brainwashed them. Indeed, this poem shows Kandel loving blindly as if brainwashed and manipulated by love and by the other. It denounce manipulation and control which was used on her because of her blind love.

Then, Kandel writes about heartbreak in the poem “There Is a Hole in My Heart”. In the first stanza, she writes: “There is a hole in my heart, / all the love is dripping out / and the winds of summer / have forgotten how to / spell my name” (l. 1-5). To represent heartbreak, Kandel expresses the presence of a “hole” (l. 1) in her heart. With “all the love dripping out” (l. 2) she creates a metaphor of love as her blood which creates a violent image of heartbreak as death. In this poem, Kandel uses the metaphor of the seasons to express her emotions: the “summer” (l. 3) is for love and happiness, it is positive. Yet, here “the winds of summer / have forgotten how to / spell my name” (l. 3-5) means the absence of happiness and love for her. This metaphor for seasons is extended in the second stanza that focuses on winter: “The frost grows heavy on my eyelids, / my fingers have no gloves, / my body has no skin” (l. 6-8). Indeed, in opposition to summer, winter is interpreted as negative, it is for sadness and the absence of love. Winter here is present with the terms “frost” (l. 6) and “gloves” (l. 7) which highlight the absence of protection which she had when in love. The parallel between “my fingers have no gloves” (l. 7) and “my body has no skin” (l. 8) further underscores the absence of protection from the cold. Kandel writing about a “hole” (l. 1) in her heart or having “no skin” (l. 8) also refers to death.

The bed is something important for Kandel in her notion of love, and it is present in the poem “Poem for a Long-Gone Lover” (1964) in which Kandel writes about the pain and loneliness she feels because her lover is gone. Kandel writes:

1 Lonely is a razor blade

- and I could bleed to death waiting for you

- without you night is emptybed and endless

- the bed is too big

5 the night is too cold

- Love hurts you never told me that

- when you kissed me. (Kandel 146)

Kandel creates a metaphor of loneliness with self-harm and suicide with “razor blade” (l. 1) and “bleed to death” (l. 2). The alliteration of “blade” (l. 1) and “bleed” (l. 2) emphasises this idea of self-harm to portray the pain she feels because of loneliness. The line “and I could bleed to death waiting for you” (l. 2) with its lexical field of self-harm and death “bleed to death” (l. 2) underscores the notion of loneliness as a form of death, due to the absence of her lover. The chiasmus of “night” (l. 3, 5) and “bed” (l. 3, 4) highlights the importance of these notions in Kandel’s idea of love, and it stresses even more the lover’s absence. The anaphora “the bed is too big / the night is too cold” (l. 4-5) with the adjectives “big” (l. 4) and “cold” (l. 5) highlights the lover’s absence. The line “night is emptybed and endless” (l. 3) with its adjective “emptybed” (l. 3) is yet a new stress on the association of “night” (l. 3, 5) and “bed” (l. 3, 4). The word “emptybed” (l. 3) is an unusual coinage, as the direct association of “empty” (l. 3) in the same word, underlines even more her loneliness. The mention of pain with “hurts” (l. 6) draws a parallel with the first line of the poem with the metaphor of the “razor blade” (l. 1). Indeed, the idea of pain whether physical or emotional is used by Kandel to evoke heartbreak.

Writing about love, in the sixth chapter entitled “Love” of *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case For Feminist Revolution*, Shulamith Firestone argues that love is “the pivot to women’s oppression” (Firestone 126). Firestone focuses on culture explaining that love has consequences on culture as men were creating culture while women were supporting them. As Firestone puts it: “Men were thinking, writing, and creating, because women were pouring their energy into those men; women are not creating culture because they are preoccupied by love. That women live for love and men for work is a truism” (Firestone 126-127). Indeed, men have developed entire professional careers taking the benefits of their relationships at the expense of women (Firestone 127). Then, focusing

on love itself, Firestone explains that “love is the height of selfishness: the self attempts to enrich itself through the absorption of another being. […] [but it is] not only the incorporation of the other, but an exchange of selves” (Firestone 128). Frequently love is destructive and Firestone evokes that it is “often resulting in the destruction of the individual, or at least an emotional cynicism that makes it difficult or impossible ever to love again” (Firestone 129). Thus, by loving the man, the woman puts her everything into him and then ends up ruined and with nothing left when the relationship comes to an end.

III/ Writing the Body

A. Preaching for Sex

Through the 1950s, the sexuality of women became a central point as Freudian theories were used again in the 1940s to urge women to stay at home and to devote their existence to the home, marriage and motherhood. For a lot of American women, sexuality became a goal of reproduction and of providing satisfaction to their husbands. In 1953, the report *Sexual Behavior In The Human Female* written by Alfred C. Kinsey, an American sexologist and zoologist, described the sexuality of American women. This report followed another one, focused on male sexuality *Sexual Behavior In The Human Male* published in 1948. This report shocked the nation by addressing the taboo of sexuality, from masturbation to pre-marital sex and extra-marital sex or homosexuality as well. Yet, the taboo of sex, especially of the sexuality of women, prevailed in those years.

In opposition to this taboo, the Beat Generation was well-known for its explicit and raw depiction of sexuality in the works of its authors as well as in their lifestyle. The women of the Beat Generation were no exception to this phenomenon of crude sexual writings. One of the poets studied, Lenore Kandel, is a perfect example of this. While woman was depicted as solely passive in her sexuality and as having no libido of her own as Freudian theories of female sexuality explained, Lenore Kandel, in her poems, writes of sex from her point of view, and showcases an active role in her sexuality as well as a confident expression of her desire which all together come in opposition to Freudian ideas of passivity.

1) Freudian Theories

To begin, the explanation of Freudian theories of femininity and female sexuality is needed, as well as the analysis and interpretation of it which were done by many feminist authors and scholars of second-wave feminism.

In the third chapter of *This Sex Which Is Not One*, entitled "Psychoanalytic Theory: Another Look", Luce Irigaray explains and analyses the Freudian theory of femininity. For Freud, Irigaray explains, the sexual development of children is the same, the clitoris in the girl is viewed as a little penis, thus her sexual desire is seen as masculine (Irigaray 35). Irigaray states that "in order for femininity to arise, a much greater repression […] will be required of the little girl, and, in particular, the transformation of her sexual activity into its opposite: passivity" (Irigaray 36). The girl comes to an understanding that the penis is the valued sex while she is considered as castrated like every other woman (Irigaray 37). Feeling castrated because she has no penis, the little girl develops a supposed penis envy which "leads her to turn away from her mother" (Irigaray 40) towards her father who has a penis thus entering the Oedipus complex (Irigaray 40). Then, Irigaray reveals that to develop femininity and the passive sexuality that is expected of woman, "the 'penile' clitoral erogenous zone has to relinquish its importance in favor of the vagina, which is now valued as the place of shelter for the penis" (Irigaray 41). According to Freud, the woman's sexual function "is above all the reproductive function. […] The desire to obtain the penis from the father is replaced by the desire to have a child. […] We must add here that the woman's happiness is complete only if the newborn child is a boy" (Irigaray 41). Thus, as explained by Irigaray, to Freud woman must be passive, her sexuality only through her vagina and she must become a mother as it is how she will realise her femininity. If she clings to an active clitoral sexuality, she is considered as having a 'masculinity complex' and penis envy (Irigaray 43). Commenting on Freudian theories, Irigaray criticises the fact that:

> Freud falls back on the affirmation that the libido is necessarily male, and maintains that there is in fact only one libido, but that in the case of femininity it may put itself in the service of 'passive aims'. So in no way does his account question the fact that this libido has to be more repressed in the sexual organization of the woman. (Irigaray 48)

Irigaray also states that Freud neglected "the analysis of the determining socio-economic and cultural factors that also govern the sexual development of women" (Irigaray 49) and that he reacted "negatively to the research of analysts who rebel against the exclusively masculine viewpoint that informs his own theory and that of certain of her disciples, male and female, where, 'the development of women' is concerned" (Irigaray 49).

Another chapter which comments on Freud's theory is the ninth chapter of *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, entitled "Freud and the Melancholia of Gender" in which Judith Butler comments on Freud's Oedipal Complex seen as the source of gender and sexuality in

men and women. In the course of the Oedipal Complex, Butler explains that it is suggested by Freud that:

> The boy must choose not only between the two objects choices [father and mother], but the two sexual dispositions, masculine and feminine. That the boy usually chooses the heterosexual would, then, be the result, not of the fear of castration by the father, but the fear of castration – that is, the fear of 'feminization' associated within heterosexual cultures with male homosexuality. (Butler 59)

According to Freud, in abandoning his mother and going towards the father the boy "consolidates his masculinity" (Butler 60). These ideas of masculinity and femininity are to be understood not only as terms regarding gender as they also refer to sexuality and "libidinal dispositions" (Butler 60) thus sexuality. To Freud, femininity is associated with passivity and masculinity with activity. Regarding the girl, Butler notes that "the Oedipal Complex can be either 'positive' (same-sex identification) or 'negative' (opposite-sex identification)" (Butler 60). Butler explains that in the case of the identification with the mother, the femininity of the girl would be consolidated, which would result in heterosexuality, while in the case of identification with the father the masculinity of the girl would be consolidated, resulting in homosexuality (Butler 60). Raising questions about Freudian theories, Butler argues that the Oedipus Complex creates "a heterosexual matrix for desire" (Butler 60). Butler notes that "in repudiating the mother as object of sexual love, the girl of necessity repudiates her masculinity and, paradoxically, 'fixes' her femininity as a consequence.
Hence, "within Freud's thesis of primary bisexuality, there is no homosexuality, and only opposites attract" (Butler 61). Butler reveals that "the resolution of the Oedipal Complex affects gender identification through not only the incest taboo, but, prior to that, the taboo against homosexuality" (Butler 63) thus "the disposition that Freud assumes to be primary or constitutive facts of sexual life are effects of a law which, internalized, produces and regulates discrete gender identity and heterosexuality" (Butler 64).

In addition to describing Freud's theories on women and their effects on US society, feminists also criticise Freud's theories by exploring his background and thus exposing his biases. In the fifth chapter of *The Feminine Mystique*, entitled "The Sexual Solipsism of Sigmund Freud", Betty Friedan dissects the life of Freud and exposes the bias which his theories contain as they were influenced by his cultural background as well as the time he lived. As Friedan reveals: "The old prejudices – women are animals, less than human, unable to think like men, born merely to breed and serve men – […] merely reappeared in the forties, in Freudian disguise. The feminine mystique derived its power from Freudian thought" (Friedan 126). Friedan explains that these theories were

at first “broadcast” (Friedan 126) by the means of people working in the fields of education and social science who usually oppose prejudices yet the fact that it came from Freud made it impossible to question (Friedan 126). Freudian thought was popularised “through the popular magazines and the opinions and interpretations of so-called experts” (Friedan 127). It was not only chaining woman to an old image and denying her identity and growth (Friedan 127), it became “the ideological bulwark of the sexual counter-revolution in America” (Friedan 127). Thus, in her quest to debunk Freudian thought, Friedan goes back to the origins of the theories and to the life and culture of Freud which deeply influenced his beliefs.

Starting with the notion of “penis envy” coined by Freud, Friedan reveals that it was observed “in middle-class women who were his patients in Vienna in the Victorian era” (Friedan 127) and it was then taken out of its context of Victorian Vienna and applied “in the 1940’s as the literal explanation of all that was wrong with American women” (Friedan 127). She further explains that many of the people who popularised these ideas actually did not know its origins, or its meaning (Friedan 128). To understand what Freud meant by these theories and terminology, one must focus on the context of their origins which proves its obsolescence and bias (Friedan 128). Indeed, Friedan reveals that Freud

> was a prisoner of his own culture. […] Much of what Freud believed to be biological, instinctual, and changeless has been shown by modern research to be the result of specific cultural causes. Much of what Freud described as characteristic of universal human nature was merely characteristic of certain middle-class European men and women at the end of the nineteenth century. (Friedan 128)

Furthermore, the sexual repression in Freud’s time certainly made him focus on the creation of “sexual rubrics” (Friedan 129) to explain every phenomenon of human psychology, as well as the approach of cause and effect coming from his medicine background (Friedan 129). Friedan states that “the whole superstructure of Freudian theory rests on the strict determinism that characterized the scientific thinking of the Victorian era” (Friedan 129). Friedan reveals that in the 1940s, American scientists and psychoanalysts reinterpreted Freudian theories with the cultural knowledge of their time yet they did not do that for the theories on women, they applied these theories literally to American women (Friedan 130). The reason behind this is the bias against women as Friedan notes that “to Freud, even more than to the magazine editors on Madison Avenue today, women were a strange, inferior, less-than-human species. He saw them as childlike dolls, who existed in terms only of man’s love, to love man and serve his needs” (Friedan 130). Freud’s misogyny stems from his cultural and family background as Friedan reveals that Freud grew up in the culture of

Victorian Europe and in Jewish culture (Friedan 131). His father was an authoritative man who ruled the family while his mother was passive and docile, giving everything to Freud (Friedan 131). Moreover, Friedan writes that:

> with his wife, as with his mother and sisters, his needs, his desires, his wishes, were the sun around which the household revolved. […] Freud did not see this attitude as a problem, or cause for any problem, in women. [To him] it was woman's nature to be ruled by man, and her sickness to envy him. (Friedan 131)

Thus, as Friedan notes "all of Freud's theories rested, admittedly, on his own penetrating, unending psychoanalysis of himself" (Friedan 133), yet some paradoxes persist, as Freud was "even for those times, exceptionally chaste, puritanical and moralistic. In his own life, he was relatively uninterested in sex" (Friedan 133), as was revealed by his chief biographer, Ernest Jones. Friedan also writes that "less reverent biographers, and even Jones himself, point out that when one considers Freud's theories in terms of his own life, one is reminded of the puritanical old maid who sees sex everywhere" (Friedan 134). To Freud, his idea of normal femininity came from penis envy felt by the woman which makes her depreciate herself and feel castrated, and eventually leads to penis envy through her husband and according to him it is fulfilled when the woman gives birth to a son (Friedan 137). As Friedan sums up "in short, she is merely an 'homme manqué,' a man with something missing" (Friedan 137).

Analysing the idea of penis envy, Friedan explains that surely women of the Victorian era definitely envied men, not for their sex but for their rights and freedom (Friedan 139). As Friedan writes "you cannot explain away woman's envy of man, or her contempt for herself, as mere refusal to accept her sexual deformity, unless you think that a woman, by nature, is a being inferior to man. Then, of course, her wish to be equal is neurotic" (Friedan 140). The popularisers of Freudian thought saw women in the same light as Freud and sought to make women adjust "to being man's passive object – they wanted to help women get rid of their suppressed envy, their neurotic desire to be equal" (Friedan 141). Despite the popularisation of these theories, some psychoanalysts were understanding that penis envy simply did not exist, women's dissatisfaction came from their denied identity and the fact that women's life was just being housewives and mothers which was not fulfilling for them (Friedan 145). Yet, Freudian thought had become a religion in America, "Freud was the spiritual leader, his theories were the bible" (Friedan 146), which made it impossible for people to question.

