

Södertörns Högskola | Department of English

Kandidatuppsats 15 hp | Engelska C | Vårterminen 2013

Women as Other: Hemingway's Portrayal of Female Characters in *To Have and Have Not*

By: Nana K. Dwomoh

Supervisor: Kirsten Shands

Abstract

This essay explores Hemingway's depiction of women in the novel *To Have and Have Not*. In *To Have and Have Not*, the novel explored in this essay, traits of Hemingway's renowned sexist depiction of women have been investigated, and the purpose of the essay was to illuminate that the women of *To Have and Have Not* are reduced to roles which resembles Simone de Beauvoir's observations, namely the perception of women as the Other, assuming subordinate roles. In order to achieve this task, a close reading has been done on Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not*, and his portrayal of five female characters in the novel has been analyzed. Simone de Beauvoir's theory has been applied for an understanding of these female characters in order to see if these women were portrayed in a manner resembling de Beauvoir notions, that is, marked by patriarchal perspectives.

The conclusion drawn in this essay is that all the women in the novel are portrayed as "absolute sex", subordinated to men. Thus, the depictions of the women in the novel *To Have and Have Not* were found to correspond to patriarchal gender roles as described by Simone de Beauvoir.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Previous Research	5
To Have and Have Not – A Brief Synopsis	6
Theoretical Approach	7
Marie Morgan	8
Dorothy Hollis	11
Helene Bradley	12
Laughton’s Wife	16
Helen Gordon	18
Conclusion	21
Works cited list	22

Introduction

Ernest Hemingway is a renowned author, whose status in the literary field is well acknowledged. Andre Dubus III, to name a few, attest to Hemingway's exceptional writing skills, writing "how pioneering and original a writer Ernest Hemingway was, that he was one of the very first, if not the first, working so diligently to give the reader the full experience of his characters" (Dubus III 10). Although, many have confirmed Hemingway's exceptional writing talent, there are some scholars who has criticized and accused Hemingway of misogyny, mainly because of Hemingway's pessimistic, sexist portrayal of the female characters in his novels, depicting them as subordinated to men. Hemingway's trait to portray his female heroines in such manner is thus, acknowledged by many scholars. One scholar, Judith Fetterly, for example, made an effort on illuminating Hemingway's sexism as a man and a writer, in her book *The Resisting Reader* (1978). Also, Professor J. Gerald Kennedy, in his article "Hemingway's Gender Trouble" (1990), underlines Hemingway's perception of gender and sexuality. Fetterly and G. Kennedy are merely a few of the many Hemingway's scholars, scrutinizing Hemingway's view on gender and sex. Recent scholars, also demonstrate their awareness of Hemingway's tendency of portraying his female characters in a pessimistic and sexist manner. An example of these tendencies can be observed in Carreras article, where it is written "[...] criticism on Hemingway and gender has been dominated by two (opposite) critical trends. While the former has long denounced Hemingway's sexist biases [...]" (Carrera 43). With this statement, Carrera is here demonstrating knowledge of former scholar's opinion of Hemingway, such as Fetterly, and their view on Hemingway's sexist portrayal regarding the female characters in his novels. Another Hemingway scholar, namely Charles Hatten, in his review on Fantina's article "Ernest Hemingway: Machismo and Masochism", writes about Hemingway's view on gender, arguing that "[...]Fantina freely acknowledge the sexism[...] of Hemingway's positions" (Hatten 157-8). Thus, Hemingway's sexist portrayal of women in his novels and his view on gender is well acknowledged in the scholarly field, which the above information is intended to illuminate. Therefore, this essay isnot intended to narrate merely criticisms of Hemingway as a sexist writer and his view on gender. Instead, in this essay, the main aim intended is to illuminate that the female characters of Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not* are reduced to roles resembling Simone de Beauvoir's ideas of women in patriarchal society. Thus, Hemingway's portrayal of

five female characters of this specific novel will be explored, in order to investigate the traits to which the female characters of *To Have and Have Not* resembles de Beauvoir's notion regarding women as the Other, namely as inferior and subordinated.

Previous research

Hemingway's works have attracted a great deal of criticism. Many essays have been written regarding Hemingway's pessimistic portrayal of the female characters in his novel's. For example, Elyse Umlauf sums up in her article "*The Women of Fitzgerald's and Hemingway's Fiction*" the typical portrayal of Hemingway's female characters; namely, cruel hearted, harsh and manipulative, causing men's downfall (Umlauf 21). It is also written in her article that Hemingway's female characters are of two categories. The first being the cruel and harsh hearted woman, beautiful and dominating. The second Hemingway female, is the woman who is merely passive, and immensely submissive to men (Umlauf 25-6). In Umlauf's article, it is further written that Hemingway detested equality in a relationship and that he despised men who enable themselves to be controlled by women. It is written moreover in her article that, according to Hemingway, women should merely be submissive to their husbands, constantly praise them and satisfy their egos, while demanding nothing for themselves (Umlauf 25). Umlauf's article is one of the many scholarly articles delving into Hemingway's misogynic view on the female characters in his novels. Thus, wealth of material focusing on Hemingway's portrayal of the females in his novels can be found. As regards the female characters of this particular novel, *To Have and Have Not*, there are written essays focusing on Hemingway's portrayal of them. One scholar, namely, Stella Sabedra Beat is of the many who has written an essay focusing on Hemingway's depiction of women in his novels. Beat's essay, titled "*An Analysis of Hemingway's Women*", focuses primarily on Hemingway's portrayal of the female characters in his major novels and in her essay, the portrayal of four female characters from Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not* is included. Beat's aim with her study, however, differs from this essay, because the intended results she hoped to achieve with her thesis was to prove that women in Hemingway's novels are a mixture of "good" and "bad" characters, and to prove that critics who claim that these women are either "good" or "bad" are wrong. In her essay, Beat further aimed to emphasize that Hemingway's view on his women characters altered with time.

