

KINGS OF THEIR CASTLES: READING HEATHCLIFF AS A CALIBAN WHO SUCCEEDS

by

ELIZABETH KOZINSKY

(Under the direction of Christy Desmet)

ABSTRACT

At first othered by his text and then given the power to marginalize the next generation, Heathcliff provides a vision of what a Caliban who succeeds would be and further explores the idea of a family producing its own outsider. Highlighting the cyclical nature of both texts, Kozinsky analyzes Heathcliff and Caliban's shared kinship with the Medieval Wild Man to explain the varying reactions to them. She also considers Heathcliff's affinity to the mastermind Prospero and their relationship to the tradition of revenge tragedy. By considering both the structural similarities of Shakespeare's play against Brontë's novel and the varying interpretations of both for a nineteenth century audience, a better sense of these characters emerges, why we fear and are fascinated by them.

INDEX WORDS: Heathcliff, Caliban, Wild Man, revenge, Other, Emily Brontë, Shakespeare, alterity, Wuthering Heights, Tempest, Prospero, Byron, natural man, appropriation

KINGS OF THEIR CASTLES: READING HEATHCLIFF AS A CALIBAN WHO SUCCEEDS

by

ELIZABETH KOZINSKY

BA, University of Georgia, 2001

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2010

© 2010

Elizabeth Kozinsky

All Rights Reserved

KINGS OF THEIR CASTLES: READING HEATHCLIFF AS A CALIBAN WHO SUCCEEDS

by

ELIZABETH KOZINSKY

Major Professor: Christy Desmet

Committee: Richard Menke
Roxanne Eberle

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2010

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Fran Teague, who long ago recognized and embraced me as an Other, and to Ben Teague, who was himself a magician on the stage. I was always in awe of you both.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of my degree and this document would not be possible without the continued support of my sister Meg who kept me fed and sane. I'd also like to thank Josh and Megan for giving me advice and perspective for the last two years. And to the other members of Team ABC, thank you for your patience, your willingness to listen, and even your constant distractions. I am a better student and teacher for having professors who put my feet to the fire and friends who put out the flame.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Natural Brothers.....	9
The Systematic Othering of Sons	12
Schooling the Fiend	18
Out of the Garden and Into the Woods	25
The Wild Man's Realm	34
3 Legacy of the Father	39
Making Their Own Masks	41
The Manipulator's Means.....	45
Heathcliff's Byronic Distance	48
Repackaging Revenge.....	57
Heathcliff's Triumphant Regression	69
4 Conclusion	74
WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED.....	78

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to understand the scope of Emily Brontë's original novel *Wuthering Heights* (1848), critics have investigated a number of possible source materials. Limited knowledge of what she might have read at home or in school, as well as the loss of her Gondal stories, have made it that much harder to understand the origin of a place like Wuthering Heights. To make matters worse, Emily did not like writing letters, and the few diary papers that remain reveal little more than the weather, her health, and the chores she was doing at the time. So while her sister Charlotte has left letters in which she volunteers opinions on different works and authors, Emily provides only the text itself as a map for moving backwards into her source texts.¹ Luckily, the text has provided a number of literary echoes that critics such as Florence Swinton Dry, Lew Girdler, and Paul Edmondson have taken time to identify properly.² All three scholars have noted the direct allusions and characters rooted in Shakespeare's canon, but none has hazarded a theory as to how such an influence shapes the novel. True, many of Brontë's allusions seem incidental and unrelated to the puzzles with which critics still engage. However, *The Tempest*, one of Shakespeare's most original works, provides a useful framework for understanding Brontë's characters and the traditions that they resist. Despite their different contexts and settings, the two

¹ Charlotte Brontë, letter to Ellen Nussey, July 4, 1834, *The Brontës: A Life in Letters*, ed. Julia Barker (New York: The Overlook Press, 1998): 98.

² Lew Girdler, "Wuthering Heights and Shakespeare," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19:4 (August 1956): 385-96. Florence Swinton Dry, *The Sources of "Wuthering Heights."* (Folcroft, Pa.: Folcroft Press, 1969). Edmondson, Paul, "Shakespeare and the Brontës," *Brontë Studies* 29 (November 2004): 185-98.

texts share the concerns of legacy and domestic power, and analyzing these concerns reveals the cyclical nature of both texts as well as the complexity surrounding the figure of the outsider invading the family circle.