Feminists also write about the effects which the resurgence of Freud's theories in the forties had on American women and Feminism. In the third chapter of *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* entitled "Freudianism: The Misguided Feminism", Shulamith Firestone analyses Freud's theories and their consequences. She writes that "though psychoanalytic therapy has been proven ineffective, and Freud's ideas about women's sexuality literally proven wrong […], the old conceptions still circulate" (Firestone 42). She begins her analysis by explaining that Freudianism and Feminism appeared and evolved at the same time (Firestone 43). Firestone reveals that "both Freudianism and Feminism came as reactions to one of the smuggest periods in Western civilization, the Victorian Era, characterized by its familycenteredness, and thus its exaggerated sexual oppression and repression" (Firestone 44). Firestone wants to reexamine Freud's ideas "from a radical feminist view" (Firestone 46). In reaction to the Oedipus Complex, Firestone explains it would make sense in terms of power as "Freud observed this complex as common to every normal individual who grows up in the nuclear family of a patriarchal society, a form of social organization that intensifies the worst effects of the inequalities inherent in the biological family itself" (Firestone 47). Firestone thus argues that with men having less power, there would be less effects of the Oedipus Complex (Firestone 47). In the nuclear family, the father is usually the breadwinner and the wife and children are dependent on him. The father "agrees to support a wife in return for her services: housekeeping, sex, and reproduction" (Firestone 48). The child lives in a family which represents the societal hierarchy of power (Firestone 48). He has "bond […] in oppression" (Firestone 49) with his mother while his father has all the power. Thus, the son "is asked to make a transition from the state of the powerless, women and children, to the state of the potentially powerful, son (ego extension) of his father" (Firestone 51).

Firestone writes about the Electra Complex that "like all Freud's theories about women, it analyses the female only as a negative male: the Electra Complex is an inverse Oedipus Complex" (Firestone 52). The little girl is

> encouraged to play with dolls, to 'play house', to be pretty and attractive. It is hoped that she will not be one of those to fight off her role till the last minute. It is hoped she will slip into it early, by persuasion, artificially, rather than by necessity; that the abstract promise of a baby will be enough of a lure to substitute for that exciting world of 'travel and adventure'. (Firestone 54)

She is thus expected to become passive, powerless, and her role as woman being a housewife and mother. Freudianism appeared in America in the 1940s as an anti-feminist reaction to the victories of first-wave feminism and the 1920s' "stereotypes of the American 'career girl', the 'coed', and the 'butchy' businesswoman" (Firestone 63). Firestone explains that psychoanalysis was used for anti-

feminist ends as “psychology departments became halfway houses to send women scurrying back ‘adjusted’ to their traditional roles as wives and mothers. Psychology became reactionary to its core, its potential as a serious discipline undermined by its usefulness to those in power” (Firestone 69). Finally, Firestone reveals that “in short, Freudian theory, regroomed for its new function of ‘social adjustment’, was used to wipe up the feminist revolt. […] It succeeded in quieting the immense social unrest and role confusion that followed in the wake of the first attack on the rigid patriarchal family” (Firestone 70).

Lenore Kandel’s poems on sexuality are the complete opposite to Freud’s theories as she was active in her sexuality.

2) Women’s Active Sexuality in Poems

Lenore Kandel’s first collection of poems *The Love Book* was published in 1966. In the 1960s, America was then diving into a sexual revolution which especially freed speech concerning sex. Thus Lenore Kandel’s poems on sexuality are testimonies of the sexual revolution of the 1960s and of the active role of woman in her sexuality which is opposed to Freud’s ideas of women’s passivity popular at the time.

Luce Irigaray comments on Freud’s approach to femininity and explores female sexuality, pleasure, desire, sex organ and how culture and society go against it, in the second chapter of *This Sex Which Is Not One*. First, Irigaray reveals that

> the opposition between ‘masculine’ clitoral activity and ‘feminine’ vaginal passivity, an opposition which Freud – and many others – saw as stages, or alternatives, in the development of a sexually ‘normal’ woman, seems rather too clearly required by the practice of male sexuality. […] In these terms, woman’s erogenous zones never amount to anything but a clitoris-sex that is not comparable to the noble phallic organ, or a hole-envelope that serves to sheathe and massage the penis in intercourse: a non-sex, or a masculine organ turned back upon itself, self-embracing. (Irigaray 23)

Concerning the woman, Irigaray adds that this view of sexuality absolutely does not address women’s pleasure. Her sexual organ is seen as lacking something in comparison to the phallus which is valued, thus the woman is thought as having ‘penis envy’ in Freud’s theories (Irigaray 23). Irigaray notes that there is an extreme focus in Western sexuality on the penis (Irigaray 24) and on men’s pleasure. Irigaray explains that

> woman, in this sexual imaginary, is only a more or less obliging prop for the enactment of man’s fantasies. That she may find pleasure there in that role, by proxy, is possible, even certain. But

> such pleasure is above all a masochistic prostitution of her body to a desire that is not her own, and it leaves her in a familiar state of dependency upon man. (Irigaray 25)

Irigaray also affirms that "woman takes pleasure more from touching than from looking" (Irigaray 26) which in relation to man who prefers watching, consigns her to "passivity: she is to be the beautiful object of contemplation" (Irigaray 26). In regards to the woman's sexual organ and the inner lips touching each other all the time, Irigaray explains that it is a form of "autoeroticism" (Irigaray 24). Irigaray also argues that in sexual relations with a man, the penis breaks with violence into these two lips touching of the vulva which takes away woman's pleasure (Irigaray 24).

One also can note that while man needs a means to give himself pleasure, the vulva is "self-caressing" (Irigaray 24). Yet, as Irigaray reveals, "that pleasure is denied by a civilization that privileges phallomorphism. The value granted to the only definable form excludes the one that is in play in female autoeroticism" (Irigaray 26). Deprived of pleasure, when the woman gives birth to a child it replaces her "appetite for touch" (Irigaray 27). Irigaray explains in Freud's theories that "maternity fills the gaps in a repressed female sexuality" (Irigaray 27). Continuing on women's sexuality, Irigaray argues that

> it is plural. […] Indeed, woman's pleasure does not have to choose between clitoral activity and vaginal passivity, for example. The pleasure of the vaginal caress does not have to be substituted for that of the clitoral caress. They each contribute, irreplaceably, to woman's pleasure. Among other caresses… (Irigaray 28)

Irigaray notes that "the geography of her pleasure is far more diversified, more multiple in its differences, more complex, more subtle, than is commonly imagined" (Irigaray 28).

Moreover, Irigaray reveals that her "desire is often interpreted, and feared, as a sort of insatiable hunger, a voracity that will swallow you whole (Irigaray 29). Further, Irigaray argues that the rejection and exclusion of the woman's imaginary makes her experience herself only partially (Irigaray 30) "in the little-structured margins of a dominant ideology, as waste, or excess, what is left of a mirror invested by the (masculine) 'subject' to reflect himself, to copy himself" (Irigaray 30). Additionally, Irigaray argues that "the role of 'femininity' is prescribed by this masculine specula(riza)tion and corresponds scarcely at all to woman's desire, which may be recovered only in secret, in hiding, with anxiety and guilt" (Irigaray 30). Irigaray reveals that for woman to take pleasure as woman, it is necessary for her to analyse the systems of oppression which oppress her (Irigaray 31). Yet, Irigaray writes that "a woman's development, however radical it may seek to be, would thus not suffice to liberate woman's desire" (Irigaray 32) as woman is considered as a good, a "commodity" (Irigaray 31) which men make commerce of, thus making it difficult for woman to

get out of this "established commerce" (Irigaray 32). Ending on a negative note, Irigaray argues that even if women tried reversing "the order of things, even supposing this to be possible, history would repeat itself in the long run, would revert to sameness: to phallocratism. It would leave room neither for women's sexuality, nor for women's imaginary, nor for women's language to take (their) place" (Irigaray 33).

Yet, in the poetry of Lenore Kandel, there are poems about her desire for sex and her pleasure, described from her point of view of her sexuality, her enjoyment of it. The first ones under study are from her collection *The Love Book*. In the article "How San Francisco Tried, and Failed, to Ban a 6-page Book about Love and Sex" published on the SFGATE website, Amanda Bartlett explains that in 1966, a few weeks after the publication of Kandel's *The Love Book*, "it was discovered by San Francisco's obscenity squad, a police officer duo who raided local shops and entertainment venues to prevent the public from watching or reading about subjects they deemed scandalous" (Bartlett). The copies of the book were confiscated from shops and book stores, while police officers tried to get the book banned and arrested the booksellers (Bartlett). Bartlett affirms that *The Love Book* "was presented from the perspective of a woman with a candidness that was considerably ahead of its time" (Bartlett). Bartlett explains that "Kandel moved to San Francisco in 1960, […] [and] lived with her husband, Bill "Sweet William" Fritsch – whom you might call her muse in *The Love Book*" (Bartlett). There was a trial in April 1967 the jury ruled that the book was obscene (Bartlett) yet "the verdict was overturned on appeal in 1971" (Bartlett).

The first poem in *The Love Book* is "God/Love Poem" (1966) in which Lenore Kandel describes making love with her lover. In the first stanza, Kandel writes "there are no ways of love but/beautiful/ / I love you all of them" (l. 1-2) in which the notion of "love" (l. 1, 2) and beauty are highlighted as in the rest of the poem. It is in the second stanza that Kandel starts her description: "I love you/ your cock in my hand / stirs like a bird / in my fingers / as you swell and grow hard in my hand / forcing my fingers open / with your rigid strength" (l. 3-8). Kandel always associates sex with "love" (l. 1, 2, 3) as the repetition of "I love you" (l. 2, 3) on the side of a description of a hand-job highlights. This description of Kandel masturbating her lover obviously carries her point of view, it portrays a part of her sexuality and something even more important is that it showcases Kandel in a sexual role that is active. This is shown through the emphasis on her hands with the repetition of "in my hand" (l. 3, 6) and "my fingers" (l. 5, 7). She is the one, and especially her hands, who is giving pleasure to the man, she is in a position of power as she controls the man's pleasure.

Yet, the man's penis is not described as passive despite the fact that the man is the one receiving. This activity of the man through his sex is shown in the terminology used to describe the penis with "your cock […] stirs" (l. 3-4), "you swell and grow hard" (l. 6), "forcing my fingers open" (l. 7), and "your rigid strength" (l. 8). While Kandel is portrayed through her hands, the penis of the man is described with verbs of action and terms which portray it as strong which is obviously to describe the erection but can also refer to the fact that a man's sex has always been depicted as powerful and active. The notions of passivity and activity depend on the interpretation but I would argue that there is definitely activity on Kandel's side.

Then, she writes "I stroke you with my loving hands / pink-nailed long fingers / I caress you / I adore you / my finger-tips… my palms / your cock rises and throbs in my hands" (l. 11-16). With "loving hands" (l. 11) Kandel comes back to the link between sex and love. As previously mentioned, the verbs of action "rises and throbs" (l. 16) again show a certain activity from the penis. The activity of Kandel is again highlighted through the use of the lexical fields of the hands with "my hands" (l. 11, 16), "fingers" (l. 12), "my finger-tips… my palms" (l. 15). This activity is also shown with the repetition of verb of action and the use of the pronoun "I" (l. 11, 13, 14) in structures such as "I stroke you" (l. 11), "I caress you" (l. 13) and "I adore you" (l. 14).

The same thing is present in the fourth stanza in which Kandel writes "I am naked against you / and I put my mouth on you slowly / I have longing to kiss you / and my tongue makes worship on you" (l. 22-25). With "I have longing" (l. 24) Kandel explicitly expresses her desire. In the line "my tongue makes worship on you" (l. 25), Kandel brings the notion of religion with "worship" (l. 25), while the personification of her "tongue" (l. 25) is a very sensual image as she is worshipping the man. In the fifth stanza, Kandel writes "your body moves to me / flesh to flesh / skin sliding over golden skin / as mine to yours / my mouth my tongue my hands / my belly and my legs / against your mouth your love / sliding… sliding… / our bodies move and join / unbearably" (l. 27-36). The repetition in structure of "your body moves to me" (l. 27) with three lines after "as mine to yours" (l. 30), and "our bodies move and join" (l. 35) emphasise the idea of union but also of a certain equality in the description of the desire and of the actions of both lovers. The enumeration of her body parts "my mouth my tongue my hands / my belly and my legs / against your mouth your love" (l. 31-33) show that while before Kandel was the one giving, it is now her who receives. This could be interpreted as her being passive yet the fact that both lovers "join" (l. 35) as well as the acts depicted show a hybridity of both passivity and activity, receiving and giving which is present in both.

In addition, Kandel brings the topic of religion into her description in the third, sixth and seventh stanzas. In the last line of the second stanza and in the third stanza Kandel writes "a revelation/ as

Aphrodite knew it // there was a time when gods were purer / /I can recall nights among the honeysuckle / our juices sweeter than honey / /we were the temple and the god entire" (l. 17-21). Making love is written as being "a revelation" (l. 17) as a religion or the discovery of God no matter in which religion could be. The mention of "Aphrodite" (l. 17) the Greek Goddess of Love emphasises this idea of depicting love and sex as mystical like religions and myths. Describing some memories of "nights" (l. 19) they spent together, Kandel writes "we were the temple and the god entire" (l. 21) which again comes back to religion. This metaphor of the man as the "god" (l. 21) and the woman as the "temple" (l. 21) show her body is a place of "worship" (l. 25) but also a source of "worship" (l. 25 as she described herself as worshipping him when she was giving him pleasure). This is reminiscent of the story of Gaia and Ouranos as Kandel, portrayed in this metaphor as the "temple" (l. 21) would be Gaia, the Greek Goddess of the Earth, while her lover, portrayed as the "god" (l. 21) would be Ouranos, the Greek God of the Sky. The union of Gaia and Ouranos is in Greek mythology the sacred primordial union. In a parallel, the metaphoric union of the "temple" (l. 21) and the "god" (l. 21) is one which makes the religion, sex and love for Kandel, and is one which is both at the origin of "worship" (l. 25), receiving and creating them.

In the seventh stanza, Kandel also extends this metaphor with the lines "love touches love / the temple and the god / are one" (l. 41-43). The "temple and the god" (l. 42) being Kandel and her lover "are one" (l. 43) in lovemaking, this highlighting their union and equality, while "the temple and the god / are one" (l. 42-43) in the sense of creating religion. Thus, Kandel and her lover create their religion, lovemaking, through a union of both activity and passivity. The mimesis seen in lines such as "love touches love" (l. 41) or "flesh to flesh" (l. 28) emphasise the ideas of union and equality. Finally, the sixth stanza, "your face above me / is the face of all the gods / and beautiful demons" (l. 37-39) again emphasises the religious aspect with a metaphor of her lover's face as one of "gods" (l. 38) and "demons" (l. 39). This comparison can be interpreted in the scope of activity and passivity as if we consider "gods" (l. 38) as in the sky, thus over and active and "demons" (l. 39) as underground, thus under and passive, we see in Kandel's lover both passivity and activity just like her. Thus this poem represents love and sexuality in a religious and mythical aspect while stressing both lovers being active and passive, thus equal, and highlights even more the active sexual role of a woman in addition to the vocal expression of her desire and sexual acts.

In *The Love Book*, there are other poems in which Kandel depicts her sexuality from her point of view which are either as explicit or more than 'God/Love Poem'. These poems are three phases of the same poem 'To Fuck With Love'. The poem 'To Fuck With Love Phase I' is about penetration and cunnilingus, with a description of her orgasm. In ' To Fuck With Love Phase II', Kandel writes the celebration of heterosexual penetrative sex with a depiction of it as "sacred" (Kandel 6) and

with an association to religion and spirituality. In ‘To Fuck With Love Phase III’, Kandel writes about orgasm and making love with her lover.

Additionally, Kandel wrote other poems evoking her sexuality in other collections, such as ‘Love-Lust Poem’ (1967). In this poem, there is an interesting anaphora with “I want” (Kandel 35). In the first stanza, Kandel writes “I want to fuck you / I want to fuck you all the parts and places / I want you all of me” (l. 1-3) while in the seventh stanza, she writes “I want you to fuck me / I want you to fuck me all the parts and all the places / I want you all of me” (l. 28-30). This anaphora creates an echo between Kandel’s desire of giving and making love and her desire to receive it. The repetition of “I want” everywhere in the poem emphasises the expression of her desire. Even though in the seventh stanza she expresses the desire to be on the receiving end, it is not passive as one could think, since she is the one expressing “I want you to fuck me” (l. 28), thus making her active in regards to her desire.