Moreover, Ari Ikonen, has written an essay titled “*Masculinities in Hemingway’s To Have and Have Not*”, but Ikonen’s essay, however, just as the title hints, is intended to study the representations of masculinities of the novel.

Another Hemingway scholar, namely Arthur Waldhorn, also writes about the novel *To Have and Have Not*. In his book, “*A Reader’s Guide to Ernest Hemingway*”, Waldhorn touches briefly upon some of Hemingway’s female characters of the novel. Also, Kim Moreland, a Professor of English, in her article, titled “*To Have and Hold Not*”, moreover touches upon Hemingway’s portrayal of three female characters of this specific novel, *To Have and Have Not*. In her article, Moreland examines the portrayal of Helen, Dorothy and Marie of the novel. Her findings were that all these women end up alone, whether by their men’s demise or disinterest. Moreland, moreover, observes that Hemingway’s depictions of these females were made in order to express the guilt that befell him after divorcing Pauline, his wife. (Moreland 91) These previous works, however, are not authored with the intention to investigate the traits of the females in *To Have and Have Not* which corresponds to Simone de Beauvoir’s notions, namely the roles of women in patriarchal society.

To Have and Have Not – A Brief Synopsis

To Have and Have Not is mainly about the protagonist Harry Morgan, who has chosen to embark on odd and perilous jobs that bring food on the table.

The story begins in Havana, Cuba, where Harry earns a living by working as fishing guide. When cheated by one of his customers out of 825 dollars, Harry becomes broke. Lacking an income, he is forced to do smuggling business between Cuba and America, smuggling both liquor and people.

In this novel, the lives of a range of individuals are also depicted. One group consists of wealthy people with marital problems; the other consists of the unfortunate poor ones that mostly do illegal jobs. The main group, the “Conchs,” includes poor people, such as Harry Morgan. These groups encounter difficulties when striving to find jobs, but are less troubled than those possessing great wealth. The other group is those with huge riches, but living troubled lives,

facing problems regarding legal issues, having troubled marriages, multiple sexual partners, and being mostly depressed and unhappy.

To Have and Have Not aims to depict how money alters the lives of these two groups. It also depicts that money is not everything and that no matter how much money you possess you are still going to encounter troubles in life and that having too much money may even cause depression.

Theoretical Approach

In order to explore the female characters in Hemingway's novel, the work of the feminist writer, Simone de Beauvoir will be turned to, namely her renowned book *The Second Sex*. De Beauvoir's primary thesis is that women are oppressed by men and that they are perceived as inferior, namely as the other. De Beauvoir argues that men are seen as the dominant, autonomous and essential and that women are seen as weak, inessential, subordinated, and dependent. Moreover, de Beauvoir argues that women are unrightfully positioned as inferior to men in the society, and that this is based on the mythical representations of women which are imprinted in the human conscious, thus creating difficulties for women who want to break free from these norms. It is further argued by de Beauvoir that women are not born 'feminine'. Instead, they are merely shaped by the norms that society has forced upon them. It is also explained by de Beauvoir that women's roles, such as taking care of the housework, bearing children and being sex slaves, deprive women of their autonomy and make them into objects. In this essay, the main theoretical perspective that will be used is de Beauvoir's theory regarding the view of women as the Other. By this term, the Other, women's subordinate position in society is emphasized by de Beauvoir, arguing that in order for a subject, that is the dominant man, to exist, there must be an object, that is, a subordinate woman. Here, de Beauvoir explains the norm of perceiving women as inferior to men since men are perceived as superior. Thus women are perceived as the Other. Regarding these disparities between male and female, de Beauvoir stated that "for him, she is sex- absolute sex, no less. [...] He is the Subject, he is the Absolute- she is the other" (de Beauvoir 16). This aspect will be focused on in this essay, and since this aspect explores men's power and women's subordination to men, which is a feature in *To Have and Have Not*, it will be useful for an analysis of the female characters in Hemingway's novel.

The portrayal of the females as “absolute sex”, subordinated to men, will shortly be explored. Before delving into these analyses, the key term subordination needs to be explained. The term subordination should be understood as inferiority. When this specific term, subordinate, is used on individuals, then the meaning of worthlessness and inferiority is implied. Thus, an individual who is in a subordinate position can be perceived as worthless, and is often neglected.

Now, Hemingway’s portrayal of the females in *To Have and Have Not* will be examined. Thus, the manner in which these women are portrayed as “absolute sex”, assuming subordinate roles will be delved into.

Marie Morgan

Now the first woman to be examined is Marie Morgan.

