

WUTHERING HEIGHTS:
A DIONYSIAC VISION

Brian Crews
Universidad de Sevilla

The openness and plurality of *Wuthering Heights* have often been remarked upon and arise out of its heterogeneous nature, where a wide variety of patterns and generic traits can be clearly identified¹. However, the broad range of interpretations which this much talked about novel has inspired exists largely due to a tendency to focus on one particular aspect and ignore or minimise another, which has led some critics to advise against definitive or whole interpretations.²

In *Wuthering Heights* there is an obvious mixture of genres, patterns and traditions, all of which form a rather ambiguous and unique whole.³ But it *is* a coherent whole and the different facets that make up the structure of the novel *can* be viewed as part of a larger, more inclusive pattern. D. Van Ghent has pointed out that the form of the novel *is* its content: a series of contrasts which reflects the idea of conflict at the centre of the work.⁴ But this falls short. We can go a little further and suggest a relationship between this structure and that attributed to classical Greek tragedy in Nietzsche's, often criticised work, *The Birth of Tragedy*. That is to say that the novel's structure and content can be spoken of in terms of the Dionysiac and Apollonian, a comparison which might help to clear up some of the anomalies in many earlier interpretations. Of course, the relation with classical Greek tragedy has been noted before, but never quite from this point of view and only as one of the novel's many interlacing patterns.⁵ Some of those to be outlined here will already be familiar to critics, but other recognisable patterns will also be identified. It remains only to state that it will become clear that the Nietzschean idea encompasses all of them.

Critics have already identified the basic contrast of the novel, that of the opposition between quotidian reality and a belief in the transcendental. This manifests itself in different forms in many different interpretations (children of storm and calm, Thrushcross Grange opposed to *Wuthering Heights*, excess against limitation and so on),⁶ but in that quotidian reality we can see *Wuthering Heights* as a typical Victorian social novel where the affairs of everyday life are depicted in detail. Arnold Kettle sums it up this way:

Wuthering Heights is about England in 1847 and the years before. The people it reveals live not in a never-never land but in Yorkshire. Heathcliff was not born in the pages of Byron, but in a Liverpool slum.

The language of Nelly, Joseph and Hareton is the language of Yorkshire people. The story of *Wuthering Heights* is concerned not with love in the abstract, but with the passions of living people, with property ownership, the attraction of social comforts, the arrangement of marriages, the importance of education, the validity of religion, the relations of rich and poor.⁷

But this clearly ignores the other side of the contrast: the Gothic, romantic impact of the novel and the transcendental beliefs of the lovers. In spite of this, though, there is an almost naturalistic realism: we find the use of dialect and the detailed description of landscape and activities within the home. So, although we have our Gothic hero, Heathcliff, he is in absolute contrast to the mundane characters of the novel. We must remember that it is they, Nelly Dean and Lockwood, who report the action and break it up with rationalising comments. In fact, on this level, we might see these rather typical characters as coming out of the comedy of manners tradition of Jane Austen: the fop, Lockwood, his *romantic* adventures, the situations in the Grange, the irony inherent in Lockwood and Nelly's observations, the standardised morality and drawing room conversation are all a part of this tradition.

However, this is only a part complementing the rest, perhaps saving the novel from becoming too ridiculous, making the far-fetched more convincing or the unfamiliar more acceptable. This is a romance but it takes place in a very real world, which is itself a structural element of the novel and related to the way in which the story is told. We might apply the terms Dionysiac and Apollonian to these contrasting elements here, but more will be said about that later.

An important aspect of the novel which has often been commented upon is the influence of Shakespeare and, in particular, of *King Lear*.⁸ Heathcliff's story is clearly related to the subplot of *Lear*: it is the story of a bastard son who usurps the affections of the legitimate son; who has him put out of his house, and who commits atrocious deeds against all and sundry. This is what takes place in *Wuthering Heights*, but other links with the play can be identified.