As early as 1848, reviewers had noted Emily Brontë's association with Shakespeare, not only recognizing allusions to his plays within *Wuthering Heights*, but also praising her as his equal in originality and understanding of the human condition.³ According to a review of her novel in 1850 by Sidney Dobell for the *Palladium*, Catherine Earnshaw is a completely original heroine (278).⁴ And while she has had more than enough written on her behalf, perhaps it is Heathcliff's lack of originality that keeps critics turning to him. Conjecturing about what Brontë might have read, critics have seen in her text echoes of Walter Scott's heroes, tragic revengers of German romance, Shakespeare's tragic leads, Byron, and even Milton's Satan as the granddaddy of all outsiders.⁵ However, all such figures seem to be chosen for their alluring qualities and the sympathy that they elicit from readers, and sympathy for Heathcliff, if felt by readers, was rarely admitted in print until nearly fifty years after his creation.⁶ Rather, one of Shakespeare's own original creations seems to match Heathcliff in points of plot and even helps to explain the

³ Paul Edmondson, "Shakespeare and the Brontës," *Brontë Studies* 29 (November 2004), 185-98. Edmondson cites G.W. Peck in his 1848 review of the novel for the *American Review* as the first suggestion of Brontë's affinity to Shakespeare.

⁴ All reviews of Brontë's work are cited in *The Brontës: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Miriam Allott (London: Routledge, 1995) unless otherwise noted.

⁵ Celia R. Daileader, "Handsome Devils: Romance, Rape, Racism, and the Rhet(t)oric of darkness," *Racism, Misogyny, and the Othello Myth: Inter-racial Couples from Shakespeare to Spike Lee* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2005), 143-222. Daileader reads Heathcliff as an Othello figure. Edward Chitham, *A Life of Emily Brontë* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987). Noting the Brontë family's subscription to *Blackwood's* magazine, Chitham suggests that Hoffman's *Das Majorat* or "The Devil's Elixir" may have contributed to the character of Heathcliff. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, "Looking Oppositely: Emily Brontë's Bible of Hell," *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*. 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 248-310. Gilbert and Gubar note Heathcliff's connection to Milton by way of the Byronic hero.

⁶ Contemporary reviews insist that there is too much detail, naturalness, and violence to the character to be admired. Dobell speaks of what an amazing character Heathcliff *might* have been if the author had controlled

strange divide between the Heathcliff of the first half and second half of the novel. Just as Caliban would overthrow Prospero if he could, Heathcliff usurps control of the Heights from the Earnshaws and illustrates how closely the slave comes to resemble the tyrant.

The islander Caliban may seem like an odd match for the tortured lover of the English moors; Caliban exists in the comic subplot of the play, while Heathcliff takes center stage in his text as a more decisive Hamlet (Watson 70). However, their representation as outsiders, their relationships to their environments and families, and their function as subversive force threatening the established order all make them as good as brothers. Caliban and Heathcliff's perceived differences come as much from their inescapable critical histories as they do from their textual treatments. And while it would be impossible to divorce these figures fully from their contexts, it would be just as futile to attempt a complete history and analysis of their evolution over time. However, the second half of the nineteenth century serves as a starting place for comparing the two texts' critical receptions. Granted, by this point Caliban is over 200 years old and part of the Shakespearean canon, while Heathcliff has just been born to an unknown author. But for audiences, at least, Caliban had been relegated to the ranks of comic sot for much of that time. Adapted in 1667, John Dryden and William Davenant's version of *The Tempest* had been produced until 1838, when Charles Macready chose to return to Shakespeare's first folio text. The Dryden-Davenant adaptation had not only striped Caliban of his most poetic lines, in which he muses on the beauty of the island, but it had also highlighted his addiction to drink, so that he functions purely as a comic grotesque. But other productions of Shakespeare's text followed Macready's, bringing new attention to the work and the somewhat neglected savage.