Then, Kandel describes oral sex and penetration in “I suck it in, all in, the sweet meat cock in my mouth and / your tongue slips wet and pointed and hot in my cunt / and my legs spread wide and wrap your head down into me // […] you rise and lean over me / and plunge that spit-slick cock into my depth” (l. 16-22). The polysyndeton in “and” (l. 16, 17, 18, 22) stresses the idea of this poem as being a sort of vocal account of what is happening. It almost seems like someone talking, thus making it seems even more real. The use of the second-person “you” (l. 21) is also interesting as Kandel gives an account of her sexuality from her point of view, yet it seems dedicated to her lover. The use of this pronoun makes the poem even more personal, as it is as if the reader was intruding on their private life, thus making the poem even relevant as Kandel seeks to make sexuality no longer something taboo and hidden in the bedroom, but something that people can be vocal about. Another striking thing to notice is the line breaks which make each line end with a description of Kandel or her body parts “in my mouth” (l. 16), “in my cunt” (l. 17), “into me” (l. 18), “over me” (l. 21) and “into my depth” (l. 22). These highlight the fact that it is Kandel’s point of view and thus make her and her desire the centre of the poem.

Moreover, the alliteration in “m” in the lines “your mouth is on mine / and the taste on your mouth is of me / and the taste on my mouth is of you / and moaning mouth into mouth” (l. 23-26) along with the repetition of “mouth” (l. 23-26) underscores the importance of the mouth as something that links them and through which they express their pleasure, as “moaning” (l. 26) reveals. The parallel in “and the taste on your mouth is of me / and the taste on my mouth is of you” (l. 24-25) with the anaphora in “and” (l. 24-26) highlights a certain equality and balance in their love making as they

both give pleasure to the other and also receive it. It also shows a form of equality in their sexuality as no one is solely active or passive.

Then, in the final stanza, Kandel again expresses her desire with the anaphora “I want” (l. 32, 34, 36, 38, 39). In this final stanza, Kandel writes about her sexual desire but also about her desire for love and how making love unifies her with her lover: “I want our bodies sleek with sweat” (l. 32), “I want the goodness of it, the way it wraps around us / and pulls us incredibly together” (l. 34-35), “I want to lie there with you / smelling the good smell of fuck that’s all over us” (l. 39-40). The line breaks emphasise the terms “us” (l. 34, 40) and “together” (l. 35), thus showing this importance of unity in love and sex for Kandel. She also writes about orgasm in the line “I want to come and come and come” (l. 36), the polysyndeton and the repetition emphasise the idea of repetition and infinity in her desire. She also writes about her lover’s orgasm and ejaculation in “I want you to explode that hot spurt of pleasure inside me” (l. 38), thus emphasising the idea that she does not just want pleasure for herself but also for him. Not only was the depiction of her own sexuality by a woman very taboo at the time, but in addition, Kandel writes explicitly about her pleasure in sex which was even more taboo.

Kandel’s poems show the total opposite to the beliefs brought by Freud’s theories that the woman was supposedly passive and with no libido. Kandel depicts her sexuality, and thus the woman as active in her sexuality and as being vocal about her pleasure and enjoying it. What is ultimately new about *The Love Book* is the fact that Kandel is a woman who writes openly about her sexuality, and writes about other practices in sexuality which were quite frowned upon at the time, since reproduction was seen as the sole goal of sexuality.

In the chapter “Sex”, Greer notes that “female orgasm has become more and more of a mystery, at the same time as it has been exalted as a duty” (Greer 44). Greer argues that “lovemaking has become another male skill, of which women are the judges” (Greer 46-47) yet in order to change this “women will have to accept part of the responsibility for their own and their partners’ enjoyment, and this involves a measure of control and conscious cooperation” (Greer 48). Thus women in order to enjoy their sexuality, will have to no longer be passive (Greer 48). This aspect is shown in the three phases of the poem “To Fuck With Love” by Kandel, and in the poems analysed previously “God/Love Poem” and “Love-Lust Poem” by Kandel, in which Kandel is portrayed as active in her sexuality and thus enjoying sex. In addition, Greer argues that “the banishment of the fantasy of the vaginal orgasm is ultimately a service, but the substitution of the clitoral spasm for genuine gratification may turn out to be a disaster for sexuality” (Greer 48).

Greer then, mentions that sexologists recommended caressing the clitoris as a beginning before penetration which they saw as real sex despite the fact that it did not give women that much pleasure or an orgasm (Greer 48). A criticism regarding Kandel's poems on sexuality is that despite the extensive depictions of oral sex and masturbation, they still describe heterosexual sex and portray oral sex and masturbation as only the start before penetration, which is shown as the sort of ultimate goal of love making which is clearly not revolutionary. Indeed, Greer explains that "the process described by the experts [steps by steps] […] is laborious and inhumanly computerized. The implication that there is a statistically ideal fuck which will always result in satisfaction if the right procedures are followed is depressing and misleading" (Greer 49). Greer states that "real gratification is not enshrined in a tiny cluster of nerves but in the sexual involvement of the whole person" (Greer 49). Indeed, Greer explains that for women who "have discovered sexual pleasure after being denied it, […] the fact that they have only ever experienced gratification from clitoral stimulation is evidence […] of the desexualization of the whole body, the substitution of genitality for sexuality" (Greer 49) and the fact that "we still make love to organs and not people" (Greer 52).

Developing on women's sexual pleasure, the thirteenth chapter "The Forfeited Self" in *The Feminine Mystique* by Betty Friedan evokes the link between sexual enjoyment and self-assertion, identity and education in women using the studies of A. H. Maslow and the Kinsey reports. Friedan evokes the psychiatrists who have tried to make their patients fit and adjust to the culture in order to cure them yet this adjustment does not allow the assertion of self and the affirmation of individuality of the person (Friedan 331). To Friedan this can be applied to housewives as she argues that "the adjusted ones, or cured ones who live without conflict or anxiety in the confined world of home have forfeited their own being; the others, the miserable, frustrated ones, still have some hope" (Friedan 332). Analysing this idea of "forfeited self" (Friedan 331) linked to sexual fulfilment, Friedan reveals that

> women will never know sexual fulfilment and the peak experience of human love until they are allowed and encouraged to grow to their full strength as human beings. For according to the new psychological theorists, self-realization, far from preventing the highest sexual fulfilment, is inextricably linked to it. (Friedan 338)

Friedan mentions the studies of Professor Maslow who "in the late thirties, […] began to study the relationship between sexuality and what he called 'dominance feeling' or 'self-esteem' or 'ego level' in women" (Friedan 338). Indeed, Friedan explains that Maslow

> found, contrary to what one might expect from the psychoanalytical theories and the conventional images of femininity, that the more 'dominant' the woman, the greater her enjoyment of sexuality – and the greater her ability to 'submit' in a psychological sense, to give herself freely in love, to have orgasm. […] These women higher in 'dominance' […] were, above all, more completely themselves, more free to be themselves – and this seemed inextricably linked with greater freedom to give themselves in love. These women were not, in the usual sense, 'feminine', but they enjoyed sexual fulfilment to a much higher degree than the conventionally feminine women in the same study. (Friedan 338)

Describing these women, Friedan explains that they are independent, prefer to choose rather than obey rules and conventions, they are strong and have purpose in their life (Friedan 339). Friedan explains that Maslow found that for these people orgasm can be either mystical or "taken rather lightly" (Friedan 344) and writes that Maslow explained as well that these women remain in control of themselves even in passionate love affairs (Friedan 344). In addition, Friedan notes that Maslow found that these people can be both active and passive lovers and even in other circumstances, and that they did not associate masculinity with activity and femininity with passivity (Friedan 345). Indeed, Friedan notes that Maslow explained that these people could be active and passive, and feminine and masculine at the same time (Friedan 345). All these aspects of high dominance women and of passivity and activity in love making can be observed in Kandel's depiction of her sexuality. Her lover and her are both active and passive, making love to each other, and Kandel is confident and clearly expresses her desire which permits her sexual enjoyment. Thus Friedan states that there is a clear evidence that American women being able to build their identity created an increase in their sexual fulfilment (Friedan 347). In addition to the study of Professor Maslow, the Kinsey reports also "showed that the more educated the woman, the more likely she was to enjoy full sexual orgasm more often, and the less likely to be frigid" (Friedan 348).

Another feminist wrote about women's sexuality. In the third chapter of *The Second Sex* Book 2 entitled "Sexual Initiation", Simone de Beauvoir explores women's sexuality, its beginning and its development. Beauvoir explains that the man with his body goes towards his partner yet "remains at the centre of this activity" (Beauvoir 366), he is the subject while the partner is seen as an object through which he gets pleasure (Beauvoir 366). Beauvoir explains that to man "the feminine flesh is for him a prey" (Beauvoir 366). Through the clitoris, the woman keeps an "erotic independence all her life" (Beauvoir 367), yet her vagina "becomes an erotic centre only through the intervention of the male" (Beauvoir 367) which "always constitutes a kind of violation" (Beauvoir 367). Her clitoris does not play a role in procreation and is connected indirectly during penetration (Beauvoir

367). Regarding heterosexual coition, Beauvoir notes that "it is the male – as in most animals – who has the aggressive role, the female submitting to his embrace" (Beauvoir 368). Beauvoir also argues that while the man has sexual freedom and receives admiration for his sex life, the woman is automatically judged for it, her sex life outside of the strict code of marriage is seen as a loss of virtue or honour (Beauvoir 369). This is observed with the fact that Kandel's *The Love Book* was censored because it depicted a woman's sexuality in an explicit way. She was judged for these poems because of her sexual freedom.

Then, Beauvoir focuses on women's desire explaining that "desire and sex pleasure demand an expenditure of vital force in woman as in man; although receptive in nature [during penetration], feminine sex-hunger is in a sense active, it is manifested in a nervous and muscular tension" (Beauvoir 372). While her desire is active, Beauvoir argues that the woman "always feels passive: she is caressed, penetrated; she undergoes coition, whereas the man exerts himself actively" (Beauvoir 378). While Beauvoir explains the woman's sexuality as passive despite her desire being active, something that needs to be highlighted is that Beauvoir mostly focuses on heterosexual penetration as a mean to explain women's sexuality, not mentioning other sexual practices in which woman can have an active role in her sexuality, which of course would not be penetrative sex. These other sexual practices are described by Lenore Kandel in "To Fuck With Love", "God/Love Poem" and "Love-Lust Poem", and portray the poet's active sexual role. Then, mentioning woman's sex pleasure during penetration, Beauvoir notes that

> it is uncertain whether vaginal feeling ever rises to a definite orgasm: statements by women on the matter are rare, and they remain extremely vague even when precision is attempted; it would appear that the reactions are widely variable in different individuals. […] She desires sex excitement and pleasure in general, but her body promises no precise conclusion to the act of love; and that is why coition is never quite terminated for her: it admits of no end. (Beauvoir 387)

Finally, Beauvoir focuses on the idea of subject and object in woman's sexuality, and reveals that the woman

> longs to melt with him into one. […] She wants to remain subject while she is made object. Being more profoundly beside herself that is man because her whole body is moved by desire and excitement, she retains her subjectivity only through union with her partner; giving and receiving must be combined for both. (Beauvoir 388-389)

Finally, Friedan comments on women's sexuality for housewives documenting the link between oppression and sex in the eleventh chapter "The Sex-Seekers" of *The Feminine Mystique*. In her interviews in the suburbs, Friedan noted that many of the housewives she met were eager to talk about sex, explaining they needed sex to feel alive, yet they could not find that feeling any more with their husband (Friedan 278). These "suburban sex-seekers […] had given up attempts to make housework or community work expand to fill the time available; they turned instead to sex. But still they were unfulfilled" (Friedan 280). Indeed, Friedan writes that "the sex-hunger of American women has been documented as nauseam – by Kinsey, by the sociologists and novelists of suburbia, by the mass media, ads, television, movies, and women's magazines that pander to the voracious female appetite for sex phantasy" (Friedan 280). This sudden turn towards sex because of boredom was visible in the entire society (Friedan 281). In response to women's focus on sexual fulfilment, "the sexual disinterest of American men and their hostility toward women, have also increased" (Friedan 281) as shown in the censorship of *The Love Book* by Kandel.

Another poem about sexuality is "Queer Heart" (1975) by Anne Waldman. This poem was written on the occasion of Gay Rights Rally and is not specifically about Waldman's sexuality. Sexuality in this poem is evoked through the lenses of activism. This corpus only contains poems about sexuality by heterosexual women, yet some Beat women were queer like Diane Di Prima. No poem about queerness was found in the corpus by Diane Di Prima, but she writes extensively about her sexuality in her *Memoirs of a Beatnik*. While Beat women wrote the body by writing about sexuality, they also wrote about women's bodies more specifically, addressing subjects like periods, childbirth and beauty standards.

B. Women's Bodies

In addition to writing about sexuality, Beat women write about the body, and beauty standards which are imposed on them by patriarchy. This relation to their body is important in feminism.

1) The Body

In Beat women's writings about the body, they evoke central subjects such as periods or giving birth. In the chapter 'The Wicked Womb', Germaine Greer writes about the womb, and periods. Greer reveals that in the education of young girls "much more care is taken to inform them about the approaching trauma of menstruation and the awful possibility of childbirth if they should lose control or give in to sexual urges" (Greer 53) than taken to inform them about their sexual organs and urges (Greer 53). Indeed, Greer argues that "exaggerated care for the male apparatus, together with reluctance to involve oneself in serious attention to the womb and its hand-maids, is the fruit of

centuries of womb-fear, not to be eradicated by political action or yelling at public meetings" (Greer 54). Beat women with their poems on the body, periods and giving birth give attention to women's bodies and thus try to erase the taboo around it by being vocal about it. Troubles with the womb were used by patriarchy to control the lives of women who were thought too weak to control their lives (Greer 55). Greer affirms that a manifestation of the womb-fear is found in the societal attitude towards periods (Greer 56), as she explains that "women who adhere to the Moslem, Hindu or Mosaic faiths must regard themselves as unclean in their time of menstruation and seclude themselves for a period. Medieval Catholicism made stipulation that menstruating women were not to come into the church" (Greer 56). Still to this day, women are discreet about their periods, scared of smelling it, and hide it, as it is a sort of taboo (Greer 57). Greer adds that "the contradiction in the attitude that regards menstruation as divinely ordained and yet unmentionable leads to the intensification of the female revolt against it, which can be traced in all the common words for it, like the *curse*" (Greer 58).

Anne Waldman writes about periods in the poem "Crack In the World" (1975). In a 3-pages long poem, Waldman writes anaphoras which not only create rhythm but most significantly remind of the repetition of periods. The anaphora "I see the crack in the world" (l. 1, 14), "see the gaping crack in the world" (l. 2), "I see the slash in the world" (l. 19), "see the crack in the universe" (l. 56) and "the crack in my world" (l. 76) highlights the idea of the woman and her body as the creator of the "world" (l. 1, 2, 14, 19, 76). The focus is also put on the sight with "see" (l. 1, 2, 14, 19, 56) which is constantly repeated. This focus on sight shows not only that Waldman writes about seeing it but she also calls to other people to understand and watch it. Waldman emphasises the idea of the woman as the creator of life and also death through the periods and ovulation. She writes of periods and of the woman's cycle as both life and death as in the lines "It sets up the structure to make a baby then tears / it down again" (l. 8-9), "it's a break in the cycle of birth and death / it's the rapid proliferation of cells / building up to die / I make up the world and kill it again & again" (l. 64-67), "collapsible legs you must carry the world" (l. 71), and "my scent / of life & death" (l. 74-75). The idea of the cycle is emphasised by "again" (l. 9, 67) at the end of the line thanks to the line break. Waldman writes about life and death emphasising both notions through repetition and lexical fields like "baby" (l. 8), "birth" (l. 64) "life" (l. 75) for life; and for death through the polyptoton "death" (l. 64-75), "die" (l. 66), and the lexical field of death: "kill" (l. 67) and "tears / it down" (l. 8-9). Waldman also underlines the idea of creation of the world: "structure to make a baby" (l. 8), "building" (l. 66), "I make up the world" (l. 67) and "collapsible legs you must carry the world" (l. 71).