What do you suppose a woman like that thinks about? What do you suppose she does in bed? How does her husband feel about her when she gets that size? Who do you suppose he runs around with in this town? Wasn’t she an appalling looking woman? Like a battleship. Terrific. [...]He would compare her to the young, firm-breasted, full-lipped little Jewess [...] (122-123).

In the novel, Marie is depicted as unattractive, fat, hideous, and her body is likened to a battleship. Marie is, moreover, depicted as despised by her husband, namely because of her corpulent body, which the information above highlight. Here, Richard Gordon’s opinion of women as “absolute sex” is highlighted and we can fathom that according to Richard, a fat and hideous woman, such as Marie, is not worth much importance, because her ugly and corpulent body makes her incapable to sexually please her husband and moreover makes her appalling to her husband. Therefore, Marie’s is, to quote Richard Gordon “appalling”. Examining these depictions of Marie Morgan, we are shown Richard’s preference of women, namely that they should be “young, firm-breasted, full-lipped”, and since Marie with her corpulent body, does not fulfill these criteria’s, she is despised and scorned. Here, scrutinizing Richard Gordon’s comparison of Marie Morgan with the young attractive and beautiful women, we are highlighted information which corresponds the portrayal of Marie Morgan to Simone de Beauvoir’s notion,

namely that to men, women are “absolute sex”. Firstly, scrutinizing Richard Gordon’s depiction of Marie, a plausible assumption is that, to Richard Gordon, a woman is “absolute sex” and she must therefore possess extreme beauty and she must also be sexually appealing, in order for him to enjoy sex with her. Thus, in Richard Gordon’s opinion, only women who are attractive and sexually pleasing can be labeled as “absolute sex”, and because Marie does not fulfill these traits, she is scorned and hated. The information which illuminates this assumption, moreover, is highlighted in the episode where Richard Gordon ponders over Marie, thinking that Marie definitely cannot be good in bed because of her huge and hideous body. Here, Richard Gordon’s thoughts “How does her husband feel about her when she gets that size” and “Who do you suppose he runs around with in this town?”, illuminate interesting details, namely that a man who has a wife so “appalling” as Marie Morgan is in pain and misery and that such a man inevitably must have an alternative sex partner. In addition, scrutinizing Richard’s perceptions of Marie, we are highlighted Hemingway’s sexist tendencies. Marie, as stated earlier, is depicted by Richard as incapable in bed and is despised for her corpulent body and unattractive appearance. Therefore, a plausible implication here, is that to Hemingway, fat and ugly women cannot be in good in bed. Thus, here, Hemingway’s trait of sexist portrayal of women in his novels is highlighted, which for example, Fantina acknowledges (Hatten 157-8).

Secondly, in the novel, Marie Morgan is depicted in a manner corresponding furthermore with de Beauvoir’s notion regarding men’s perception of women as “absolute sex”. This time, Marie, portrayed as dying for sexual intercourse with her husband Harry Morgan, “[Leans] over the table and [kisses] him on the mouth” and is told “Leave me alone, I got to think”(89). Here, neglected and ignored, Marie makes a new attempt, saying “Aw, Harry,[...] [holding] him tight against her”(90), and is yet again shunned, and she is told “Let me go. I ain't got no time”(90). Here, we can comprehend Marie’s eagerness to have sexual intercourse, but as we also see here, Marie is fully neglected and shunned. Here, an interesting detail is that Marie is depicted as the sexually forward, in need of Harry Morgan, and not the other way around. In another episode, we are highlighted Marie's past as a prostitute. On this occasion, while having sexual intercourse with Harry Morgan, Marie says “There ain’t no other men like that. People ain’t never tried them don’t know. I’ve had plenty of them” (81), hinting her past as a prostitute and her experience of having multiple sex partners. Here, Marie’s infatuation for sexual intercourse is portrayed, this

interesting information is vividly depicted when Marie says “Christ, I could do that all night if a man was built that way. I’d like to do it and never sleep. Never, never, no, never. No, never, never, never” (81). The last episode, in which Marie Morgan is moreover portrayed as “absolute sex”, occurs when Harry Morgan comes home, lies on the bed, with Marie’s “[...] lips on his face [...] searching for him and then her hand on him“(79). In this scene, Marie is asked “Do you want to?”, and quickly replies “Yes. Now”, thus vividly revealing that Marie Morgan is “absolute sex”.

Next, the manner in which Marie Morgan is portrayed as subordinated and inferior in the novel will be examined.