A confusion about the idea of love, the origin of which Terence Hawkes traces back to the Old English verbs *Lofian* and *lufian*, exists in *Lear*.⁹ The former means to value or appraise, and the latter to feel affection for. In the novel, like *Lear*, Cathy sees love in terms of property, at least when she gives her reasons for marrying Edgar. Similarly, she realises only too late that love is something above and beyond this (even if it cannot be viewed in this way from a "civilised" point of view). This is clearly part of the fundamental contrast we have already identified but, in *Wuthering Heights*, as regards *Lear*, what we find is basically a variety of motifs taken from the play: for example, the importance of storm to reflect the idea of disorder, as well as to show the destructive element in Nature. All things are born and must die, brutality is inherent to man as well as animals and family relations are sometimes

“unnaturally” violent. This view of Nature, made clear in this way by Shakespeare: “As flies to wanton boys are we to th’ gods/ They kill us for their sport” (IV.1.37), sums up the ideology behind the novel. In an early essay, Emily Brontë made her attitude clear:

All creation is equally insane. There are those flies playing above the stream, swallows and fish diminishing their number each minute; these will become in their turn the prey of some tyrant of air and water; and man for his amusement or his needs will kill their murderers. Nature is an inexplicable puzzle, life exists on the principle of destruction; every creature must be the relentless instrument of death to the others, or himself will cease to live.¹⁰

Nature, then, is seen as a threat to civilisation and in the novel we find that, on the one hand, *Wuthering Heights* and, on the other, Heathcliff are representative of the primitive, violent and uncivilised, in complete opposition to the Grange. Again, the idea of contrast, or opposition, upon which the novel is built, is apparent and suggests that underneath the facade of civilisation there is something more primitive and also more permanent, that which is “heath” and “cliff.” But it is more than that. It seems that the artificiality of the Grange becomes more obvious because of this coming into contact with Heathcliff. He acts as a catalyst, bringing about the events that take place and even bringing out the true nature of those he comes into contact with. It seems that Heathcliff represents a reality that is truer than that of the Grange, the truth that underlies civilisation. Later we will see how this too can be seen in terms of the concepts of Dionysiac and Apollonian.

Returning to the Shakespearean influence, it should be made clear that this goes beyond the simple borrowing of elements from *King Lear*. There are other motifs which can be related to his romances, or tragi-comedies, and to the history plays. In the romances, we find, for example, the ideas of reconciliation and regeneration. They tend to present a situation which is potentially tragic, indeed it becomes so, and the audience feels pity or sympathy for the characters. However, following this false conclusion there is a fall into a period of confusion, disorder, disillusionment and conflict. This is followed by the passage of some time during which the true nature of things is realised and a further, rising action, involving the coming of the seasons, brings about a reconciliation of conflicting elements and regeneration, often symbolised by a new birth, a marriage or the coming of spring after winter. This is clearly related to the plot of *Wuthering Heights* and implies that it shares a similar, virtually medieval, ideology. This ideology has it that there is a hierarchy of order in the universe (related to the harmony of the spheres), which, in Shakespeare’s plays and, essentially, in *Wuthering Heights*, means that everything has its appointed place (remember “The Butterfly”). The idea of a “Great Chain of Being” or the universe as a set of parallel planes means that if someone usurps their position or commits an unnatural act to break the chain

of order, a corresponding disorder takes place on another plane: the time goes "out of joint" or the music goes out of tune. In *Wuthering Heights*, as in *Lear*, the effect of such an event is reflected in the extreme violence of nature and in the unnatural behaviour of the characters.

However, in spite of everything (in particular, the efforts of Heathcliff), order does return. The permanence of nature and of the spheres, the order suggested by the cycles of the seasons triumphs. In *Lear*, the hierarchy is perverted when Lear becomes a king without a kingdom; in *Wuthering Heights*, when Heathcliff usurps Hindley. Getting back to Shakespearean romances, in *Pericles*, the unnatural event suggested at the outset is an incestuous relationship. This suggestion also exists in *Wuthering Heights*, in that Heathcliff, who is treated as a son, may indeed be the illegitimate child of Earnshaw and, consequently, his passion for Cathy is also incestuous. So these unnatural acts and this disruption of order are, at least one level, the cause of the subsequent chaos on different planes. But order is restored, an overall pattern which can be related with a Dionysiac-Apollonian vision of the novel.