Recognizing Caliban and Heathcliff as two examples of brutish men moved by fortune, we might expect similar reactions to them in the middle of the nineteenth century. Instead, Caliban is granted more and more humanity while Heathcliff is increasingly denied his. Caliban's critics were quick to point out his vices, but often with the admission of some redeeming qualities. Balanced by the characters Ariel and Miranda and always kept in relative control, Caliban's brutish nature is only perceived as a distant threat of what man might be. And while critics consistently labeled him as "low," as Prospero himself does, they nevertheless considered Caliban one of Shakespeare's greatest and most original creations. On the other hand, initial reviews of *Wuthering Heights*, even those that praise the work, deny Heathcliff his humanity with a venom wholly lacking in the critical response to Caliban. In 1848, the *Atlas* called Heathcliff "a creature in whom every evil passion seems to have reached a gigantic excess" (Allott 232). And Sydney Dobell predicted of his creator, "She will never sin so much against consistent keeping as to draw another Heathcliff"(Allott 280). Given his crimes against the Earnshaws and Lintons, it is no wonder that critics would label Heathcliff a villain, but rather than applaud the author for such an interesting portrayal of villainy, the review from *Graham's Magazine* wondered "[h]ow a human being could have attempted such a book as the present without committing suicide" (Allott 242). True, both figures elicited varying responses, but overall Heathcliff was reviled when he first appeared, seemingly for the same qualities that were pardoned in the pitiable Caliban.

Charting changes in critical responses to *The Tempest* in his article "Prospero's Wife," Stephen Orgel reminds us of the audience's role in preserving a character in cultural memory and, therefore, how much that character reveals about its audience's sympathies and anxieties. Virginia Vaughan, in "'Something Rich and Strange': Caliban's Theatrical Metamorphosis,"

argues that the changing interpretations of Caliban mirror society's changing view of “primitive man.” Yet a character made of *heath* and *cliff* is reviled specifically for his barbarity at a time when Caliban is increasingly excused for his crimes as a product of his environment. So closely aligned as they are, these two figures can illuminate not only changing views of nature, but of revenge, education and culture, and alterity in general.

For all their similarities, it is difficult to claim more than an echo, intentional or not, of *The Tempest*'s sense of alterity emerging in *Wuthering Heights*. For literary critics seeking sources, Emily Brontë has long served as a kind of naturally occurring control group. It is unlikely that she ever saw Shakespeare performed. There is not even an extant family copy of the plays to search for marginalia, but several direct allusions to his other plays in *Wuthering Heights* confirm that she did read some form of Shakespeare. She also may have read reviews of performances through her family's subscription to *Blackwood's* magazine. But regardless of the changing interpretations of Caliban or the myriad adaptations, we can be certain that any conscious or unconscious echoes of *The Tempest* in *Wuthering Heights* come from Brontë's relationship to the play itself. Instead of an actor's interpretation of the text coloring her imagination, no doubt Brontë read Shakespeare's plays through the lens of Byron and other Romantic writers who honored primitive man as being untouched by the corruption of society.

We cannot know Brontë's reaction to the play, but as Paul Edmondson notes, the novel contains many Calibans, suggesting an interest if not a preference for marginalized characters (195). Given Brontë's earlier works and her reputation as a solitary person, it is not surprising that she would sympathize with the outsider, creating a number of her own in the poems of Gondal before ever creating Heathcliff. And the few anecdotes biographers have gleaned from

those associated with the Brontës point to her isolation.⁷ From 1843 to 1845, she lived alone with her father and divided her time between domestic tasks and her poetry, and several of her poems point to her sense of isolation.⁸ Though recent critics have focused upon the Brontës as a writing community, when Anne and Charlotte returned to Haworth and began writing with the intent to publish, all three girls were inspired by periods of their lives when they were parted, no doubt affecting their treatment of marginalized characters. Charlotte's *The Professor* is very much based around her time with her tutor M. Heger in Brussels, while Anne's *Agnes Grey* is autobiographically inclined toward her experiences as a governess. The action of *Wuthering Heights* has little to do with Emily's own life experiences, but Edward Chitham argues convincingly in his biography *A Life of Emily Brontë* that the landscape of the two houses closely resembles the layout surrounding Law Hill, where Emily was employed to teach. As children the three Brontë girls had imagined entire kingdoms together, but while they continued to collaborate as adults, each author entered her own world alone. Recent critics have suggested that much of Emily's reputation as a loner has been created to fill in lost details, but conflicting evidence about her own isolation may well explain her seeming ambivalence toward her most famous outcast. For while *The Tempest* ends with power rightfully restored and the "savage" conveniently groveling at Prospero's feet, Heathcliff's end is more ambiguous. His revenge plot succeeds, yet his most triumphant moment seems to be his death.