Firstly, analyzing the relationship between Marie and her husband Harry Morgan, Harry’s regard of Marie as inferior can be seen. One detail is, for example highlighted when Marie kisses Harry, and thereafter, is told “Leave me alone, I got to think” (89). A second detail is moreover highlighted when Marie hugs Harry, awaiting a positive reaction, but instead, gets shunned and is neglected. This time, Marie is told “Let me go. I ain’t got no time” (90). A third detail, moreover illuminating Marie’s inferiority and subordination to Harry is highlighted in the episode where Harry asks Marie if she is willing to have sexual intercourse. On this occasion, as already stated, the answer given to Harry by Marie is “Yes. Now” (79). Here, scrutinizing Harry’s question “do you want to”, a plausible assumption is that this specific question was posed by Harry as a mean to indicate his power over Marie, knowing that Marie is incapable to refuse to have sex with him. Thus, here, the assumption is that Marie fears to refuse Harry’s request, which is highlighted by her quick reply “yes, now”. Thus, in this scene, Marie’s weakness and subordination in relation to Harry Morgan can be observed. Secondly, the scene in the kitchen furthermore stresses the power relation between Harry Morgan and Marie Morgan. In this episode, Harry enters the kitchen and asks Marie “What have you got to eat?”(88). Here, Harry is, later on, aggravated for the food delaying, and exclaims, “Where’s my dinner? What you waiting for?”(88). On this occasion, Marie, depicted as weak, inferior and fearful answers “I’m bringing it” (88). Thus, scrutinizing these events from the novel, we can observe that these depictions of Marie Morgan resemble the ideas of de Beauvoir regarding the subordinate and inferior woman. Thus, it is vividly highlighted that Harry Morgan is the Subject, namely the “supreme” and “absolute”, while Marie is merely the Other, namely, as stated earlier, weak and

inferior. In addition, we can comprehend that Umlauf's observations regarding Hemingway's love of female submission, hatred for equality in relationships, and his contempt for men permitting women to manipulate them (Umlauf 25), are here useful to illuminate an understanding of why Hemingway depicted Marie Morgan with these traits.

Dorothy Hollis

Now the portrayal of Dorothy Hollis, another female character in Hemingway's novel, will be analyzed.

Hemingway's character, Dorothy Hollis, the woman who "[...] want a lot it [to] feel so fine" (168), is moreover, portrayed in the novel as "absolute sex". On a boat, having difficulties sleeping, Dorothy is portrayed as dying, longing for a man to have sexual intercourse with. Eddie, her sex partner, fails to have sex with her in the manner she had wanted him to. Thus, Dorothy, in her agony, starts thinking "I wish I'd brought a maid" (167), and "[...]It's just it itself, and you would love them always if they gave it to you" (168). Here, examining these portrayals of Dorothy Hollis, we are highlighted details which shows that Dorothy is a female that loves having sexual intercourse. More details, emphasizing Dorothy's love for sexual intercourse, are highlighted when she thinks "If I lie here now all night and can't sleep I'll go crazy" (169), further proving her immense love for sexual intercourse. Here, Dorothy, realizing that no man can be found, continues crying out, thinking "Oh, well, I might as well. I hate to but what can you do? What can you do but go ahead and do it even though, even though" (169). Here, analyzing this specific interior thought, an implication highlighted, is that masturbation is a means for Dorothy to attain the sexual pleasure that she passionately seeks. In addition, this episode enable for us to fathom how vital a man is to Dorothy. Here, depicted as sex thirsty, weak and neglected, Dorothy exaggeratingly longs for a man. These details of Dorothy are interesting, for they remind us of de Beauvoir's observation, namely that man can think of himself without a woman, but woman cannot think of herself without a man (de Beauvoir 8). Thus, these details are moreover demonstrating for us that Hemingway's character Dorothy Hollis is reduced to the role which resembles de Beauvoir's observation, namely that women are perceived by men as "absolute sex" and that women simply is the Other, meaning they are inferior and subordinated.

Another interesting detail, as observed by P. Eby, which help illuminate Hemingway's portrayal of Dorothy, moreover, is that the name "Hollis", the surname given to Dorothy, is an indication of Hemingway's destructive relationship with his wife Pauline (P. Eby 96). In addition, according to Moreland, many of the females in *To Have and Have Not*, were portrayed as a way of highlighting the guilt Hemingway felt after breaking up with his second wife, Pauline (Moreland 91). Therefore, we can assume that the women in *To Have and Have Not* were not merely portrayed as a way for Hemingway to express his guilt for parting with his wife, but rather, they were depicted as a way for Hemingway to indicate and highlight his hatred and irritation for Pauline parting up with him. Thus, perhaps these depictions of Dorothy as lonely, neglected, longing for a man to have sexual intercourse with, were means for Hemingway to content himself for his breaking up with Pauline. However, Dorothy Hollis has traits which corresponds with de Beauvoir's observation regarding the view of women as "absolute sex", taking subordinate roles.

Helene Bradley

The character Helene Bradley has traits of the typical Hemingway female, which is acknowledged by Umlauf. Thus, Helene is beautiful, evil and harsh mannered (Umlauf 25-6). Although married to Tommy Bradley, Helene has multiple sex partners, having sexual intercourse with them in her husband's presence. Portrayed as an immense lover of sexual intercourse, Helene moreover, begs, and forces men to have to sex with her, hitting them if they refuse to.

That afternoon she had not seen him as the door opened. [...] Richard Gordon had turned his head and seen him, standing heavy and bearded in the doorway. Don't stop, Helene had said. Please don't stop. [...] But Richard Gordon had stopped and his head was still turned, staring. "Don't mind him. Don't mind anything. Don't you see you can't stop now? [...] The bearded man had closed the door softly. He was smiling. What's the matter, darling? Helene Bradley had asked, now in the darkness again. I must go. Don't you see you can't go? That man-" "That's only Tommy," Helene had said. "He knows all about these things. Don't mind him. Come on, darling. Please do. I can't. You must, Helene had

said. [...]I have to go, said Richard Gordon. In the darkness he had felt the slap across his face. Then there was another slap. Across his mouth this time (131-132).