As we said, the two cycles of Shakespeare's history plays provide yet another insight into the novel. In a sense, their pattern is similar to that of the romances: there, Richard II's place is usurped by Bolingbroke and although Henry V provides some reconciliation, it is not until Henry VIII's reign that, according to the plays, true order is restored. The cycles of events in *Wuthering Heights* have to work out or resolve a similar disruption of order. When "Hareton Earnshaw 1500" appears above the door of the Heights, this indicates which family is the rightful owner; who has the true title to the place. The lawful title is usurped by Heathcliff, but order returns when the latest Hareton Earnshaw receives his inheritance.

So, we find, once again, yet another instance of order and disorder that can be related to the novel where reconciliation and regeneration triumph; but there are other patterns to be considered. Q. D. Leavis has already noted the similarity of *Wuthering Heights* to the fairy tale. There are several overt references to this kind of literature in the novel, particularly related to Heathcliff, who is a "prince" and a "goblin". It is not without justification that Leavis should compare the novel's structure to that of "The Beauty and the Beast."¹¹ But in a sense we might go further and attribute the various functions identified by Propp in *Morphology of the Folktale* to the characters of *Wuthering Heights*, and it is with little difficulty that we divide the characters into their several spheres of villain, donor, helper, princess and father, hero and so on.¹² In this vein, we might even suggest an interpretation similar to Levi-Strauss's treatment of the Oedipus myth in *Structural Anthropology*, perhaps even comparing the novel to the story of Oedipus.¹³ But beyond the elements of an abandoned child (Heathcliff), an unnatural relationship with a relative (Heathcliff-Cathy), the killing of a relative (Heathcliff driving Hindley to death), plague and disorder (certainly disorder) and even exile (Heathcliff running off from the Heights), it is rather difficult to find many

more "mythemes" in common. However, it would not be too extravagant to suggest that myth is the common source for the novel and some of its more immediate influences, like *Lear* and the fairy tale. We might also say that the common mythological element is what makes a Nietzschean interpretation so appropriate. In fact we can go beyond that and think of the nature of narrative itself which does not limit itself to telling stories but, among other things, writes morals. In this case, the morals of the Oedipus myth, *Lear* and *Wuthering Heights* can be interpreted as the same: it is not simply that some overriding power exists in the universe, but that, in spite of our efforts, fundamentally, nothing changes, life will go on.

The fairy tale element in the novel can also be seen as a link with the romantic tradition in general and echoes of Byronic heroes or noble rustics are never far away. But other kinds of romanticism are involved in the novel, particularly as regards the idea of conflict as an essential part of existence. A little has been said about this before, but here we can relate this idea to Blake. In *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (1790-93), he wrote:

Without contraries is no progression. Attraction and Repulsion,
Reason and Energy, Love and Hate, are necessary to Human existence
(Plate 3),

and

The road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom.

. . . .

The cut worm forgives the plough.

. . . .

The tigers of wrath are wiser than the horses of instruction (Plates 7
and 9).

This is another vision of conflict as the basis of life which can be attributed to the basic scheme of the novel, but it should not be viewed as something tragic or essentially "bad." Nelly Dean's attitude towards everything that happens seems representative of this. Her "life goes on" attitude as well as her and Lockwood's ironic comments defuse any potentially tragic situation. We have said that Emily Bronte saw life as being based on destruction, but conflict here is necessary for progression. The oppositions in the novel are necessary because there is constant conflict in life itself and the meaning of the novel lies in that very opposition. The harmony or sense of harmony, that we appreciate at the end of the novel exists in conflict and this is the basic paradox of the novel. Perhaps the harmony or synthesis of the novel only takes place, or has been effected through art, for in a sense it cannot exist in the quotidian reality of the novel. The harmony, if you like, is transcendental.