Moreover, Waldman writes about the body as structured for reproduction and about the cycle. The words “structure” (l. 8) and “architecture of womb-body” (l. 10) are interesting as Waldman portrays not only the periodic cycle which rhythms the life of women, but in addition she evokes the body with “womb-body” (l. 10) as being made for reproduction. The term “haunting me” (l. 10, 70) also reminds of something cyclical, this term is also emphasised through the line break. Waldman also writes about the idea of structure and reproduction with “this factory / this beautiful machine” (l. 51-52). Waldman describes periods and the reason behind them, which is obviously linked to reproduction. The repetition of “Ovum not fertilized” (l. 13, 38, 69) highlights the reason behind periods. Waldman describes periods with “Blood flowing through the body crack” (l. 4), the epiphora “out on land, to bleed / On on street, to bleed / In the snow, blood” (l. 21-23) and “it is endometrium shedding” (l. 31). Waldman depicts menstruations with the adequate terms and explanation, but also highlights “blood” (l. 4, 23) and “bleed” (l. 21, 22) thus showing an important side of periods, which for a long time remained taboo especially in religions, in which some religious people thought the woman impure because of her bleeding.

In addition, Waldman creates a parallel between periods and werewolves which emphasises the periodicity of both the myth and the monthly cycle. Waldman makes several repetitions of “moon” (l. 5, 6, 47, 68) which link the periods to the myth of werewolves, who are humans who turn into wolves at the full moon. Waldman draws this parallel in the lines “Body, send your rivers to the moon / Body twist me to the source of the moon / It turns me under a wave” (l. 5-7). The anaphora of “body” (l. 5, 6) and the epiphora of “moon” (l. 5, 6) clearly create this parallel. Waldman also uses the lexical field of water to refer to blood with “rivers” (l. 5), “source” (l. 6), and “wave” (l. 7) which stresses the importance of the blood as a link between the woman and the wolf in this parallel. Waldman extends this parallel in the lines “this is periodic / It comes at the full moon / Let me go howling at night / […] The curse, glorious is upon me” (l. 46-57). The terms “full moon” (l. 47), “howling” (l. 48) refer to wolves and werewolves in that case, while the terms “periodic” (l. 46) and “the curse” (l. 57) can refer to both periods and werewolves. Waldman continues with the parallel in “I offer my entrails to the moon” (l. 68). Something striking is that terms referring to werewolves are always highlighted thanks to line breaks which make them stand at the end of the line. Another interesting thing is that in myths, the moon is usually associated with women such as the Goddesses Luna, the goddess of heaven and the full moon representing fertile motherhood; the Goddess Diana, the goddess on earth and of the half moon, representing virginity and the reborn; and the Goddess Hecate, the goddess of the underworld and of the dark moon, representing the witch, the power to heal and transform. Through this parallel, Waldman mystifies and glorifies womanhood, the body and periods, hence the importance given to life and death.

Finally, Waldman writes about men, both as the woman being the one who created them but also the fact that periods happen because of the "ovum not fertilized" (l. 13, 38, 69). Waldman writes "He must not keep me down / Let me go my way alone tonight / No man to touch me" (l. 16-18), "the man hasn't done it" (l. 39), "No man to touch me / Don't fathom my heart tonight, man" (l. 49-50), "You keep away from me / You keep your distance / […] You came through the crack in my world / You men who came out of me, back off" (l. 72-77). Waldman writes to the "men" (l. 77) emphasising that she wants them to stay away from her with "let me go my way alone" (l. 17), the repetition "no man to touch me" (l. 18, 49), "don't fathom my heart" (l. 50), the anaphora "you keep away from me / you keep your distance" (l. 72-73) and "back off" (l. 77). This highlights a desire to stay alone because of her periods as show "I will overpower you with my scent / of life and death" (l. 74-75) which can refer to her power as "overpower" (l. 74) points to, but also to Waldman being maybe self-conscious because of blood as "scent" (l. 74) shows. Another aspect to comment on is the anaphora "My body enchanted me to this / My body demented to this" (l. 28-29) and "Body enchanted to this / Body elaborated on this" (l. 80-81) which stresses the fact that the body is created this way for reproduction as show "body elaborated on this" (l. 81), and it also stresses the parallel to the myth of the moon and werewolves with "enchanted" (l. 28, 80).

In addition, in the poem 'REVOLUTIONARY LETTER #44' (1971), Diane Di Prima writes for women "for my sisters" (Di Prima 57), and evokes childbirth and celebrates women as the origin of life. The fact that the poem is dedicated to women is emphasised by the use of the "we" (l. 1, 3, 6, 11, 12) and "our" (l. 5, 10, 12) which shows that Di Prima's poem is an account of something which all women would understand. In the first lines, the line breaks highlight terms at the end of lines which are part of the lexical field of pain: "As we know that blood / is birth, agony / breaks open doors, as we / can bend, graciously, beneath burdens, undermine / like rain, or earthworms, as our cries" (l. 1-5). The terms underlined by line breaks are "blood" (l. 1), "agony" (l. 2), "undermine" (l. 4), and "our cries" (l. 5) which show Di Prima's will to emphasise the aspect of pain and suffering in childbirth. The lines "as we know that blood / is birth, agony / breaks open doors" (l. 1-3) evoke the paradox of childbirth as it is through pain that the woman gives birth. The fact that "as we know" (l. 1) are the first words of the poem is also interesting as it shows that Di Prima writes about something that for women is common knowledge, and she wants to celebrate this common experience. The alliterations in "b" in "As we know that blood / is birth, agony / breaks open doors, as we / can bend, graciously, beneath burdens" (l. 1-4) make some terms stand out, but it can also be a reference to terms like birth or baby.

Then, Di Prima evokes the loss of energy and tiredness right after the baby is born by drawing a comparison between the woman and elements of nature: “as we / can […] undermine / like rain, or earthworms, as our cries / yield to the cries of the newborn” (l. 3-6). The comparison “undermine / like rain, or earthworms” (l. 4-5) is striking as the woman is compared to natural elements thus emphasising the common association of woman to nature. This comparison is important as nature is associated to womanhood because of the creation, the birth of life, thus it stresses Di Prima’s will to celebrate woman as the origin of life. The repetition of “cries” (l. 5, 6), for the woman and the child, highlights the close link that the mother and her child have and also reveals again the link between pain and birth.

Finally, the syntactic unit “as we” (l. 6) in “as we hear / the plea in the voices around us, not words of passion or cunning, discount / anger or pride, grow strong / in our own strength” (l. 6-10) is quite confusing and difficult to understand. The “as we” (l. 6) is the subject for the verbs which are highlighted by the line break “we hear” (l. 6), “discount” (l. 8-9) and “grow strong” (l. 9). This confusing syntax can be a way of showing tiredness because of labour in the syntax or also show the simultaneity or succession of actions which happen after the birth of a baby. Di Prima emphasises women’s strength with “grow strong / in our own strength” (l. 9-10) and with “our own” (l. 10). Di Prima also expresses strength with “quick arms / to pull down walls” (l. 10-11). Di Prima celebrates woman as the origin of life with the lines “we liberate / out of our knowledge, labor, sucking babes, we / liberate, and nourish, as the earth” (l. 11-13). The line breaks and the repetition emphasise “we liberate” (l. 11, 12-13) which is striking as it both refers to childbirth and also to freedom, thus it depicts women as being the ones who give birth and freedom to humans. Di Prima underlines women’s effort and pain in childbirth with “we liberate / out of our knowledge, labor, sucking babes” (l. 11-12). Di Prima also stresses the fact that woman is at the origin of life with another comparison to nature: “we / liberate, and nourish, as the earth” (l. 12-13). The comparison of women to “the earth” (l. 13) is important again because both give birth and life to things or babies. In culture and myths, “the earth” (l. 13) is always associated to womanhood like for example in Greek myths with Gaia, Demeter, Persephone or Diana.

Moreover, Beat women write about beauty standards.

2) Beauty Standards

Furthermore, Beat women write about beauty standards for women and about ageing. In the chapter ‘The Stereotype’, Germaine Greer writes about beauty standards for women. Greer reveals that women “are required to look expensive, fashionable, well-groomed, and not to be seen in the same dress twice” (Greer 66). Through the expression “the stereotype”, Greer refers to beauty standards.

Greer describes the stereotype as “the Eternal Feminine. She is the sexual object sought by all men, and by all women. […] She is the reward of achievement. She need never give positive evidence of her moral character because virtue is assumed from her loveliness, and her passivity” (Greer 67). Greer explains that the woman as the stereotype is a doll (Greer 69). Greer argues that “she absolutely must be young, her body hairless, her flesh buoyant, and she must not have a sexual organ. No musculature must distort the smoothness of the lines of her body” (Greer 69).

Beat women have written poems about ageing like the poem ‘A Woman Alone’ (1978) by Denise Levertov. Levertov writes “She has fears, but not about loneliness; / fears about how to deal with the aging / of her body – how to deal / with photographs and the mirror. She feels / so much younger and more beautiful / than she looks” (l. 20-25). The repetition of “how to deal with” (l. 21, 22-23) emphasises her “fears” (l. 20, 21) which are “the aging / of her body” (l. 21-22) and “photographs and the mirror” (l. 23). The line breaks also stress “aging” (l. 21) at the end of the line, and “deal / with photographs and the mirror” (l. 22-23) which end up at the beginning of the line. Moreover, the opposition between her feelings and her appearance is striking in “She feels / so much younger and more beautiful / than she looks” (l. 23-25). Both “she feels” (l. 23) and “she looks” (l. 25) stand apart thanks to line breaks thus emphasising the opposition between how she views herself and the influence of beauty standards which make her doubt her beauty. The use of line breaks again is interesting as the line break after “she feels” (l. 23) underscores “so much younger and more beautiful” (l. 24). The importance that is given to terms of the lexical field of appearance such as “aging” (l. 21), “photographs and the mirror” (l. 23), “beautiful” (l. 24) which stand apart at the end of the line, and “she looks” (l. 25) depicts the influence of beauty standards on her but ultimately of other people’s perception of her.

Another poem about ageing is ‘Hag’s Heart’ (1975), in which Anne Waldman chants the old woman. In this poem, Waldman opposes notions of old and new to celebrate a “hag” (l. 21) which is clearly different from the beauty standards which venerate youthfulness in women. Waldman writes of old age in “The mind’s a relic, a fossil, antiquated soldier” (l. 10) and “My body is unprecedented, maturing” (l. 12). The lexical field of the old or ancient is present with “relic” (l. 10), “fossil” (l. 10), “antiquated” (l. 10) which evoke the incredible and ancient knowledge of Waldman while “maturing” (l. 12) refers also to age, yet is more anchored in the present than the other terms. The asyndeton emphasises the oldness of “the mind” (l. 10). Waldman develops more this opposition of old and new in the lines “This hag’s the dernier cri of fashion / She’s almost bald // That one’s outmoded, an anachronism” (l. 21-23). The antithesis of “this hag’s the dernier cri of fashion” (l. 21) and “that one’s outmoded” (l. 23) perfectly illustrates this opposition used by

Waldman to chant the power of the old woman. The term "an anachronism" (l. 23) also encapsulates this emphasis on time, as the old woman is described as physically old with "my body is […] maturing" (l. 12) and "she's almost bald" (l. 22) yet this term highlights her going back in time as if she was more than just old but in fact ancient.

Moreover, Waldman describes the old woman as powerful in "Hag sends the Patriarchs running to their shelters / All graybeards retreat / I am the newest addition / I am the poetry veteran" (l. 26-29). The antithesis and the anaphora in "I am the newest addition / I am the poetry veteran" (l. 28-29) highlight again this opposition of old and new which describes the power of youthfulness and the power of old age in one woman. This way, Waldman shows her acceptance of old age and chants it, but at the same time she writes that it is not an end in itself, it is just age, and she is young and new in many other ways. Her power as an old woman is clearly shown in "Hag sends the Patriarchs running to their shelters / All graybeards retreat" (l. 26-27) which highlights the power she has as an old woman against patriarchy, and also is a criticism of patriarchy and beauty standards held for women considering age as the "hag" (l. 26) accepts so much her age that she defies and possibly scares the "Patriarchs" (l. 26) away.

Finally, in this poem, Waldman writes about ecology with the lines "Please take all the tins, glass, paper & aluminium cans / & return them to themselves / A succulent voracious appetite sucks the poor old earth / to fuel the fire / to mass produce these things" (l. 30-34). Waldman does not just write about ecology, but she also criticises mass production and to an extent capitalism with "a succulent voracious appetite sucks the poor old earth / to fuel the fire / to mass produce these things" (l. 32-34). The line breaks highlight the terms "poor old earth" (l. 32), and the line "to mass produce these things" (l. 34). The enumeration in "all the tins, glass, paper & aluminium cans" (l. 30) highlights the endless pollution of the planet. Waldman is very vocal about ecology in her poems[7] which is shown in the line "& my hags heart gets heavy with these things" (l. 40).

Other sorts of beauty standards are addressed such as the one concerning the vulva which Denise Levertov writes about in her poem 'Hypocrite Women' (1964). Levertov writes "Hypocrite women, how seldom we speak / of our own doubts, while dubiously / we mother man in his doubt!" (l. 1-3). The use of the first-person plural "we" (l. 1, 3, 7, 8, 14) shows that Levertov calls all women "hypocrite women" (l. 1) even herself. The use of this pronoun in the poem also gives the impression that this "we" (l. 1, 3, 7, 8, 14) is supposed to represent every women and what they think. It gives an impression of universality and thus of Levertov expressing a supposed truth which

7 Waldman's ecology awareness is extensively addressed in the article "On Webbed Monsters, Revolutionary Activists and Plutonium Glow: Eco-Crisis in Diane di Prima and Anne Waldman" by Estíbaliz Encarnación-Pinedo.

no one speaks about, yet not all women have thought this way about their vulva. The polyptoton of "doubts" (l. 2), "dubiously" (l. 2) and "doubt" (l. 3) emphasises the idea of self-consciousness and self-criticism and doubt regarding one's appearance.

Then, Levertov clearly writes about the perception of the vulva with "and if […] / a poet told us // our cunts are ugly – why didn't we admit we have thought so too?" (l. 4-8). In the chapter "Sex", Greer explains that there is a strange modesty around the vulva that the woman discovers in society and even with doctors (Greer 44). As Greer explains "part of the modesty about the female genitalia stems from actual distaste. The worst name anyone can be called is *cunt*" (Greer 44), this societal distaste makes the woman self conscious regarding her vulva, its look or smell but also everything which is linked to it like periods which the woman hides (Greer 45). The "poet" (l. 6) represents a man. The reported speech and the line break with the change of stanza in "told us // our cunts are ugly" (l. 6-7) highlight even more the male perception of the vulva. With the term "too" (l. 8) and the line break in "we / admit" (l. 7-8), Levertov stresses the fact that this negative comment is something that she and other women had thought before. The fact that "our cunts are ugly" (l. 7) is at the beginning of the first line of the stanza, and "admit" (l. 8) at the beginning of the next line, so close in the poem, shows that Levertov herself has thought this and wants to be open about it. With "why didn't we / admit we have thought so too" (l. 7-8), Levertov addresses the taboo that is around the vulva.