This episode emphasizes Hemingway's portrayal of Helene Bradley as "absolute sex". Here, Helene, visited by Richard Gordon, the married man, in her husband's presence, has sexual intercourse with Richard, when Helene's husband Tommy, suddenly shows up. Here, Helene, displays her ill manners, saying "That's only Tommy, don't mind him". Moreover, when Richard ceases the sexual intercourse, to her agony, she says "don't stop". Then she says "please don't stop", this time, adding "please", to stress her misery for Richard ceasing the sexual intercourse. In addition, Helene says to Richard "Come on, darling. Please do", and Richard says "I can't", and Helene exclaims, "you must". Delving into these portrayals of Helene Bradley, we see the traits of Helene as "absolute sex". In addition, examining Moreland's suggestion, that Hemingway depicted most of the females in *To Have and Have Not* as a way of showing guilt for his parting with Pauline (Moreland 91), we are highlighted interesting information which help us fathom why Hemingway portrayed Helene Bradley with such traits. As Moreland, moreover, observed, Hemingway portrayed the character Helene Bradley as a way to condemn Jane Mason, a woman who Hemingway previously had a relationship with (Moreland 92). Therefore, a plausible understanding we get by scrutinizing Moreland's claims along with these depictions of Helene, is that, Hemingway tends to depict women he dislikes in a negative and harsh sexual manner. This assumption is, moreover, emphasized by P. Eby, who observed that sexuality is so central and vital in Hemingway's depiction of relationships (P. Eby 99). Thus, delving into Hemingway's portrayal of Helene, any indications of guilt and sadness, as a result of Hemingway's marriage collapse, which Moreland assumed, are blurry. Instead, the plausible causes for these portrayals seems to be based on hatred and anger, which is further detected, when Hemingway's portrayal of Helene Bradley is contrasted with his depiction of Dorothy Hollis. Both women are portrayed as lonely, neglected, and in agony, longing for men to have sexual intercourse with.

Did you see Tommy Bradley today? Asked Henry Carpenter. I can't bear him, said Wallace. Neither him nor that whore of a wife of his. I like Helene, said Henry Carpenter. She has such a good time. Did you ever try it? Of course. It's marvelous. I can't stick her

at any price, said Wallace Johnston [...] She's a remarkably nice woman, you'd like her, Wally (158).

Here, the two friends are having a discourse about Helene Bradley, emphasizing their perception of Helene as "absolute sex". In this episode, Helene is called a "whore", and negative remarks are utilized, to refer to Helene and her sexual activities. Wallace, for example, uses the pronoun "it", to refer to Helene Bradley, demonstrating his lack of respect for her. Moreover, Henry, when asked whether he have had sexual intercourse with Helene, exclaims, "Of course. It's marvelous", demonstrating moreover his view on Helene as "absolute sex". Here, by Henry's statement "it's marvelous", his taught of Helene as a thing to be used, in order to attain sexual pleasure can be fathomed. In addition, examining Henry's statements, namely "She's a remarkably nice woman," and "You'd like her, Wally", an assumption highlighted, is that Helene is adored by Henry, namely because she is attractive and sexually active. Here, contrasting Henry's view of Helene Bradley as "marvelous" with Richard Gordon's view of Marie Morgan as "appalling", one assumption we are highlighted is that, in Hemingway's view, only women who are extraordinary beautiful, and sexually active can be perceived by as "absolute sex". In addition, Wallace's use of the word "whore", as an attempt to refer to Helene Bradley and his dislike for her, moreover, indicates for us Hemingway's irritation and displeasure for breaking up with his previous spouses. Therefore, perhaps, the portrayal of Helene Bradley as "whore", was a means for Hemingway to content himself after breaking up with Jane Mason and Pauline, as was the portrayal of Dorothy Hollis. However, scrutinizing these two men's harsh discourse concerning Helene Bradley, we are highlighted interesting details which demonstrates for us their view of Helene Bradley as "absolute sex". Thus, this episode, moreover, demonstrates for us that the portrayal of Helene Bradley resembles de Beauvoir's notions regarding men's view of women as "absolute sex".

In addition, scrutinizing Helene's harsh conduct during the intercourse with Richard Gordon and examining Wallace's discourse with his friend Henry, we are highlighted interesting details which corresponds to Fantina's claims. As Fantina observed, Hemingway had masochistic sexual tendencies (Hatten 157), which is highlighted in these two separate episodes. Firstly, during Helene's intercourse with Richard, Helene is furious and brutally slaps Richard, enraged for Richard refusing to obey her command. Here, it seems that Helene, the sex crazy masochist, not

only takes pleasure in being humiliated in front of her husband, but she also enjoys applying force during sexual intercourse. Secondly, more details hinting Hemingway's masochistic tendencies is highlighted when Wallace, as stated earlier, calls Helene a "whore", utilizing the word "stick" as an attempt to depict his repulsion of sexual intercourse with Helene. Here, labeling Wallace as a masochistic based on his conduct is complicated. However, scrutinizing Wallace's harsh descriptions of Helene, it is, instead, demonstrated that Wallace is a man of a sadistic nature, who probably enjoys humiliating and scorning his female sex partners during intercourse. Thus, we can also assume that Hemingway had these traits, as Fantina, as stated earlier, observed.