This clearly brings in another facet of romanticism reminiscent of Shelley and Keats. They too searched for some kind of reconciliation between the

permanent and the transitory and although we can hardly say that Emily Bronte is a Platonist, it seems that the return of order, the permanence of nature and the belief in something unlimited beyond our everyday lives implies a transcendental belief not unlike what we find in the romantic poets, who even make use of similar images of permanence in nature. It seems that the destruction of harmony in the first part of the novel and its reestablishment in the second part is simply part of a continual cycle.

All this is related to the idea of recurrence and there are continual recurrences in the novel: in the dreams there are obvious similarities, the various storms, recurrent situations in the bed, the hanging of the dogs and so on are leitmotives which reinforce the idea of cycles apparent in the novel. At the same time, there are leitmotives that reinforce the idea of contrast. The recurrence of the windows continually suggests the idea of inside and outside, or of this side and the "other" side, something beyond us which transcends the conflict of everyday life¹⁴. Ideas of light and darkness are associated with this and seem to indicate a darker side to nature underlying the facade of civilisation. This itself is related to the Heights-Grange conflict, which is, essentially, the opposition of culture and nature. It is not by accident that, at one point, books, associated with the Grange, are consumed by fire, associated with the Heights. Under the influence of Heathcliff, culture or civilisation is consumed by Nature. But later the balance is restored and this can be linked to a symbolic episode in the novel where the sun and moon, indicative of nature and its cycles, play an important role:

I would have asked why Mrs. Dean had deserted the Grange but it was impossible to delay her at such a crisis, so I turned away and made my exit, rambling leisurely along, with the glow of a sinking sun behind, and the mild glory of a rising moon in front; one fading, and another brightening...¹⁵.

Here, the moon has taken the place of the sun. Heathcliff's fire has lost its influence and the cooler moon takes its place. The sinking sun and rising moon are symbols of what is taking place in the story: Heathcliff is sinking and about to die, but it is more than this. There is a rise-fall-rise structure in the novel which coincides with this image of the sun and moon. At the same time, we are provided with an image of the sense of balance in the novel, which also recalls the idea of cycles we spoke of earlier: the cycles of the seasons and of day and night are connected to the cyclical nature of the novel and can in turn be linked with the patterns of the history plays and romances.

Related to these cycles is a continual sensation of things falling into place. In the first three chapters we are provided with cataphoric references that look forward to the development and resolution of the novel¹⁶. We mentioned the inscription "Hareton Earnshaw 1500" which provides a clue as to the ultimate owner of the Heights, but the dreams in particular provide a great deal of information as to the manner in which the novel will proceed. At one point

Catherine says: "I've dreamt in my life dreams that have stayed with me ever after and changed my ideas, they've gone through me, like wine through water, and altered the colour of my mind."¹⁷ This is the effect of Lockwood's dream at the beginning. It permeates the novel like "wine through water" and holds the novel together, supplying a guide to the reader as to what to expect and as to how to interpret the novel¹⁸. Later we find that Cathy's dream is not unlike Lockwood's at the beginning and, in a sense, it explains it. Basically, this relates to the idea of recurrence and to the fact that much is prepared for in the opening chapters, even the main images and symbols are introduced. So from the beginning, there is a sense of progression and movement in the novel, a movement that shifts from one side of the contrast to the other, from Catherine Earnshaw I to Catherine Earnshaw II, from Wuthering Heights to the Grange and back again, from calm to storm and back to calm, from passion and violence to the quiet conversations of Nelly and Lockwood. There is a continual ebb and flow which coincides with the continual looking forward and backward that we have mentioned: once again form and content are inextricably linked.