Heathcliff's movement from rebellious servant to grim patriarch makes him all the more difficult to nail down as a type. Where Heathcliff's fate diverges from that of Caliban, he begins

⁷ Edward Chitham notes a student from Law Hill who remembered Emily as saying that the house-dog was dearer to her than her students. According to A.M.F. Robinson, one of her first biographers, Emily continually refused medical attention at the end of her life and died standing. Chitham is quick to point out how these sparse moments have been used to shape the myth of Emily Brontë, but a sense of her solitary nature still emerges.

⁸ One of the best examples comes in the poem "I am the only being whose doom."

to resemble Prospero as the mastermind of his own text and revenger against his enemies. And as both men move closer and closer to complete control, their need for complete revenge is assuaged because as marginalized figures, they have remade themselves as central powers of their realms. Fully embodying the role of both master and servant, Heathcliff, by his reversal of fortunes, illustrates that what is passed down within the family is the tradition of rebellion against the father. And if we recognize Caliban's own desire for power as the dream of the son becoming the father, we can see Heathcliff's control of the Earnshaw and Linton estates as Caliban's dream finally realized. A comparison of both texts, therefore, fully reveals the outsider's family connection.

Using *The Tempest* as a lens through which to analyze *Wuthering Heights* is particularly useful because of the strange divide critics observe between the first and second half of Brontë's novel. Chitham notes that because the Brontë sisters first attempted to publish their three tales together, *Wuthering Heights*, *Agnes Grey*, and *The Professor*, one would expect all three to be of similar lengths. But when *Wuthering Heights* was eventually published separately, it was approximately twice as long as the other two. Chitham argues that the second half of the novel was written after the initial rejection of their novels, when Charlotte began work on *Jane Eyre* and Anne began writing *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*. This would explain what some critics have called the second telling of the story of Heathcliff and Cathy in the next generation, a romance that conforms to convention.⁹ And Heathcliff as a bridging figure between the two narratives becomes more problematic to critics for the way in which his role changes. Brontë critics have often tackled the problem by focusing on Heathcliff as either the rebellious lover of the first half or the tyrant of the last but rarely both. As a figure who would destroy the very idea of family

⁹ For the sake of clarity, I will hereafter refer to Catherine Earnshaw Linton as Cathy, the name Heathcliff most

lineage, Heathcliff becomes the patriarch, but cannot make sense of himself anymore than we can. However, a look at the nature of domination within *The Tempest* helps to recognize as a consequence of revenge that we often become the things we hate.

At first othered by his text and then given the power to marginalize the next generation, Heathcliff provides a vision of what a Caliban who succeeds would be and further explores the idea of a family producing its own outsider. By considering both the structural similarities of Shakespeare's play against Brontë's novel and the varying interpretations of both for a nineteenth-century audience, a better sense of these characters emerges, suggesting why we fear and are fascinated by them.

CHAPTER 2

NATURAL BROTHERS

It is difficult to create an accurate picture of Heathcliff's initial reception. There is a limit to how many reviews and character criticisms can be found, and for those that can be found we must ask how much these particular responses speak for the rest of English readers. However, limiting ourselves to the expert opinions of the critics still allows a view of how the authorities of literature contend with such an anti-authority figure. Most initial criticism lauds the book for its originality and naturalness while denouncing its violence and immorality, but when specific characters are noted, it is almost without exception Heathcliff who comes under fire.¹⁰ He is referred to as a "brutal master" (*Athenaeum* 1847) and an "evil genius" (*Atlas* 1848).¹¹ The reviewer for the *Atlas* in 1848 asserts that Brontë's attempt to redeem Heathcliff through his love for Cathy fails. And while praising her sister's work in the preface of the second edition, Charlotte Brontë still felt the need to refute the claim that the relationship was redemptive. Though there is little to be found in the way of sympathetic responses, such strong condemnations hint at more flattering readings of Brontë's protagonist. Still the violence and sadism of the character seem to require some apology and explanation for liking him.