In addition, delving into Hemingway's depiction of Helene Bradley, Helene's inferiority and subordination can be observed. For example, Wallace's reference to Helene as "it", depicts for us his view of Helene as beneath his status. Here, we are highlighted that Helene is a thing lacking value. Here, it is illuminated that Helene is not referred to as "her", but rather "it", to stress Helene Bradley's inferiority. Furthermore, Wallace's comment, "I can't stick her at any price", moreover, vividly paints for us his perception of Helene as inferior. By Wallace's choice of a verb, "stick", utilized to refer to sexual intercourse, we are, moreover, shown his view of Helene as totally below his class. Moreover, in the episode of sexual intercourse between Helene and Richard Gordon, Helene Bradley is portrayed as subordinate and inferior. Helene's constant pleading, "please, please, please", begging Richard Gordon to have sexual intercourse with her, highlights Helene's submissiveness and powerlessness in relation to Richard Gordon. Here, Richard Gordon's status as "the absolute" and "superior" is highlighted, while Helene Bradley's inferiority and subordination is demonstrated. Here de Beauvoir's observations, namely that woman are dependent and inferior to men, if not his slave (de Beauvoir 17), illuminates for us, moreover, the portrayal of Helene Bradley. Thus, scrutinizing the above narrative, we are highlighted that gender roles in this episode correspond to de Beauvoir's observations regarding the view of men as subjects and absolute and the view of women as the other, namely inferior.

Laughton's Wife

The character called "Laughton's wife", is moreover, portrayed as "absolute sex". Although, married to James Laughton, this Hemingway female give traits of Hemingway's typical crude, deceptive and manipulative female characters, and seduces other men. Examining the conduct of Laughton's wife at the bar, we are highlighted details which demonstrate for us that this character, moreover, is "absolute sex". Firstly, in one occasion, at the bar, Harry asks Freddy, the bar owner, "can I speak to you" (92), and Laughton's wife, in her husband's presence, although not addressed, interrupts and says to Harry "Certainly. Go right ahead and say anything you like" (92). Here, we can assume that Harry Morgan is being seduced by Laughton's wife. However, in this episode, Laughton's wife is scorned, her attempt to seduce Harry is unfruitful, and she is told "shut up, you whore" (92). Moreover, she makes further attempts to seduce Harry. This time, also in her husband's company, she perceives Harry Morgan and exclaims "If it isn't my dream man" (105). Here, when Harry intends to leave the bar, she tells him "don't go" (105), then she says to Harry "please don't go"(105), revealing immense need of Harry Morgan, indicating her desire to have sexual intercourse with him. Secondly, the depiction of Laughton's wife as "absolute sex" is moreover, vividly highlighted, when her utterances at the bar are examined. This time, at the bar, she says to Professor Macwalsey's, "you know, I like you"(95), then says to her husband after the absence of the professor, "I liked the professor, he had a sweet manner" (95), adding, "but that Ghengis Khan one would do me"(96), referring to Harry Morgan. Scrutinizing her specific statement, "but that Ghengis Khan one would do me", it is vividly demonstrated for us that Laughton's wife is "absolute sex". Furthermore, in this episode, regarding the mannerism of Professor Macwalsey's, she says to her husband "My, he was nice" (96). Here, James Laughton, her husband makes an interesting comment, namely "You'll probably see him again" (96). Here, examining Laughton's statement, we are highlighted information that demonstrates for us, moreover, that this woman is "absolute sex". Thus, by this statement, we can assume that, to James Laughton's, the wife is an immense sex lover, and if she ventured to meet with Professor Macwalsey's, hoping to have sexual intercourse with him, it would not be an incident of amazement. Laughton's statement, moreover, highlights for us that Laughton's wife probably has had other sex partners or is currently cheating on James Laughton.

Thus Laughton's statement "You'll probably see him again", perhaps, suggest his awareness of his wife's indulging in sexual affairs with other men, in his absence.

In addition, scrutinizing the portrayal of Laughton's wife, we are highlighted interesting information which demonstrate for us Hemingway's sexist tendencies. It should be borne in mind that in the novel, Laughton's wife is said to possess "blonde curly hair cut short like a man's, a bad complexion, [with] face and build of a lady wrestler"(91), and when Harry Gordon's treatment of her at the bar, calling her a "whore", is scrutinized, we can fathom Hemingway's disgust for women resembling men. One vital detail supporting this assumption can be observed when Freddy, the bar owner's perception of Laughton's wife is scrutinized. Freddy describes Laughton's wife as repulsive, scorning her for her manly appearance. In this episode, Freddy thinks, "God, isn't she awful?" (96) and "What kind of a man was it would pick out a woman like that to live with?"(97). Moreover, Freddy thinks, "not even with your eyes shut," (97). Here, Freddy's thoughts of Laughton's wife, perhaps, imply that a strong build is not suitable for women and that women should not resemble men in their appearance, thus, Laughton's wife, with her strong build and manly appearance, is detested by Freddy. Thus, a plausible assumption we get by scrutinizing this episode is that Hemingway dislike women who possess a strong build and resembles men. Perhaps, maybe these depictions of Laughton's wife are the result of another destructive Hemingway relationship with a woman, as it was with Helene Bradley and Dorothy Hollis. Here, moreover, we can assume that Hemingway, by help of his novels, tends to portray his dislike and hatred for women, who in real life, failed in fulfilling his personal view on gender. However, these sexist tendencies are very interesting, since they correspond with Simone de Beauvoir's ideas. As Beauvoir observed, men represent something positive, but women, on the other hand, are represented as something negative (de Beauvoir 6). Thus, we can understand why a woman, such as Laughton's wife, with a strong build and manly appearance is vividly scorned and is object for ridicule.