Finally, Levertov describes negatively the vulva thus reincorporating beauty standards in her poem while at the same being vocal about something which was taboo, that is talking about the vulva. Writing about men's hatred of women and of woman's genitalia, Germaine Greer reveals in the chapter 'Loathing and Disgust', that "the universal lack of esteem for the female organ becomes a deficiency in women's self-esteem" (Greer 291). Greer writes that "women are so brainwashed about the physical image that they should have that […] they rarely undress with éclat. They are often apologetic about their bodies" (Greer 292). Her negative depiction is present in "they are not for the eye!" (l. 9), thus emphasising the idea of judgement on appearances. With "no, they are dark and wrinkled and hairy" (l. 10), the polysyndeton stresses the endless criticism that is given to the vulva, both by Levertov and by the society. The lines "we are too much women to / own to such unwomanliness" (l. 14-15) oppose "too much women" (l. 14) which refers to beauty, thus again incorporating the beauty standard as directly meaning "women" (l. 14), to "unwomanliness" (l. 15), thus meaning ugliness, used to refer to the vulva. The women is understood here as the stereotype of beauty who has a vulva which she considers "ugly" (l. 7). Levertov wants to be vocal about this, with "and / what shame" (l. 8-9), she tries to turn the negativity of what she thinks to something positive. She clearly exclaims that there is no shame in having felt self-conscious about your vulva.

In addition to writing about women's bodies, Beat women also try to re-empower women with their poetry.

IV) Re-Empowering

A. The Power of Mythical Female Figures

Beat women also wrote poems about mythical female figures through which they seek to re-empower women. Many mythical female figures are to be found in their poems, too many for this study's scope, so only two important and striking examples are presented in the following pages: the She-Wolf, and the Shaman.

1) Diane Di Prima and Loba, the She-Wolf

In *Loba*, Diane Di Prima develops an extended metaphor of the woman as a wolf, a she-wolf. The Loba, thus is at first an unknown goddess, who represents womanhood and its power. In the article "Intertextuality in Diane Di Prima's *Loba*: Religious Discourse and Feminism", Estibaliz Encarnacion-Pinedo writes that *Loba* by Di Prima includes:

> different representations of female power and historical imagination. These includes goddesses, nymphs, monsters, and other fantastic creatures from world mythologies, religions, folklore, or legends from different origins – Greek, Latin, Egyptian, Sumerian, Navajo, Japanese, Hopi, Irish, Welsh, Celtic, Etruscan, Indian, Hindu, Buddhist, Hebrew, Jewish, Christian, Yoruba, etc. (Encarnacion-Pinedo 2018 3)

The author argues that "these female archetypes serve different purposes, acting, for instance, as incarnations of the goddess [Loba], or as counterparts through which the poet challenges the inscriptions of female subordination in history" (Encarnacion-Pinedo 2018 4). Encarnacion-Pinedo reveals that thanks to the Loba being a shape-shifter, Di Prima can write revisions of female power in myths and religious texts (Encarnacion-Pinedo 2018 4). The author explains that "the influence and presence of the goddess in Di Prima's *Loba* – most of which was written in the 1970s – coincides chronologically with a growing concern over the lack of space for the development of a female agency not determined by […] men" (Encarnacion-Pinedo 2018 12). Indeed, "the worship of the Goddess, closely linked to second-wave feminist groups, comes out from a period of growing political and personal dissatisfaction with the position of women in a world ruled by men" (Encarnacion-Pinedo 2018 12).

This use of several myths to portray the Loba is shown in “She is the Wind” (1978) in which Di Prima describes the Loba with metaphors of other female creatures, monsters and things which are associated with Evil, malediction or negativity.

1 she is the wind you never leave behind
- black cat you killed in empty lot, she is
- smell of the summer weeds, the one who lurks
- in open childhood closets, she coughs
5 in the next room, hoots, nests in your hair
- she is incubus
- face at the window
- she is
- harpy on your fire-escape, marble figurine
10 carved in the mantelpiece.
- She is
- […] deathgrip
- you cannot cut away, black limpid eyes
- of mad girl singing carols behind mesh, she is
15 the hiss in your goodbyes. (Di Prima 45)

Di Prima depicts the Loba as an “incubus” (l. 6) which is an antithesis since the Loba is female and “incubus” (l. 6) refers to a male demon who seeks sex in sleeping women, this antithetical figure was maybe chosen to highlight the idea that the Loba is a woman, but maybe more than this because she also has the capacities of a male demon.

Then, the Loba is also depicted as a “harpy on your fire-escape” (l. 9), as a “deathgrip” (l. 12), as the “black limpid eyes / of mad girl singing carols behind mesh” (l. 14) and as “the hiss in your goodbyes” (l. 15). All these things are very negative. The Loba is also describes as the “black cat you killed in empty lot” (l. 2) which is linked in culture to malediction and witches. Di Prima uses anaphoras and epiphoras to emphasise “she is” (l. 1, 2, 6, 8, 14). Di Prima also uses line breaks to highlight the terms which describe the Loba as in “she is incubus / face at the window” (l. 6-7), “she is / harpy” (l. 8-9), “she is / […] deathgrip” (l. 11-12), and “she is / the hiss” (l. 14-15).

In addition, Di Prima stresses the omnipresence of the Loba with negation as in “she is the wind you never leave behind” (l. 1) and “deathgrip / you cannot cut away” (l. 12-13), and with the lexical field of the house as in “the one who lurks / in open childhood closets, she coughs / in the next room” (l. 3-5), “she is incubus / face at the window / she is / harpy on your fire-escape, marble figurine / carved in the mantelpiece” (l. 6-10). The use of the lexical field of the house shows that she is like a presence who never leaves you, which highlights the idea of Evil creature that stays around, as if she was a malediction. This idea of constant presence is also shown in the term “carved” (l. 10) and with the lines “hoots, nests in your hair” (l. 5) showing the presence as on the head, which reminds of nightmares and is thus linked to the next line “she is incubus” (l. 6), since incubi and succubi enter the brain of their victims during sleep. Di Prima also shows the omnipresence of the Loba through the metaphor “she is / smell of the summer weeds” (l. 2-3) which indeed shows the persistence of her presence through the odour which lingers.

Another poem describes the Loba, it is “She Who” (1998). Di Prima depicts the Loba as the most powerful being existing as in the first stanza with anaphoras emphasising this description: “she whose body is door to the world / […] she whose laughter is the earthquake / she whose inhalation is the end of time” (l. 2-6). The terms “door to the world” (l. 2) and “end of time” (l. 6) are striking as they show that the Loba is not just the most powerful being, but she is everything and its limits at the same time as “door” (l. 2) and “end” (l. 6) show. Di Prima also portrays the immensity and power of the Loba in “stars are the seed pearls she sets on her flesh / they are the milk of her breasts & the juice of her love / her orgasm shakes the dark worlds to their depths” (l. 9-11). This description of “stars” (l. 9) shows that her “flesh” (l. 9) is the universe while the line “her orgasm shakes the dark worlds to their depths” (l. 11) shows her power. The extended metaphor depicts her as a powerful creature, a cosmological goddess, while the prosopopoeia shows the Loba as having a human form as the terms describing her body, “face” (l. 1), “body” (l. 2), “the milk of her breasts & the juice of her love” (l. 10) highlight.

Moreover, the Loba is depicted by Di Prima as more powerful than humans and than “men” (l. 17) especially. This is a striking criticism of patriarchy, and a move to re-empower women through the depiction of a goddess who is so much more than even male gods. The first criticism of male gods is “the lord of the dead stirs uneasy on his throne / he is one of the teeth of her mouth” (l. 12-13). The terms “stirs uneasy on his throne” (l. 12) seem ridiculous and the description of “the lord of the dead” (l. 12) as “one of the teeth of her mouth” (l. 13) is as well. Di Prima wrote these lines on a separate stanza, thus highlighting this criticism and women empowerment. The pronoun “we” (l. 1, 15, 16) is important as it represents everyone, and especially humans. Di Prima also shows the

unlimited being that is the Loba through not only her powers but also the knowledge which humans have of her and "her daughters" (l. 14) as show "her daughters stream w/ flaming hair from the portals of hell / they are the goddesses we can name, we name them Nut / we name them Kali & Olokun, Omphale & Mara" (l. 14-16) and "she whose face we have never seen" (l. 1). The repetition of "we can name" (l. 15) and "we name them" (l. 15, 16) underlines what humans know and especially emphasises the names of these goddesses that we know thus since we know "her daughters" (l. 14), we understand the power of the Loba. "Nut" (l. 15) is the Egyptian goddess of the sky and the universe. "Kali" (l. 16) is a Hindu goddess who represents destruction and time, she is seen as the mother of the universe. "Olokun" (l. 16) is an androgynous Yoruba goddess of the ocean. "Omphale" (l. 16) is in Greek mythology the owner and mistress of Hercules and the queen of Lydia. "Mara" (l. 16) is the name of the Hindu goddess of death and of the ancient Latvian goddess of life, the protector of the land.

Finally, Di Prima criticises and belittles male gods while empowering goddesses in the line "it is at their hands that the gods of men receive power" (l. 17). The terms "their hands" (l. 17) refer to the "daughters" (l. 14) of Loba. The term "men" (l. 17) can both refer to male humans and to humans as a whole, yet here it can be seen as only referring to male humans since Di Prima criticises "the gods of men" (l. 17), thus meaning both male gods and male humans. Indeed, this belittling of male gods and male humans can be interpreted as a criticism of patriarchy in religions, thus portraying the "gods of men" (l. 17) whom "men" (l. 17) use as an argument to perpetuate the patriarchy, as only getting powers from goddesses.

Another poem about the Loba is "Loba in Childbed" (1976) in which Diane Di Prima evokes childbirth. Di Prima describes the Loba giving birth in a human form yet with an association to spirituality that is still present. The repetition of "she lay in bed, screaming" (l. 1) and "she / lay back, panting" (l. 4-5) highlights the description of the Loba giving birth. The polyptoton "screaming" (l. 1), "screamed" (l. 14), "scream" (l. 55) along with "she cried out" (l. 19) emphasise the pain that the Loba feels and the difficulty that it is. Through this poem, Di Prima portrays the Loba, the goddess, as representing every woman and mother as she is giving birth. Di Prima describes the reality of childbirth with in addition alliterations highlighting this depiction: "sweat stuck / hair to her forehead" (l. 3-4). This description of the reality is also underlined thanks to line breaks in "she / screamed, for him, for herself, she / tried to open, to widen tunnel" (l. 13-15).

Additionally, Di Prima adds a spiritual aspect to this childbirth especially through repetition as in "the boat / carried her to the heart of the mandala" (l. 1-2), "skull boat / carried her to the heart of her womb, red / pulsing eye of her spirit" (l. 6-8), and "bursting from the heart / of the devastated /

mandala, skull boat grew wings" (l. 20-22). Indeed, "the heart of the mandala" (l. 2) seems be representing the "womb" (l. 7). The "mandala" (l. 2, 22) comes from Buddhism and represents the spiritual map with different aspects and is used in meditation for example. The fact that Di Prima refers to the "mandala" (l. 2, 22) and to the "mantra" (l. 55), another Buddhist element, to write about childbirth emphasises not only her Buddhism, but also the need for concentration, strength, determination in giving birth. Indeed, Di Prima writes "only / shrill mantra scream" (l. 54-55) underscoring the pain and effort it takes. The fact that Di Prima refers to the "womb" (l. 7) as "red / pulsing eye of her spirit" (l. 7-8) is also striking as it portrays the "womb" (l. 7) as the most important thing at the moment on a spiritual level. It can also mean that she metaphorically and spiritually sees the things from her "womb" (l. 7), which would mean that through meditation in giving birth she sees the pain that she feels through the "red / pulsing eye of her spirit" (l. 7-8).

2) Anne Waldman and Shamanism

Another way of empowering women is introduced by Anne Waldman, whose poem "Fast Speaking Woman" (1975) seeks to represent and empower all women. Anne Waldman explains in the page before the poem that it is "indebted to Maria Sabina, the Mazatec Indian Shamaness in Mexico, guiding persons in magic mushroom ceremony & is a reworking & coincidence of the same for all wandering spirits" (Waldman 2). Waldman also writes that "the piece began as a travel meditation during a trip to South America, continued back in NYC, then later in India. It kept growing. Sabina died in the mid-1980s" (Waldman 2).

In the essay "Shamanic Ritual as Poetic Model: The Case of Maria Sabina and Anne Waldman", Daniel C. Noel writes about Maria Sabina, explaining that "the language of Sabina's chants is not a fully memorized formula, as one might expect in the domain of ritual; in fact, it is almost the opposite: a kind of improvisation which often links short enunciations by means of similar sound-qualities" (Noel 60). Noel addresses the inspiration and influence of Sabina on Waldman arguing that "Waldman's use of Sabina's material may represent a remythologizing of poetry through ritual. Furthermore, it may also suggest, despite the undeniable loss, a redemptive possibility of reconnection with what the Mazatecs have been forced to relinquish" (Noel 62). Noel explains that "Fast Speaking Woman lists a multitude of women, or a multitude of characteristics of one woman, playing with the sounds of all sorts of words to describe her" (Noel 63). Noel also affirms that the connections between words that Waldman makes in "Fast Speaking Woman" are similar to Sabina's, yet the content is different (Noel 64). Noel also notes that "the wandering spirits to whom

Waldman says her poem is dedicated extend beyond the poets and those who attend their readings to the contemporary woman, or the archetypal woman, for who the fast speaking woman most especially speaks" (Noel 69).

In the short chapter "Fast Speaking Woman & the Dakini Principle", Anne Waldman evokes her inspirations to write the poem. Waldman writes "I had in my head that I would do a list-chant telling all the kinds of women there are to be, interweaving personal details […] with all the energetic adjectives I could conjure up to make the speak of/to/for Everywoman. Chant is heartbeat. Chant is an ancient efficacious poetic practice" (Waldman 35). Waldman explains that during a trip to Latin America in 1972, she discovered Latin American tantra (Waldman 37). She writes that "in the Native American context, tantra refers to the unequivocal energy, magic, and healing properties of human mind and sacred language, and the unbroken continuity to enlightenment as well" (Waldman 37). She discovered Maria Sabina through recordings of her ceremonies and a translated text (Waldman 37). Commenting on criticism regarding cultural appropriation, Waldman states:

> Neither shaman nor psychic healer, I was a product of my generation, ignorant then of 'cultural colonialism', and eager to learn from other/ wiser cultures. When I meditated or took peyote or tried to imitate Navaho chant I heard on recordings, I did so not to co-opt but to 'taste' as a timeless seeker in my own imagination's interstices, passionately in love with the magics of the phenomenal world. (Waldman 38)

In the poem "Fast Speaking Woman", Anne Waldman seeks to represent every woman and herself as well, to chant, and celebrate them. The poem is 832 lines long. She uses extensive repetitions of "I am […] woman" which create a ritualistic chant as in:

> 96 I'm a solo woman
>
> - I'm a saphire woman
>
> - I'm a stay-at-home woman
>
> - I'm a butterfly woman
>
> 110 […] I'm a travelling woman
>
> - I'm a hitchhike woman
>
> 205 […] I'm the dissonant woman
>
> - I'm the anarchist woman
>
> - I'm the Bantu woman (Waldman 6-10)

In addition, the anaphoric structure “water that cleans / flowers that clean / water that cleans as I go” (l. 62-64) is repeated by Waldman, sometimes with a small change of words or order. It creates an interruption in the poem, which is a refrain. Noel explains it is “the second of Sabina’s formulas that Waldman uses” (Noel 65), she use it eight times. Waldman revealed that she uses this refrain “as a place to pause and shift rhythm and acknowledge the cleansing impulse of the writing” (Waldman 38). Noel also noted that “the first lines of the poem are a kind of testimony of ritual purity borrowed from Sabina” (Noel 65). Here are the lines:

1 because I don’t have spit

- because I don’t have rubbish

- because I don’t have dust

- because I don’t have that which is in air

5 because I am air

- let me try you with my magic power (Waldman 3)

Waldman also explained that “the poem arrived in distinct sections with more sounds associations than anything else mnemonic” (Waldman 36). Beat women writers also wrote about being writers and about poetry.

B. Being a Woman Writer in the Beat Generation

Beat women writers write about being writers and about poetry which emphasises the female agency, which they developed in writing about female figures as shown in the previous section. By writing about being poets and poetry, they re-empower themselves and give themselves female agency against societal criticism.