It is clear that this kind of structure is related to many different kinds of literature and we might say that it is typical of the English novel. Richard Chase puts it this way: "The English novel... follows the tendency of tragic and Christian art, which characteristically move through contradictions to forms of harmony, reconciliation, catharsis, and transfiguration"¹⁹. This certainly seems to describe the structure of *Wuthering Heights* although it can be explained more clearly in terms of the Dionysiac and Apollonian. But if we get back to the "wine through water", image, we will find that this provides a clue to a different way of interpreting the structure which coincides with our overall Dionysiac-Apollonian view. This curious metaphor really explains what Dionysus has to do with the novel. Dionysus, the god of wine, represents the imaginative or dreamlike quality in classical Greek tragedy as indeed he does here in the novel. This Dionysiac dreamlike quality permeates the work but is limited and controlled by the Apollonian element of Lockwood and Nelly's conversation. They water down the wine for us and make it more palatable.

Prior to elaborating our Dionysiac-Apollonian view of the novel, it might be worthwhile to consider a few apparent anomalies in the character of Heathcliff. It is around Heathcliff that the whole novel revolves, but it is sometimes difficult to understand his motivation towards action. It seems excessive for a simple revenge tragedy and then, when his opportunity to ruin the family appears, he does not act. It is too simple to say that he represents storm and the others calm, or that he is passion and the others something else. David Daiches asks the question:

Who and what is Heathcliff? What is the force that plays such havoc with the lives of two very different families, and what is the meaning of the natural kinship between Heathcliff and the elder Catherine? It is not enough to say that he represents "storm" as opposed to the

Lintons' calm, or even that he represents the natural or non-human element in humanity: neither of these explanations really account for the part he plays in the story. Nor can we simply say that he represents passion and that the working out of the plot shows the ultimate futility of all human passion, for this leaves wholly unexplained the teasing ambivalence of his behaviour and the mixture of compulsion, of the inhuman and the humanly irresistible, that every significant character in the novel (including Nelly Dean) sees in him. We get no direct representation of Heathcliff: he is seen almost always as a force acting on others, and it is to his effect on others that we must pay particular attention if we wish to come to the heart of the mystery²⁰.

Whatever you decide he represents, whether it is the devil, nature or sexual passion, he does seem to represent, as Daiches says, "some profound and ambiguous force working in man and nature", something which appears to be divorced from the facade of civilisation²¹. But perhaps we should ask if Heathcliff is a victim of these forces. He seems to be anything but a victim, and yet the reader sympathises with him. The fact is that he is a man, in a sense, stripped of civilisation; he is heath and cliff; he is representative of natural forces. For this reason, he is like Nietzsche's superman, saying yes to life and to the natural instincts of man, because of which he is above the rest of the characters. He is "beyond good and evil", beyond praise or blame. He represents truth and brings out the true nature of other characters, as opposed to the falseness of civilisation whose facade is constantly under threat. The existence of good or evil is seen as beyond the control of the individual (that is if we can talk about good and evil in this novel) and therefore Heathcliff simply represents truth, naked rather than padded existence. But there is another way to view Heathcliff and his behaviour which ties in with the overall pattern of the novel if we see it in terms of the Dionysiac and the Apollonian.

In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche makes a distinction between these two qualities. Apollo is the god of youth and light and stands for reason, cultural and moral rectitude; whereas Dionysus is the god of wine and stands for the irrational and the undisciplined. He is making the distinction between reason and instinct, culture and primitive nature, the brains against the loins or heart. Already we notice parallels with *Wuthering Heights* and the various patterns mentioned. The Apollonian signifies that which is sunny and serene (the Grange and the park), while the Dionysiac represents the stormy and turbulent (the heath and the Heights). For Nietzsche, the Dionysiac is also associated with creative and imaginative power and the dreamlike quality we mentioned before.