In addition, exploring the depiction of Laughton's wife at the bar, we are, moreover, highlighted details which demonstrate her weakness and subordination. At the bar, Laughton's wife is, as stated earlier, called a "whore", scorned and humiliated. Yet, in this episode, depicted as enchanted by Harry, who had just disrespected her, she eagerly plead him to linger in her company, saying "don't go", begging him "please don't go". In this episode, we are highlighted

Laughton's wife subordination and her incapability of verbally combating Harry Morgan for calling her a whore, instead, as it is observed here, she is portrayed as powerless, weak, subordinating herself to Harry. Moreover, scrutinizing Laughton's wife conduct in this episode, we can observe that the portrayal of Laughton's wife correspond with Hemingway's desire for inequality in relationships, and his interest for women who worship their men, as Umlauf observed. Moreover, de Beauvoir's observations, namely that woman is expected to abide by the command of men and function as his slave, help us fathom why Laughton's wife has been depicted in this manner. Thus, the above narratives demonstrates for us why Harry Morgan is portrayed as the vital and supreme while Laughton's wife is depicted as neglected and subordinated. Thus, here, we see that the depictions of Laughton's wife correspond to Beauvoir's ideas of men as subjects and absolute and the view of women as the other, namely inferior.

Helen Gordon

Hemingway's portrayal of Helen Gordon, will now be examined.

In the novel, depicted as the possessor of a "lovely Irish face, dark hair [curling] almost to her shoulders and smooth clear skin" (97), "the prettiest stranger in Key West that winter" (97), Helen Gordon is one of Hemingway's passive, submissive female characters, regarded as "absolute sex". Here, comparing the portrayal of Helen Gordon with the depictions of Laughton's wife and Richard Gordon's descriptions of Marie Morgan, much interesting details, highlighting Hemingway's view on gender, are shown. First of all, Freddy, the bar owner, who previously had scorned Laughton's wife for her manly appearance, here, stares "admiringly" at Helen. Here, Freddy's "admiration" for Helen, probably because of Helen's sexy appearance, furthermore suggests that, in Hemingway's view, only women who are beautiful and attractive can be regarded as "absolute sex". It should be borne in mind, as stated earlier, that, Freddy detested Laughton's wife, because of her wrestler body and manly appearance, as Richard Gordon despised Marie Morgan for her ugly and "appalling" appearance. However, in this episode, Freddy, seeing Helen Gordon, beautiful, with her soft and smooth skin, Freddy adores her, gazing at Helen fascinatingly and "admiringly". Thus, here, the assumptions we get, scrutinizing these comparisons, is that Hemingway despise women who resemble men and women who are not attractive nor sexually enticing. Therefore, Laughton's wife, as well as Marie Morgan, are detested and they are a cause for repulsion. Helen Gordon, on the other hand,

with her beautiful body and pretty face, is regarded as “absolute sex”, and consequently, Helen is praised by Freddy. Thus, here, we can observe that Hemingway’s depiction of Helen Gordon corresponds with de Beauvoir’s ideas regarding men’s perception of women as “absolute sex”.

Another episode, demonstrating for us the portrayal of Helen Gordon as “absolute sex” is highlighted when Helen quarrels with Richard Gordon. In this scene, a quarrel takes place between Helen and Richard Gordon, and Helen is called “bitch”. The quarrel, occurring because Helen had permitted Professor Macwalsey’s to accompany her home, and the two had kissed. Here, when asked, “Did you kiss him?”(127), Helen says “No” (127). Then, Helen is asked, “Did he kiss you?”(127), and Helen replies “Yes, I liked it” (127). Here, Richard Gordon, frustrated and aggravated, twice says to Helen “You bitch”, and shortly, Helen is brutally slapped (128). Here, Fantina’s observation of Hemingway’s male characters having traits of Hemingway’s masochistic behavior (Hatten 157), help us fathom Richard Gordon’s conduct in this episode. Here, a suggestion is that Richard Gordon, perhaps not a masochist, is just like Wallace and Harry Morgan, a sadist, who perhaps finds amusement in humiliating and beating women. This suggestion is moreover emphasized when Helen says to him “I’m so sorry for you, Dick” (132), and Richard Gordon, completely apathetic, says “Don’t you be sorry for me or I’ll slap you again” (132). In addition, Helen’s statement, when asked if she had been kissed by Macwalsey’s, “yes, I liked it”, moreover illuminate for us that she is “absolute sex”. Furthermore, in this scene, Helen, intending to marry Professor Macwalsey’s, is asked “What are you going to do?” (129). Here, she says “I don’t know yet. I may marry John Macwalsey’s” (129), and is told “You will not” (129), and she says “I will if I wish” (129). Then Richard says to Helen, “He wouldn’t marry you” (129). Here, scrutinizing this specific utterance by Richard Gordon, we are highlighted an interesting detail, moreover, demonstrating that Helen is “absolute sex”. Here, a plausible implication is that, Richard Gordon merely sees Helen as “absolute sex”, and consequently, reasons that Professor Macwalsey’s only intends having sexual intercourse with Helen, and thereafter discarding her. Thus, here, we can observe, as stated earlier, how Hemingway’s depiction of Helen Gordon corresponds with de Beauvoir’s ideas regarding men’s perception of women as “absolute sex”.