1) Beat Women’s Female Agency

Beat women frame themselves as writers in their poetry which gives them female agency as writers. The poem “I'm going to be a poet” (1974) by Kyger highlights her will to be a poet like men. In this poem, Kyger writes “I'm going to be a poet, I can put it together too” (l. 1). This is an affirmation in regards to the criticism she and other women writers received. She responds to the assumption that she, a woman, can not be a poet. The term “too” (l. 1) is highlighted through the line break which leaves it at the end of the line. With this term, Kyger refers to men, and thus affirms women are capable of doing it like the men. This line reveals the hardships that Beat women faced in order to write. The alliterations in “t” in “I’m going to be a poet, I can put it together too” (l. 1) emphasise her tenacity and will power. In a chapter entitled “Baby” in *The Female Eunuch*, Germaine Greer

describes the difference in the education between boys and girls. While boys are allowed to discover the world, girls need to remain inside and quiet, help their mother, play with their dolls (Greer 87). They are expected to stay the same when growing up, becoming mothers and wives, staying home (Greer 87). She argues that "if women become 'intellectuals' they are disenfranchised of their bodies, repressed, intense, inefficient, still as servile as ever. [...] Most creative women bear the stamp of futility and confusion even in their best work" (Greer 88).

In the poem "The Nun Abutsu" (1975), Anne Waldman writes about the Japanese poet and nun Nun Abutsu who died in 1283. She draws a parallel between herself and the Japanese poet, thus celebrating another woman poet from a different time and place. This poem portrays a woman writing, and addresses the reasons why she writes:

1 sea wind
- chilly on me
- snow rides down

- each night
5 look up
- that moon is smaller

- I wane
- too
- as I write

10 not sadness
- brings me
- to words

- but how everything
- resembles something else
15 is an exultation

- enormous waves
- rise – (Waldman 101)

This is a visual poem, which brings to mind the *Caligrammes* by Guillaume Apollinaire. The poem's presentation forms the shapes of waves with a regularity in its structure with seven stanzas of three lines each. The presence of the waves is not just in the poem's shape but also in its content. The lexical field of the sea is present with "sea wind" (l. 1), "enormous waves / rise" (l. 16-17). In addition, there are alliterations in "s" which produce a musical effect reminding of the wind or waves in "sea wind […] / snow rides down // […] that moon is smaller // […] not sadness / brings me / to words // […] resembles something else […] // enormous waves" (l. 1-16). Waldman writes "I wane" (l. 7) which is a word which has a double meaning. The term "wane" (l. 7) refers to the visible part of the moon decreasing – there is a reference to the moon in the preceding line – and it also refers to a state or feeling of someone becoming weaker or declining, just like someone slowly losing their power or health. Here, the poet writes "I wane / too / as I write" (l. 7-9) which shows that the woman writer is slowly losing her health or life. It can also be interpreted as Waldman entering another phase, like the moon, a phase during which she is unseen or invisibilised.
Additionally, in the line "not sadness / brings me / to words // but how everything / resembles something else / is an exultation" (l. 10-15), Waldman reveals that it is not her sadness which makes her "wane" (l. 7), yet the sadness has no influence on her writing as the negation and the line break highlight in "not sadness" (l. 10). The reason why she writes is the "exultation" (l. 15), the extraordinary joy and happiness which the similarity of certain things gives her. Something interesting to note is how the line breaks and the change of stanza highlight the terms "words" (l. 12) and "exultation" (l. 15). The observation of things and the discovery of their resemblance brings her to write. It can be seen as Anne Waldman writing about Nun Abutsu but also about herself and her writing. She clearly frames herself as a poet in this poem, and this parallel with another woman poet makes it even more powerful and relevant.

In the poem "Verse for the New Amazing Grace" (1975) on page 116-117, Anne Waldman writes an ode to poetry which she sees as a Goddess in which she believes. For this poem, she uses a more classic form with six stanzas of quatrains. It is very regular and it is written in common metre with rhymes in ABAB for the first, second, fourth and fifth stanzas, the third and sixth stanzas have no rhymes. The common metre is also called ballad metre as it is often used in ballads. Waldman writes:

1 The grace of all the bards who pen

- Their words do transport me

- Sweet vowels & consonants strenghten

- Goddess Poesy's legacy

5 Heart-pearls roll off the poets' tongues

- Who chant in praise of Love

- Troubadours blest with hearty lungs

- Esoterics zapped from above

- Sappho's bite & Shakespeare's wit

10 & Dante's mystical climb

- Dickinson's rhyme, bearded Whitman's breath

- Are etched in genetic spine

- And if the planet cease to spin

- Sad universe go silent, dark

15 Ancient poetry's echoes will make a din

- Rekindle the primordial spark

- O I bow down to Christ's thorny crown

- All sacraments meant to heal

- The Buddha's smile, old Yaweh's frown

20 And Allah's consummate zeal

- But poetry's a Goddess sent

- To save a wretch like me

- She strums the strings of life's desperate edge

- With her haunting melody. (Waldman 116-117)

In the first stanza, Waldman praises poetry, using the lexical field of writing with “bards” (l. 1), “words” (l. 2), “vowels” (l. 3) and “consonants” (l. 3). Waldman writes a metaphor linked to the language of love in “Heart-pearls roll off the poets' tongues / Who chant in praise of Love / Troubadours blest with hearty lungs” (l. 5-7). The poets here are Troubadours, who were poets and artists of the Middle Ages, in what is today the South of France. They sang in Occitan, the traditional language of Occitans, the native people of what used to be Occitania, now called South of France. They popularised courtly love and chivalry in songs chanting love in courts all around Europe. The metaphors of “heart-pearls” (l. 5) on their “tongues” (l. 5) and “hearty lungs” (l. 7) therefore refers to their art of singing love as she writes “who chant in praise of Love” (l. 6). The “heart” (l. 5) is an obvious and common reference to love. In the third stanza, there are no rhymes. She writes of well-known poets of all countries and time “Sappho’s bite & Shakespeare’s wit / & Dante’s mystical climb / Dickinson’s rhyme, bearded Whitman’s breath” (l. 9-11). Here, some of the most well-known poets in the Western history of poetry create a “spine” (l. 12) as in “are etched in genetic spine” (l. 12), and therefore create the body of the “Goddess Poesy” (l. 4).

Additionally, the fourth stanza casts poetry as the essence of the world as seen in “And if the planet cease to spin / Sad universe go silent, dark / Ancient poetry's echoes will make a din / Rekindle the primordial spark” (l. 13-16). The rhymes highlight the terms “spin” (l. 13) and “din” (l. 15), and “dark” (l. 14) and “spark” (l. 16). While the alliteration in “dark” (l. 14) and “din” (l. 15), and “spin” (l. 13) and “spark” (l. 16) underlines the power of poetry on the planet. Poetry is described as an actual Goddess. She has the “primordial spark” (l. 16), she is presented as more important for Waldman than all the Gods and Goddesses known. This is confirmed with the last two stanzas: “O I bow down to Christ's thorny crown / All sacrements meant to heal / The Buddha's smile, old Yaweh's frown / And Allah's consummate zeal // But poetry's a Goddess sent / To save a wretch like me / She strums the strings of life's desperate edge / With her haunting melody” (l. 17-24). Something that is crucial to notice is that she bows down to Gods, which in culture are described as men, but the one she actually chooses and devotes herself to, and explain is the only one for her, is Poetry, portrayed here as a “Goddess” (l. 21), therefore a woman. In this poem, not only she writes about her devotion to poetry, but also figuratively to womanhood. In this sense, this poem works as a sort of emblem of her writing. It reveals her strong feminism and is linked to her writings portraying womanhood in her collection *Fast Speaking Woman*.

In the poem “Entr’acte ‘Let Us Sing Unto the Lord a New Song’” (1971), Denise Levertov writes an ode to poetry and revolution. She writes:

1 There’s a pulse in Richard

- that day and night says

- revolution revolution revolution

- and another

5 not always heard:

- poetry poetry

- ripling through his sleep,

- a river pulse.

- Heart's fire

10 breaks the chest almost,

- flame-pulse,

- *revolution*:

- and if its beat

- falter

15 life itself

- shall cease.

- Heart's river,

- living water,

- *poetry*:

20 and if that pulse

- grow faint

- fever shall parch the soul, breath

- choke upon ashes. (Levertov 96)

In this poem, she talks about “Richard” (l. 1), yet it is quite clear later in the poem that this is more universal. It applies to her who lived a life of poetry and activism. The poem is quite visual as the repetitions of “revolution” (l. 3) and “poetry” (l. 6) seem like a pulse, thus underscoring the importance of these two elements to live. Levertov also introduces a relation of complementarity and opposition which is created by the fact that “revolution” (l. 3) is associated with “fire” (l. 9) while “poetry” (l. 6) is associated with “water” (l. 18). The structure of the poem highlights this relationship as the two have an anaphoric structure: “Heart's fire” (l. 9) and “Heart's river” (l. 17). Indeed, the stanzas introducing “revolution” (l. 3) and “poetry” (l. 6) seem like a chorus discussing these two different notions. After this introductory chorus, there is another anaphoric structure which starts with “and if” (l. 13, 20) and reveals what will happen if the pulse stops. The lexical field of the pulse present with the words “heart” (l. 9, 17), “pulse” (l. 1, 8, 11, 20), “beat” (l. 13), “chest” (l. 10) but also to some extent “rhythm” (l. 24) which highlights how both notions make the heart beat and thus keep the human alive.

In addition to this, the poem is quite a visual one: the pulse being one of the central subject, the appearance of the poem looks like a pulse going up and down throughout the poem. Levertov writes that if the “pulse” (l. 1, 8, 11, 20) stops, if revolution stops, life stops. But if poetry disappears, “fever shall parch the soul, breath / choke upon ashes” (l. 22-23). Obviously, “fever” (l. 22) and “ashes” (l. 23) are related to “fire” (l. 9), which means that the disappearance of poetry would break the equilibrium of life and destroy the “soul” (l. 22) of the person. This complementarity of revolution and poetry is addressed in the ninth and tenth stanzas. Revolution being the “fire” (l. 9) of existence and poetry the “water” (l. 18) for the soul, the food for thought, which calms the “fire” (l. 9), as shown with “But when their rhythms / mesh / then though the pain of living / never lets up // the singing begins” (l. 24-28). Therefore, as Denise Levertov expressed in this poem, poetry and revolution need to “mesh” (l. 25) for life to keep going, for “the singing [to begin]” (l. 28).

This balance of poetry and activism is something that is very peculiar in the life of women of the Beat Generation, even more for the ones studied here. Poetry brought them to revolution, revolution brought them to poetry. Through writing as women, they were already doing something revolutionary, but in addition what they write is also revolutionary in itself.

In her poem “She and the Muse” (1982), Denise Levertov writes about a woman who writes when the man she was with leaves. It is composed of six stanzas of four lines each. First, the focus is put

on the man who leaves. She highlights his departure in the first stanza "Away he goes, the hour's delightful hero / *arrivederci*: and his horse clatters / out of the courtyard" (l. 1-3). His person is described as someone important. He is a "delightful hero" (l. 1). In the third stanza, she also pictures his departure with "he rides off in the dustcloud of his own / story" (l. 9-10). Indeed, "his own / story" (l. 9-10) is turned into dust as he leaves. The line break in "his own / story" (l. 9-10) stresses the term "story" (l. 10) which can be interpreted as the fact that being a man, he is able to be free, have his life, while the woman is not when he is here. As soon, as he leaves, he is no longer the hero there, she is the "heroine" (l. 18) as it is written in the final stanza. Thus, in the third stanza, there is a shift from the focus which first is on the man to a focus on the woman. At first, it seems as if the first and second stanza depicted the beginning of an epic, an adventure. It is not the case, as the focus then comes onto the woman, "She and the Muse". She goes back to her life, to do what she wants to do: "when he had vanished she / who had stood firm to wave and watch / from the top step, goes in to the cool // flagstoned kitchen, clears honey and milk and bread / off the table, sweeps from the hearth / ashes from last night's fire, and climbs the stairs / to strip tumbled sheets from her wide bed" (l. 10-16).

Here, after the shift from man to woman, the poems shows the actions of the woman. There is a depiction of domestic chores, and thus a return to the domestic which is something that was expected of a woman and her role in the house. Yet, these domestic chores are done in a way that clears up the space and the time for her to do something else. The man left, and the tasks accomplished, she can now go back to her true calling, writing. This other change happens in the fifth and sixth stanzas. The shift is shown in the visual aspect of the poem. The first line of the fifth stanza is not aligned on the left like the others but is on the right side. Levertov writes in the fifth stanza:

- Now the long-desired

- visit is over. The heroine

- is a scribe. Returned to solitude,

20 eagerly she re-enters the third room. (Levertov 139)

This stanza highlights that she is the "heroine" (l. 18), but also that she is a writer, "a scribe" (l. 19). The reminder of the end of the visit and her being alone reveals that now that she is alone, she can do it, she can write. It feels like a secret, a secret that she hid from the man. The use of "returned" (l. 19) and "re-enters" (l. 20) evokes the fact that it is not something new, she has been alone, in her room writing many times before. With the adverb "eagerly" (l. 20), Levertov confirms that not only

she has been writing before, but she likes it, she is eager for it. In *A Room of One's Own*, Virginia Woolf stresses the importance of having a room of one's own for women writers:

> Intellectual freedom depends upon material things. Poetry depends upon intellectual freedom. And women have always been poor, not for two hundred years merely, but from the beginning of time. Women have had less intellectual freedom than the sons of Athenian slaves. Women, then, have not had a dog's chance of writing poetry. That is why I have laid so much stress on money and a room of one's own. (Woolf 81)

Additionally, Levertov writes: "The room hung with tapestries, scenes that change / whenever she looks away. Here is her lectern, / here her writing desk. She picks a quill, / dips it, begins to write. But not of him" (l. 21-24). This stanza depicts that she has a room of her own where she can write. This room, "with tapestries, scenes that change / whenever she looks away" (l. 21-22) highlights that this room is a safe haven. It is a place which opens her perspective, she sees other things, she explores other things as shown with "scenes that change / whenever she looks away" (l. 21-22) and "her writing desk" (l. 23). She escapes from the domestic life through this room and especially through writing. With the final line "begins to write. But not of him." (l. 24), Levertov brings up the subject of a feminine writing. Indeed, this woman who escapes her domestic life centred on taking care of the man and the house, writes for herself and by herself. She writes not about men but about what she wants to write about. The shift from the man to the woman is explored in the poem by Levertov going from a focus on the man to a focus on the woman.
Moreover, this woman does not write about the man, but about other things, maybe herself, developing a feminine writing, with a focus which differs from usual writings by men. Thus, She, as in the title, is the Muse, her own Muse. This poem is crucial in the exploration of the idea of a feminine writing, and of women being writers by Levertov, among other women of the Beat Generation.

In the poem "Apparuit" (1973), Diane di Prima writes about another woman poet like her, who in fact is her shadow. It is written in free verse, and is a chant. The title of the poem "apparuit" signifies "appears" in Latin. Indeed, di Prima dedicates this poem to an apparition who is her shadow, thus she describes herself through the description of this shadow. In the first and second stanzas, she writes: "There is some sweet woman / whose words I have never seen / who springs / fullblown into mind // it is as if she had printed a large book / & her work was full & satisfied / & she / satisfied in the loves of both sexes" (l. 1-8).
In the beginning of the poem, it is not directly understandable that it is her and her shadow that she is writing about. In the second stanza, another clue makes the reader understand that these two

women are connected. With “it is as if she had printed a large book” (l. 5), the woman described appears as a writer, like Diane di Prima. The mention of bisexuality with “she / satisfied in the loves of both sexes” (l. 7-8) is another link between the two women. The woman in the poem is described as bisexual, and di Prima was bisexual as well.