In Greek tragedy, the Apollonian and Dionysiac form a unity, where dialogue provides the Apollonian element and the dithyrambic choral songs the Dionysiac (originally these were wild choral songs or chants describing the adventures of Dionysus). In *Wuthering Heights*, the reflective dialogue of Nelly and Lockwood provides the Apollonian element while Heathcliff and

Cathy's reported speech and the dreams provide the Dionysiac, particularly on a structural level. The story itself is, in a sense, the Dionysiac vision, but the Dionysiac, orgiastic element is controlled by the Apollonian, which is clearly related to the story being kept believable by the everydayness of Lockwood and Nelly's dialogue.

According to Nietzsche, the Dionysiac element absorbs culture and all that separates man gives way before a sense of unity. Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights* absorbs culture and is the unifying element in the story, particularly as regards its structure, although he is initially disruptive. At the same time we can compare Heathcliff to the satyr of Dionysian tragedy (remember he is called a goblin), and in spite of phenomenal change he is there to tell us that essentially life is indestructably joyful and powerful. As the Dionysiac element he is also, or seeks to be, the Romantic opposite to civilisation, "an unvarnished expression of truth"²². The contrast between "this truth of nature and the pretentious lie of civilisation" that Nietzsche describes in *The Birth of Tragedy* is related to that between "the eternal core of things and the entire phenomenal world"²³. This is the central contrast of the novel and for Nietzsche this becomes evident in the relation between seeming and being. This is the same as the relation between Civilisation and Nature, the Grange and the Heights and so on. Heathcliff is what he appears to be while Edgar appears to be something he is not: civilisation is only a veneer. When the Apollonian, "seeming" elements come into contact with the Dionysiac "being", they are absorbed by it and hence Edgar, Isabella and the rest change when they come into contact with Heathcliff; hence the books are consumed by the fire. This seeming-being contrast is also an essential element of Shakespeare's histories and romances. In the former, the "seeming" kings cannot restore the order that the true king will, and, in the latter, the seeming tragedy passes in a movement towards understanding, reconciliation and regeneration.

However, the Dionysiac state of ecstasy, which reforges the bond between man and man, passes in Greek tragedy as it does in the novel. When it has passed and Dionysiac man understands the truth of things, there is a peculiar effect which explains Heathcliff's reluctance to finish what he has started:

While the transport of the Dionysiac state, with its suspension of the ordinary barriers of existence, lasts, it carries with it a Lethan element in which everything that has been experienced by the individual is drowned. This chasm of oblivion separates the quotidian reality from the Dionysiac. But as soon as that quotidian reality enters consciousness once more it is viewed with loathing, and the consequence is an ascetic, aboulie state of mind. In this sense Dionysiac man might be said to resemble Hamlet: both have looked deeply into the true nature of things, they have *understood* and are now loath to act. They realize that no action of theirs can work any change in the eternal condition of things and they regard the imputation as ludicrous or debasing that they should set right the time that is out of joint.

Understanding kills action, for in order to act we require the veil of illusion; such is Hamlet's doctrine, not to be confounded with the cheap wisdom of John-a-Dreams, who through too much reflection, as it were a surplus of possibilities, never arrives at action. What, both in the case of Hamlet and of Dionysiac man, overbalances any motive leading to action, is not reflection but understanding, the apprehension of truth and its terror. Now no comfort any longer avails, desire reaches beyond the transcendental world, beyond the gods themselves, and existence, with its gulling reflection in the gods and an immortal Beyond, is denied. The truth once seen, man is aware everywhere of the ghastly absurdity of existence, comprehends the symbolism of Ophelia's fate and the wisdom of the wood sprite Silenus: nausea invades him.

Then, in this supreme jeopardy of the will, art, that sorceress expert in healing, approaches him; only she can turn his fits of nausea into imaginations with which it is possible to live. These are on the one hand the spirit of the sublime, which subjugates terror by means of art; on the other hand the comic spirit, which releases us, through art, from the tedium of absurdity. The satyr chorus of the dithyramb was the salvation of Greek art; the threatening paroxysms I have mentioned were contained by the intermediary of those Dionysiac attendants²⁴.