Finally, the portrayal of Helen Gordon as subordinated and inferior will be examined.

At the bar, the depictions of Helen Gordon as subordinated to her husband can be observed. This time, Helen, bored and wanting to leave the bar, says “I’m going home” (98), and asks Richard “Are you coming, Dick?”(98). Here, Richard Gordon, neglecting her, says “I thought I’d stay down town a while” (98), and Helen, completely amazed and perplexed at this reply, asks “Yes?” (98), wanting to confirm that she had heard correctly, and Richard, moreover exposing his apathy, answers “Yes,” (98). Examining this scene, Helen’s subordination is highlighted. Here, Helen is portrayed as lonely, in need of her husband, but she is neglected. Richard, in this episode, portrayed as the “absolute and supreme”, is asked to accompany the lonely, afraid and exposed Helen Gordon, but refuses. Here, Helen’s statement “Are you coming, Dick?” suggests her weakness and incapability of going home alone, and is thus requesting for Richards company. Moreover, Helen’s subordination is portrayed when quarrelling with Richard Morgan. In this scene, Helen, slapped, scorned and labeled bitch, is told “I’m going out for a while” (133). Here, Helen, depicted as weak and lonely, says “Oh, don’t go out” (133), pleading Richard, the man who had recently mistreated her to linger in her company. Hemingway’s portrayal of Helen here, is interesting in the sense that it reminds us of Laughton’s wife conduct at the bar. There, Laughton’s wife, also portrayed as weak and subordinated, was humiliated and scorned by Harry Morgan, but Laughton’s wife, just as Helen Gordon, pleads Harry Morgan not to go. Thus, scrutinizing these details, traits of Hemingway’s passion for woman who are submissive, passive and worshipping their men can be seen, as Umlauf observed. However, these episodes highlights Helen’s vulnerability and powerlessness in relation to Richard Gordon. Thus, we can observe that Helen Gordon's conducts corresponds with de Beauvoir’s notions regarding the perception of women as subordinate and inferior to men.

Conclusion

To sum up, applying a beauvoirian reading on Hemingway's novel *To Have and Have Not*, we can observe that the women in the novel are portrayed in a manner resembling women in a patriarchal society, as observed by Simone de Beauvoir. They are all portrayed as "absolute sex" and are subordinated to men. Moreover, they are all scorned and humiliated. Two interesting details which illuminates an explanation of the females in *To Have and Have Not* are highlighted, firstly by Moreland, who observed that many of the female characters were portrayed in these manners as a result of Hemingway's marriage breakdown and his previous bad relationship with women. Secondly, Umlauf's observation regarding Hemingway's love for women who are weak and subordinated to men, moreover illuminates an understanding of the females in the novel. Thus, we can fathom why the female characters are portrayed as inferior and subordinated. Moreover, we can fathom why characters, such as Helene Bradley, Dorothy Hollis and Laughton's wife are depicted as scorned and neglected, longing for men. Last of all, de Beauvoir's observations of women as the Other and men's perception of women as "absolute sex" are useful and help us understand Hemingway's view on gender and explains the conducts and depictions of the females in *ToHave and Have Not*.

Works Cited List

Carrera, J.M. Armengol. "Race-ing Hemingway: Revisions of Masculinity and/as Whiteness in Ernest Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa and Under Kilimanjaro" *The Hemingway Review*, Volume 31, Number 1, Fall 2011, pp. 43-61. Muse

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Great Britain: Jonathan Cape, 1953. Print

Dubus III, Andre. "Ernest Hemingway: Why His Work Matters Now More than Ever, A Love Letter from the Digital World" *The Hemingway Review*, Volume 32, Number 1, Fall 2012, pp. 7-15. Muse

Eby, Carl P. "Wake Up Alone and Like It!: Dorothy Hollis, Marjorie Hillis, and To Have and Have Not". *The Hemingway Review*, Volume 26, Number 1, Fall 2006, pp. 96-105. Muse

Hatten, Charles. "Ernest Hemingway: Machismo and Masochism". *South Atlantic Review* Vol. 71, No. 3, Summer, 2006 pp. 157-160. Jstor

Hemingway, Ernest. *To Have and Have Not*. United Kingdom: Jonathan Cape, 1937. Print.

Moreland, Kim. "To Have and Hold Not: Marie Morgan, Helen Gordon, and Dorothy Hollis. *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Eds. Lawrence Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: U Alabama P, 2002. 81-92. Print.

Umlauf, Elyse. "The Women of Fitzgerald's and Hemingway's Fiction". 5-1-1985, pp.21-28
Lake Forest College.