Furthermore, in the third stanza, she keeps on describing herself with the lines: “not strung out // by the rappel à l’ordre / not straining or excusing herself or defiant / strident angry” (l. 9-13). The anaphora of “not” (l. 9-11) emphasises her character who does what she wants and goes against mainstream thinking or assumptions. In the fourth stanza, she writes “she has moved gracefully from fleshly maidenhood / to the lean delights of the mother” (l. 15-16). This further deepens the link between the two women. Di Prima was a “mother” (l. 16) too. Motherhood is also something central in her approach to femininity and womanhood. The fifth stanza contains an antithesis: “she is serene / with the grace & gentleness of the warrior” (l. 17-18). The antithesis of “grace & gentleness of the warrior” (l. 18) seems to indicate that she considers herself a “warrior” (l. 18), due to her life. The use of terms which are stereotypically associated to womanhood with the term “warrior” (l. 18) is potentially a way for her to describe something which would be close to the form of a woman “warrior” (l. 18). The conjunction of stereotypically masculine “warrior” (l. 18) and the stereotypically feminine “grace & gentleness” (l. 18) creates a hybridity in terms associated with genders, and joining violence and peace.

Additionally, clinging to the feminine but wanting to clash with the assumptions of it, she continues in this approach in the seventh stanza. She writes “her voice is not milk & honey / it is not harsh, it is a voice / her voice” (l. 28-30). This description of the voice, the woman’s voice, goes against the assumptions on the voice of women. “Milk & honey” (l. 28) is in general described as for women and “harsh” (l. 29) for men. She highlights that it is “her voice” (l. 28) nothing else with line breaks stressing these terms in the beginning of line 28, and alone on line 30. In the eighth stanza, which reads “she writes // whatever suits her she moves where she pleases” (l. 30-32), di Prima underscores her independence in her life but also in her writing. Further in the poem, it becomes understandable that the woman is her shadow or a double. In the tenth stanza, she writes “I close a window, she is not reflected in it / but I see her silhouette against the glass” (l. 36-37). Di Prima sees the “silhouette” (l. 37) but not the reflection, it is not herself but her shadow.

Finally, there is an oxymoron and an antithesis with “sweet whore innocent / power my fiend” (l. 40-41). Again this shows another sort of hybridity, here it is good and evil. The other woman, the “silhouette” (l. 37), is di Prima’s “fiend” (l. 41), her demon. She is a double, a good or evil double who knows: it is her “shadow” (l. 52), maybe her doppelgänger. The terms “you commit / this poem like a ripe plum” (l. 47-48) which di Prima eats in the desert, highlight the commitment, the

promise, the will to have this poem written for her, but also demonstrate a certain ambiguity. It can be understood as the "shadow" (l. 52) wanting di Prima to write a poem to her absolutely. The woman is di Prima's "shadow sister" (l. 52) as she writes at the end of the poem. This poem reveals the importance of the woman writer for Diane di Prima. She writes about her shadow who writes too, emphasising writing to her. Yet, she also relies on a sort of mystic shadow, a womanly creature to describe herself and her writing. Indeed, Diane di Prima, especially in *Loba*, is interested in the creation and re-writing of myths around womanhood. Using a mystical shadow to write about writing amplifies and gives depth to her status as a woman writer and a poet.

In another poem from *Loba*, "Point of Ripening: Lughnasa" (1973), Diane di Prima searches for a myth which would correspond to her, a woman poet. In the first stanza, she writes "There is no myth / for what I am living now." (l. 1-2). Thus due to the absence of a myth on something similar to herself, she creates it. She writes herself as a myth. In the third stanza, she continues on this trajectory with the lines: "Scribe, painter, chanter of / new-made eternal / hymns, scattering pearls /of love, of healing – songs / books, dances, rites / pots, sculptures & piles of shells / of stones to mark / the trail (it is new)" (l. 10-17).
She emphasises her creations and her writing as she is a "scribe" (l. 10). One can note the lexical field of the arts as well as that of religion, which highlights the mystification of herself as an artist, a poet. Then, she writes:

- There is no myth
- for this older, ample woman

20 When she sets sail

- poems on parchment
- float on the waves. (Di Prima 305)

The anaphora "there is no myth" (l. 1, 18) thus underscores her creation of a new myth for herself as a writer. She describes herself using "this" (l. 19), as if describing someone else. Indeed, as written above, she depicts herself as the myth of a woman poet. The lines "when she sets sail / poems on parchment / float on the waves" (l. 20-22) seems like a description of a deity or mystic creature whose appearance would be seen through the presence of poems floating around. The poem becomes visual in this stanza. The lines are floating around the page, not aligned, picturing

perfectly the “poems on parchment / [which] float on the waves” (l. 21-22). Here the words float on the page. She discovers the absence of a myth for a woman poet and thus creates it for herself. This reveals the importance that poetry has for her and also of being a woman poet.

In *A Room of One's Own*, Virginia Woolf evokes what women need to write, and feminine writing. Woolf reveals that while women are the centre of literature, with men writing about them, women do not write about men (Woolf 21). Indeed, Woolf argues that “it is fatal for anyone who writes to think of their sex. […] It is fatal for a woman to lay the least stress on any grievance; to plead even with justice any cause; in any way to speak consciously as a woman” (Woolf 78). This aspect of “speaking consciously as a woman” (Woolf 78) is particularly seen in Beat women’s poetry. The poems in this section put the female voice at the centre, empower themselves as writers, but they also, for some, address the discrimination against women in their poetry, and in this section against women writers. Woolf explains that for men, “women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice his natural size” (Woolf 28). Addressing writing for women, Woolf argues that the absence of women writers for centuries is due to the fact that women could not have a room of their own, except if they were extremely rich, money was a problem as well, and society did not encourage women to write as they did for men (Woolf 40). Evoking money, Woolf explains that for women, “in the first place, to earn money was impossible for them, and in the second, had it been possible, the law denied them the right to possess what money they earned” (Woolf 18). Woolf explains that “towards the end of the eighteenth century […] the middle-class woman began to write” (Woolf 49) and they could write because they started to earn money with it (Woolf 49). Evoking women writers, Woolf reveals that “it is far more important at the moment to know how much money women had and how many rooms than to theorize about their capacities” (Woolf 79).

In the eighth chapter of *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*, entitled “(Male) Culture”, Firestone notes that women have inspired culture, as the muses of men. She affirms that “women have been the main subject of art” (Firestone 157). Yet, there are not many women who have been artists themselves, as Firestone explains: “in those cases where individual women have participated in male culture, they have had to do so on male terms” (Firestone 157). They had to compete against men, as men, but their identity as women still was holding them back because of the expectations of women's role (Firestone 157). Culture and its creations and dicta being set and controlled by men, the woman artist only has access to culture from a male point of view, making it difficult to picture her own reality and experience (Firestone 158). Some of these women portrayed

the woman "within the limits of what had been defined as female by a male tradition: they saw women through male eyes, painted a male's idea of female" (Firestone 159). A woman artist cannot escape the cultural tradition of art set by men, but she can attempt at creating art with her own view, *a female view* (Firestone 159). If she does so, the male culture and its standards will judge her art as inferior, as she does not produce art in a similar fashion as the men (Firestone 159). This is specifically shown in the fact that Beat men deemed Beat women as less intelligent and talented. Firestone reveals that:

> In those cases where a woman, tired of losing at a male game, has attempted to participate in culture *in a female way*, she has been put down and misunderstood, named by the (male) cultural establishment "Lady Artist", i.e., trivial, inferior. And even where it must be (grudgingly) admitted that she is 'good,' it is fashionable – a cheap way to indicate one's own 'seriousness' and refinement of taste – to insinuate that she is good but irrelevant. (Firestone 159)

Indeed, such judgement comes from patriarchal and cultural assumptions that men are the ones entitled to create and judge what art is (Firestone 159). As Firestone comments, it is what is deemed as "good taste (male taste)" (Firestone 161). Women creating art bring another vision of reality, because they are women living a different reality than men (Firestone 165). Firestone explains the difference in women and men's art creation "is not, as some like to think, simply a difference of 'style' in treating the same subject matter [...] but the very subject matter itself" (Firestone 165). They live different realities, yet the male one is "accepted by both male and female as Reality" (Firestone 166). Hence the need for women artists to introduce new subjects to the field of art (Firestone 167). Doing so, their art will fight this assumption of male reality as Reality itself (Firestone 167). This is exactly what Beat women do in their poetry, they fight patriarchy and also introduce women-centred subjects which make us discover another reality, women's reality, which is clearly different from the one that can be read in Beat men's works. Women as audience members seeing and interpreting art need to see their reality pictured (Firestone 167). They need a "cultural mirror" (Firestone 166) which was denied to both women as artists and as audiences (Firestone 166). They demand "a 'female' art to reinforce the female reality" (Firestone 167). The female experience needs to be incorporated into culture as one of the prerequisites for a "true cultural revolution" (Firestone 169). Writing as women, and about women-centred subjects was a cultural revolution in itself by Beat women.

In the fourth chapter of *This Sex Which Is Not One*, entitled "The Power of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine", Luce Irigaray argues that the discourse is phallocentric, which

means centred on the phallus, that is men (Irigaray 68). She states that "it is not a matter of toppling that order so as to replace it [...] but of disrupting and modifying it" (Irigaray 68). I would argue that by writing about women-centred subjects, Beat women disrupt and modify Beat men's masculinist discourse. Irigaray explains the philosophical discourse is the one that needs to be challenged, as it "sets forth the law for all others [discourses and] [...] it constitutes the discourse on discourse" (Irigaray 74). To her, there is a need to reopen and reanalyse the philosophical discourse to find what is "feminine" and to give it back to the feminine and give recognition (Irigaray 74). This is what she calls the "process of interpretive rereading" (Irigaray 75). First, there is a grammatical examination of the discourse to see how it works, its laws and its silences (Irigaray 75). But this is not enough as there is a necessity "to work at 'destroying' the discursive mechanism" (Irigaray 76). To do so, language work is needed in which we interpret and identify the mechanisms of the discourse which maintain the subordination of the feminine (Irigaray 75). The new language's

> function would thus be to cast phallocentrism, phallocratism, loose from its moorings in order to return the masculine to its own language, leaving open the possibility of a different language. Which means that the masculine would no longer be 'everything'.(Irigaray 80)

In *The Laugh of the Medusa*, Hélène Cixous writes about women writing and feminine writing. She argues that:

> Woman must write herself: must write about women and bring women to writing, from which they have been driven away as violently as from their bodies [...] Woman must put herself into the text – as into the world and into history – by her own movement. (Cixous 875)

It will change the future. There is an urgent need to break the ground of patriarchal discourse and to write and establish a new discourse (Cixous 875). Women need to write so other women write and discover the endless imagination of women and read something that resembles them (Cixous 875). Writing is something taken away from women (Cixous 876). They are "led into self-disdain by the great arm of parental-conjugal phallocentrism" (Cixous 876). Women are led to feel ashamed of writing (Cixous 876). Cixous reveals thus sarcastically that it is:

> because writing is at once too high, too great for you, it's reserved for the great – that is, for 'great men'; and it's 'silly'. Besides you've written a little, but in secret. And it wasn't good, because it was in secret, and because you punished yourself for writing. (Cixous 876-877)

Patriarchal society made women repress and hate themselves (Cixous 878). Women must write, and let no one, not men, not themselves, keep them from it (Cixous 877). Men have "insidiously, violently, [...] led them [women] to hate women, to be their own enemies, to mobilize their immense

strength against themselves, to be the executants of their virile needs" (Cixous 878). Patriarchy also has its place in literature, as men, making the largest number of writers in history, have incorporated this ideology in their texts (Cixous 879). Cixous affirms that "writing has been run by a [...] typically masculine economy; [...] this is a locus where the repression of women has been perpetuated, over and over, [...] in a manner that's frightening since it's often hidden or adorned with the mystifying charms of fiction" (Cixous 879). This is why woman must write herself, as she will reclaim her body which has been censored in the same way as her voice has been censored (Cixous 880). In their writings, Beat women write and reclaim the body and their voice which has been censored both legally as in the case of *The Love Book* by Lenore Kandel, and figuratively as Beat women were invisibilised by their male pears. By writing, she speaks up and enters history (Cixous 880). Women have to stop listening to men to start changing history (Cixous 880). Speaking up for women is a powerful transgression (Cixous 880). She needs her own language. Cixous argues that:

> if woman has always functioned 'within' the discourse of man, [...] it is time for her to dislocate this 'within', to explode it, turn it around, and seize it; to make it hers, containing it, taking it in her own mouth, biting that tongue with her very own teeth to invent for herself a language to get inside of. (Cixous 887)

Additionally, Cixous remarks that the woman "does not cling to herself" (Cixous 890) like men with their egos (Cixous 890). Woman is "a giver" (Cixous 888). Her writing knows no boundaries, no limits (Cixous 890). She can identify with many things, many people (Cixous 890).

2) Ars Poetica

Additionally, Beat women write Ars Poetica poems, meaning they write about writing. These poems frame Beat women even more as writers.

One Ars Poetica poem is "Too Easy: to Write of Miracles" (1948), in which Denise Levertov addresses what she finds easy and difficult when writing. Thus it is a poem about the art of poetry. In this poem, there are multiple alliterations, assonances, and consonances which bring a musicality, rhythm and cohesion to the poem. In the first stanza, she writes:

> 1 Too easy: to write of miracles, dreams where the famous give
>
> - mysterious utterance to silent truth;
>
> - to confuse snow with the stars,
>
> - simulate a star's fantastic wisdom. (Levertov 3)

She claims that it is easy to write of things which are not real, for which you need to use your imagination to write as in “miracles” (l. 1) or “dreams” (l. 1). In the second stanza, she writes “easy like the willow to lament, […] / or die in words and angrily turn / to pace like ghosts about the walls of war” (l. 5-10). With these lines, she draws a comparison with writing in for example “easy like the willow to lament” (l. 5). Obviously, the “willow” (l. 5) is also called weeping “willow” (l. 5) and here there is a humanisation of the “willow” (l. 5) tree which laments, that is cries and mourns. Another comparison is to “ghosts” (l. 10), thus also emphasising the presence of sadness, death in poetry, she probably is writing about lyric poetry. Levertov describes what is too easy to write, she addresses clichés in poetic writing such as here the “willow to lament” (l. 5) and “ghosts” (l. 10). The comparisons of the “willow” (l. 5) and the “ghosts” (l. 10) are things which seem too obvious to her. The alliterations in ‘w’ and ‘t’ in “easy like the willow to lament, […] / or die in words and angrily turn / to pace like ghosts about the walls of war” (l. 5-10) which create a rhythm.
Additionally, in the third stanza, she reveals what is difficult to write. To her, it is

- difficult to write
- of the real image, real hand, the heart
- of day or autumn beating steadily:
20 to speak of human gestures, clarify
- all the context of a simple phrase
- – the hour, the shadow, the fire,
- the loaf on a bare table. (Levertov 3)

With the anaphora “too easy to write” (l. 1) and “difficult to write” (l. 17), Levertov highlights the difference in writing clichés and writing actual things, shown in the anaphora “the real image, real hand” (l. 18). While the first one seemed to address others writers, this one seems to be a description of her experience with writing. What she sees with her own eyes or lives are “difficult to write” (l. 17) about in details. In a poem, she can not transcribe everything that she sees, shown in the enumeration: “the hour, the shadow, the fire, / the loaf on a bare table” (l. 22-23), a poem is different from a photograph.
Finally, the last stanza is even more about writing than the others, as it clearly focuses on the technique and way in which she writes:

- hard, under the honest sun, to weigh
25 a word until it balances with love –
- burden of happiness on fearful shoulders;

- in the ease of daylight to discover

- what measure has its music, and achieve

- the unhaunted country of the final poem. (Levertov 3)

Levertov describes her writing in terms of “weigh” (l. 24), “balance” (l. 25), “measure” (l. 28). Indeed, it almost seems like a description of a recipe. She weighs her “word” (l. 25) to find a “balance” (l. 25) in her poem. She searches “what measure has its music” (l. 28), searching for the melody and rhythm of the poem with all the consonances or alliterations as in this poem. All of the technique is, as she describes it, a “burden of happiness on fearful shoulders” (l. 26). The “burden” (l. 26) reminds of a weigh, this notion or lexical field being omnipresent in this stanza. Her “shoulders” (l. 26) might be “fearful” (l. 26) because of the difficulty but it brings her “happiness” (l. 26) to write. This poem highlights her dedication to writing. She writes about writing, thus emphasising her position as a writer and a poet. Using constant alliterations and consonances throughout the poem, she plays with sounds and rhythm showing her talent at writing. At the end of the poem, she writes *Sicily, 1948*, which shows her poetry predates the Beat Generation. It anchors herself even more as a poet who started to write on her own.