This clearly describes the transformation that takes place in Heathcliff and explains his final failure to act: he understood. At the same time there are suggestions of how art achieves reconciliation, of that which is permanent beyond quotidian reality and even of the relation between dream and reality. So tragedy for Nietzsche and *Wuthering Heights* for us are Apollonian embodiments of Dionysiac insights and powers. The novel's structure is the Apollonian form that embodies or expresses the Dionysiac vision.

The form of the book is a tension between the impulse to excess and the impulse to limitation²⁵. This is also the content. There is a reconciliation between the two; civilisation seems to be depicted as the only constructive way to exist, while naked truth is disruptive and destructive. But that same destructive force (as it is in the history plays, romances, *Lear* and so on) is part of the life force whose cycles restore things to their proper order. The chorus of Greek tragedy is representative of that life force, in the same way as in the novel, Nelly Dean and the marriage between Hareton and Cathy represent continuity and renewal. Cathy and Heathcliff destroy but later the damage is reconstructed. Similarly, the Apollonian element embodies the Dionysiac and makes it acceptable to the reader: this is what Nelly and Lockwood do for us. The world is depicted as infinite but in a limited, restrictive way.

It is clear then that the ideas of the Dionysiac and Apollonian explain the novel as regards both form and content. At the same time, Nietzsche's ideas in *The Birth of Tragedy* encompass the various patterns and traditions that we have identified in the novel which "move through contradictions to forms of harmony, reconciliation, catharsis and transfiguration".

WUTHERING HEIGHTS: A DIONYSIAC VISION

Notas

1. See Q. D. Leavis, "A Fresh Approach to *Wuthering Heights*", in *Emily Brontë: A Critical Anthology*, ed. J. P. Petit. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), pp. 255-61.
2. Frank Kermode advises against this in chapter IV of *The Classic: Literary Images of Permanence and Change* (New York: The Viking Press, 1975).
3. Denis Donoghue mentions this in "Emily Brontë: On the Latitude of Interpretation", in Petit, p. 320.
4. Dorothea Van Ghent, "The English Novel: Form and Function", in Petit, p. 119.
5. John Hagan, "Control of Sympathy in *Wuthering Heights*", in *The Brontës: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Ian Gregor (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1970), p. 65.
6. For this kind of interpretation see Van Ghent, and Lord David Cecil, *Early Victorian Novelists* (Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1948), pp. 148-67.
7. Arnold Kettle, *An Introduction to the English Novel* (London: Hutchison & Co., 1967), I, 130.
8. This has been pointed out by several critics including Q. D. Leavis, in Petit, pp. 255-61 and Jacques Blondel, "Literary Influences on *Wuthering Heights*" in *Emily Brontë: Wuthering Heights: A Selection of Critical Essays*, ed. Miriam Allot (London: Macmillan, 1983), pp. 229-39.
9. See Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare's Talking Animals: Language and Drama in Society* (Totowa, N. J.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1974).
10. Emily Brontë, "The Butterfly", in *Five Essays Written in French*, trans. Lorine White Nagel (Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1948), p. 17.
11. Leavis, pp. 257-58.
12. Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. Laurence Scott (Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1958), pp. 26-63.
13. Claude Levi-Strauss, "Structural Study of Myth", in *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Clare Jacobson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), pp. 206-31.
14. Van Ghent, pp. 120-21.
15. Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*, introd. David Daiches (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), p. 337.
16. Kermode, p. 119.
17. Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*, p. 180.
18. Miriam Allott alludes to this in "The Rejection of Heathcliff", in Allott, pp. 183-206, as does Frank Kermode.
19. Richard Chase, *The American Novel and its Tradition* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957), p. 2.
20. David Daiches, introd., *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Brontë, p. 18.
21. Daiches, p. 27.
22. Friederich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, trans., Francis Golffing, in *Shakespeare's Tragedies*, ed. Laurence Lerner (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p. 282.
23. Nietzsche, p. 282.
24. Nietzsche, pp. 280-81.
25. This terminology is used by Van Ghent, pp. 117-18.