Another Ars Poetica poem is “Who Even Said I Was a Poet” (1972) in which Joanne Kyger evokes her writing and the criticism she received. It is written in free verse, in the first-person. Kyger writes “Who even said I was a poet. Because I write / this down” (l. 1-2). This seems like something that was said to her, a criticism on her being a poet. To this comment, she argues back with “because I write” (l. 2). Kyger reveals “I want bullet-like speed and precision / to show that this mind connects in ways of delight, and / also says truth way beyond this individual voice” (l. 2-4). The line “I want bullet-like speed and precision” (l. 2) is a striking image as the use of “bullet” (l. 2) depicts what she wants for her writing is something that is powerful. The use of “this” (l. 3, 4) suggests that she is addressing criticism which she receives. The lines “even if I repeat what others say, / it becomes mine” (l. 11-12), also seem like an answer to criticism, as “even if” (l. 11) indicates. The line break emphasises “it becomes mine”. It is as if she was declaring even if it is true, it is mine. Kyger writes “One thinks ‘the obvious’. You say it sounds so obvious. / I wanted to do something I called writing” (l. 16-17). Once again, she is addressing criticism. Here, the use of the pronoun “you” (l. 16) clearly points to another person who said this to her. This “you” (l. 16) is probably men, and especially Beat men. In opposition to this comment and the second-person, she uses the first-person to again answer the comment. In the line “I wanted to do something I called writing” (l. 17), there is the idea with “I called” (l. 17) that her writing is considered as such by herself, yet not by others.

With this line, it feels like she is justifying herself and her actions to another person who not only criticises her but also thinks her writing is not relevant or not great. Here, she defends her poetry and thus, establishes herself even more as a poet, as a writer despite the negativity that surrounds her.

Conclusion

This study explored Beat women's writings from a feminist point of view. First, I focused on the Beat lifestyle, the treatment of Beat women by their male counterparts, and Beat women's criticism and denunciation of US society and patriarchy. In this part, I showed that Beat women's writings are testimonies of their implication in the Beat Generation, and in the counterculture and their feminism. As women, and as members of the Beat Generation, they were the margins of the margins. Therefore being writers was something more difficult for them to achieve as they received heavier criticism than men. Then, I discussed the more personal subjects of marriage and love. Beat women were vocal about subjects which show their involvement in second-wave feminism. They addressed marriage as a prison from which they want to escape. They addressed domestic chores and being a housewife, and how it affects women's mental health. They also wrote about love as something upon which women can be dependent, thus leaving with nothing when it ends. In a third part, I demonstrated Beat women's strong feminism in their accounts of their active sexuality, which is opposed to societal taboo and Freud's theories of female passivity. I analysed Beat women's writing on the body, addressing subjects like periods, which are taboo in society. I also explored Beat women's writings criticising beauty standards. These subjects centred on the female body prove Beat women's feminist and revolutionary stance when fighting taboos and patriarchy. Finally, I explored Beat women's feminism in their writings of re-empowerment. Beat women used female mythical figures as a means to empower women. They also sought to empower and frame themselves as writers through writings on female writers and ars poetica poems which gave them female agency, and showed again the importance of their feminine writings.
Yet, this study is not an exhaustive one. Due to a lack of time, I could not study all the different elements in their poetry. I originally was going to develop two other parts which would be interesting for further research.

One part was on activism and politics. In this part, several things can be studied. First, the criticism of US society, which I shortly addressed in my first chapter of this study. The poems regarding this topic are numerous: RL# 36, RL#40, RL#49, RL#60, RL#62, RL#70, RL#80, RL "Rant From a Cool Place", RL#23, RL#37, RL#47, RL#61, RL#52, RL#72, RL#42, RL#22, and RL#73 by Diane Di Prima; "Whatever It Takes" by Joanne Kyger; "Clearly Beloved, We Are Huddled Here Together" and "Holding" by Lenore Kandel. Another topic is Anti-war poems which are about the Vietnam war, and also about WW2, those are by Denise Levertov who is older than the other poets

of this corpus. The poems are: “Listening to Distant Guns”, “Obsessions”, “The Dead”, “During the Eichmann Trial”, “Chekov on the West Heath”, “Life at War”, “Advent 1966”, “Tenebrae”, and “Making Peace” by Denise Levertov; “Spel Against the Specious Ones”, “Millenium Sutra” by Anne Waldman; “Old Men” by Lenore Kandel; “I Didn’t Want to Think” by Joanne Kyger; and RL#13, RL#67, RL#69, RL#78, and RL#86 by Diane Di Prima. Other struggles are addressed such as gay rights and civil rights with the poems: “Queer Heart” by Anne Waldman, “Spring 61” by Lenore Kandel, RL#19 and RL#42 by Diane Di Prima. Then, studying revolution would also be interesting, this topic is principally present in Di Prima’s *Revolutionary Letters*. First, there are poems on what to do in political revolution: RL#3, RL#7, RL#8, RL#9, RL#14, RL#15, RL#18, RL#20, RL#25, RL#48, RL#10, RL#12, RL#41, RL#29 by Di Prima. Then, there are poems about denunciations: RL#21, RL#30, RL#32, RL#65, RL#76, RL#88, RL#93, RL#28, RL#68. Then, there are poems on revolution in the way of life and the mindset: RL#33, RL#34, RL#51. The last activist aspect of their poetry was their ecology awareness with the poems: “Millenium Sutra” by Anne Waldman; “3 a.m., September1, 1969” and “The Life of Other” by Denise Levertov; RL#13, RL#16, RL#55, RL#39, RL#42, RL#54, RL#38, RL#88, RL#17, RL#35 by Di Prima.

The part interesting for further study in this corpus concerns religions and myths. The poems by Diane Di Prima, for this part are all from *Loba*. Beat women used mythical figures in their poems on female re-empowerment. Some of these mythical figures are from Greek mythology: Poems on Persephone: “Lament You Are in this Mind of” by Anne Waldman; “Persephone” and “Persephone: Reprise” by Di Prima. Poems on the Maze, the Minotaur and Ariadne: “The Time of the Golden Bull” by Lenore Kandel; “The Maze” by Joanne Kyger; “Ariadne as Starmaker” by Diane Di Prima. Poems on Odysseus and Penelope: “The Odyssey Poems” and “12.29 & 30” by Joanne Kyger. Another figure is the figure of the witch in: “Witch Song” by Lenore Kandel; “In Mind” by Denise Levertov; “The Pigs For Circe in May” by Joanne Kyger. In addition, more poems can be studied on the Loba: “Ave”, “The Loba Dances”, “The Day Lay Like a Pearl on her Lap”, “Sometimes She Slips Sinuous Thru Green”, “Love Song of the Loba, “Her Power Is to Open What is Shut”, “Belili Ishtar”, “Some Lies about the Loba”, “DREAM: The Loba Reveals Herself”, “It Is Still News That Her Passion”, “The Loba Sings to her Cub”, “Litany”, “She Strides in Blue Jeans to the Corner”, “Some Shapes of the Loba”, “Nativity”, “Is he in Bondage” by Diane Di Prima. Furthermore, Judeo-Christian myths can be studied, they are especially present in Denise Levertov’s poetry: “Illustrious Ancestors”, “Mass for the Day of St Thomas Didymus”, “St Peter and the Angel”, “On a Theme form Julian’s Chapter XX”, “Annunciation”, The Love of Morning”, “St Thomas Didymus”, “Salvator Mundi: Via Crucis”, “The Avowal”, “Flickering Mind”, “Ikon the

Harrowing of Hell", "Converion of Brother Lawrence", "Primary Wonder", "The Showings: Lady Julian of Norwich, 1342-1416" by Denise Levertov. Other poets also wrote about Judeo-Christian myths: "Prayer on the Wind" by Lenore Kandel; "Everyday I Burn a Stick of Incense", "Lord Jesus Christ" by Joanne Kyger; "& From Wherever Thou Willst Thou Gatherest Me", "But In Gathering Me Thou Gatherest Thyself", "Lilith: an Interlude", "Annunciation", "Juliana" by Diane Di Prima. Then, there are poems on Buddhism and Hinduism: "Philip Whalen's Hat", "Is This the Buddha", "Not Much Time Left" "The Karmapa Spoke to Me From a Center of Light", "Good Manners", "Replacement Buddhas", "Naropa Approaches His Teacher Instruction Time Again", "Stupidly Inspired", "April 30", "Lord Ganesha", "From the Life of Naropa", "Arthur Okamura's Pupil's Bodhi Leaf", "The Dharani" by Joanne Kyger; "I Bow at Bodhgaya", "Red Hat Lama", "After Mirabai", "Pratitya Samutpada" by Anne Waldman; "Invocation to Maitreya", "Hymn to Maitreya in America", "Hard Core Love", "Apogee", "Age of Consent", "Small Prayers for Falling Angels", "Poem for Tyrants", "Excerpt From a Prayer Wheel" by Lenore Kandel; RL#43, Part in Loba on Kali by Diane Di Prima. Finally, another aspect that is briefly studied in my study, but can be analysed further is Native American myths and Shamanism: "A Book of Events", "Taking Mushrooms", "Battle Beast" by Anne Waldman; "Everyday Magic" by Lenore Kandel; "Up my Coast", "Visit to Maya Land" by Joanne Kyger; and "When She Hoots It Makes", "And Will You Hunt The Loba?" by Diane Di Prima.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Di Prima, Diane. *Revolutionary Letters.* Last Gasp, 1971, 2005.

Di Prima, Diane. *Loba.* Penguin Books, 1973, 1998.

Kandel, Lenore. *Collected Poems of Lenore Kandel.* North Atlantic Books, 2012.

Kyger, Joanne. *As Ever, Selected Poems.* Penguin Books, 2002.

Levertov, Denise. *Selected Poems.* New Directions, 2002.

Waldman, Anne. *Fast Speaking Woman: Chants & Essays.* City Lights Books, 1996.

Secondary Sources:

Feminism:

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." Translated by Keith Cohen, Paula Cohen. *Signs*, Vol.1, No.4, summer 1976, pp. 875-893.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Edited and translated by H. M. Parshley, Jonathan Cape, 1956.

Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. Bantam Books, 1971.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique.* Norton, 2001.

Greer, Germaine. *The Female Eunuch.* Harper Collins, 2008.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Translated by Catherine Porter, Carolyn Burke, Cornell University, 1985.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas.* Oxford University Press, 2015.

Beat Generation Women:

Friedman, Amy L. "I Say My New Name: Women Writers of the Beat Generation." *The Beat Generation Writers*. Edited by A. Robert Lee. Pluto Press, 1996.

Friedman, Amy L. ''Being Here as Hard as I Could: the Beat Generation Women Writers." *Discourse*, Vol. 20, No. 1/2, The Silent Beat, winter and spring 1998, pp. 229-244.

Johnson, Joyce. *Minor Characters*. Houghton and Mifflin, 1983.

Johnson, Ronna C., Nancy Grace. *Girls Who Wore Black: Women Writing the Beat Generation.* Rutgers University Press, 2002.

Knight, Arthur, Kit Knight. *The Beat Road: The Unspeakable Visions of the Individual*. Unspeakable Visions, 1984. Vol. 14.

Knight, Brenda. *Women of the Beat Generation: the Writers, Artists, and Muses at the Heart of Revolution.* Conari Press, 1996.

McNeil, Helen. "The Archaeology of Gender in the Beat Movement." *The Beat Generation Writers*. Edited by A. Robert Lee. Pluto Press, 1996.

Oates, Katie. "A Fleeting Moment in the a Floating World: The Women of the Beat Generation Through Allen Ginsberg's Eyes." *Beatdom*, February 25, 2018, https://www.beatdom.com/fleeting-moment-floating-world-women-beat-generation-allen-ginsbergs-eyes/.

Stimpson, Catharine R. ''The Beat Generation and the Trials of Homosexual Liberation." *Salmagundi*, No. 58/59, fall 1982-winter 1983, pp. 373-392.

Scholarly studies dedicated to the writers of the corpus:

Bartlett, Amanda. “How San Francisco Tried, and Failed, to Ban a 6-Page Book About Love and Sex.” *SFGATE*, February 14, 2023, https://www.sfgate.com/local/article/san-francisco-banned-love-book-17769589.php.

Davidson, Ian. “Times and Spaces Never Dreamed of in Diane di Prima's *Revolutionary Letters*.” *Journal of Narrative Theory*, Vol. 48, No. 3, Women's Experimental Forms, fall 2018, pp. 314-338.

Encarnación-Pinedo, Estíbaliz. “Intertextuality in Diane di Prima’s *Loba*: Religious Discourse and Feminism.” *Humanities*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 2018.

Encarnación-Pinedo, Estíbaliz. “On Webbed Monsters, Revolutionary Activists and Plutonium Glow: Eco-Crisis in Diane di Prima and Anne Waldman.” *Humanities*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2021.

Giannini Quinn, Roseanne. “The Willingness to Speak: Diane di Prima and Italian American Feminist Body Politics.” *Melus*, Vol. 28, No. 3, Italian American Literature, autumn 2003, pp. 175-193.

Grace M., Nancy, and Tony Trigilio. “Troubling Classical and Buddhist Traditions in Diane di Prima’s *Loba*.” *Hip Sublime: Beat Writers and the Classical Tradition*, edited by Murnaghan, Sheila, & Rosen, Ralph M., Ohio State University Press, 2018, pp. 226-251.

Kirschenbaum, Blossom S. “Diane di Prima: Extending La Famiglia.” *Melus*, Vol. 14, No. 3/4, Italian-American Literature, autumn – winter 1987, pp. 53-67.

Nesbitt, William. “Echoes of the Revolution: Diane Di Prima and the Beat Generation.” *Beatdom*, March 18, 2017, https://www.beatdom.com/echoes-revolution-diane-di-prima-beat-generation/.

Noel, Daniel C. “Shamanic Ritual as Poetic Model: the Case of Maria Sabina and Anne Waldman.” *Journal of Ritual Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 1987, pp. 57-71.

Historical, Social and Cultural Context:

Boyer, Paul S., et al. *The Enduring Vision: A History of the American People*. 6th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2008. Vol. 2: Since 1865.

Burns, Stewart. *Social Movements of the 1960s: Searching for Democracy*. Twayne Publishers, 1990.

Gordon Melton, J., Baumann, Martin, editors. *Religions of the World: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia of Beliefs and Practices*. ABC-CLIO, 2002.

Gordon, Stuart. *The Encyclopedia of Myths and Legends*. Headline Books, 1994.

Norton, Mary Beth, et al. *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*. 5th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998. Vol. 2: Since 1865.

Shipley, Morgan. "Hippies and the Mystic Way: Dropping Out, Unitive Experiences, and Communal Utopianism." *Utopian Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 2013, pp. 232-263.

Paglia, Camille. "Cults and Cosmic Consciousness: Religious Vision in the American 1960s." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Third Series, Vol. 10, No. 3, winter 2003, pp. 57-111.

Pew Research Center. *Modern Parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family*. Pew Research Center, 2013.