¹⁰ Quoted most often are the reviews found in Emily Brontë's writing desk: The *Atlas* wrote in 1848 that the text possesses a "rugged power" (Allott 230) even while criticizing the characters as hateful. *The Examiner* admits to its "considerable power, but, as a whole, it is wild" (Allott 220) Such statements suggest that a certain degree of expressiveness and natural emotion is commended, but too much makes the text unpalatable to readers.

¹¹ Both reviews are included in the Norton Critical Edition of *Wuthering Heights*, edited by Richard J. Dunn.

In 1857 John Skelton attempted to make sense of the fascination: “He may be an imp of darkness . . . but he has come direct from the affluent heart of nature, and the hardy charm of her bleak hill-sides and savage moorlands rests upon the boy” (Allott 337). This connection to nature hardly accounts for the sexual appeal that later critics have tried to decode. But before Heathcliff becomes a tortured Byronic hero, he is a rough innocent of nature, much like Caliban on his island. And what Skelton so clearly illustrates by echoing the devilish language and the romanticization of nature in the text (also found throughout *The Tempest*) is that unlike the social libertine, the natural man is forgiven his faults in light of his relationship to nature.¹² Like the novel itself, critics can appreciate the raw passion of a man unconcerned with decorum, but ultimately such creatures must be controlled. Perhaps that explains the more forgiving tone critics use when discussing the vices and uncontrolled passions of a figure like Caliban. He considerably acknowledges the superior powers of education and culture in Prospero by the end of *The Tempest* and falls down before him. Moreover, his traditional representation as something deformed or *almost* human distances him from man as much as his physical location does, allowing critics to consider how the “creature” comments upon man.

From early in the century, with critics like Hazlitt and Coleridge to Strachey and Phillipotts at its end, responses to Caliban tend to balance his vices against his “affinities with the higher world of spirits” (Dowden, qtd. in Furness's Variorum). As A. W. Schlegel explains in his *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, “The whole delineation of this monster is inconceivably consistent and profound, and, notwithstanding its hatefulness, by no means hurtful to our feelings, as the honour

¹² *The Examiner* in 1848 referred to the book as “wild” and the characters as “savages.” Though the critic suggests the author should censor some of the more coarse aspects of human nature, he applauds his bravery for going “fearlessly into the moors and desolate places, for his heroes” (Allott 222). *The Atlas* (1848) praises the novel for its “rugged power—an unconscious strength” while aligning Heathcliff with “the ferocity of the tiger” (Allott 232), thereby conflating the uncultivated power of the text with Heathcliff’s power as a character.

of human nature is left untouched” (qtd. in Furness's *Variorum*). Heathcliff, by contrast, seems very much to have hurt our feelings judging by the dehumanizing terms used to describe him. Exceeding the bestial descriptors of the text itself, the *North American Review* wrote that the author had made “a compendium of the most striking qualities of tiger, wolf, cur, and wild cat in the hope of framing out of such elements a suitable brute-demon to serve as the hero of his novel” (Allott 248). But as convincing as such commentary might seem in denying their humanity, both figures continue to come under scrutiny. In 1888 the president of the Shakespeare Club of Oakland, California, issued a quiz to his members on *The Tempest* which regarding Caliban included the question “What is the source of our strange interest in him?” (*Shakespeariana*). What might have been their answers? As with Vernon Lee's characters discussing *Wuthering Heights* in “A Dialogue on Novels,” the focus moves from defining these characters to trying to unravel why they continue to fascinate us.¹³ Perhaps it is because of a gnawing sense that we have not come to terms yet with where their humanity intersects with ours. Part of Heathcliff's relationship to Caliban comes from how their texts have so completely othered them, when in fact they both firmly belong to their surroundings, a relationship we envy and fear. From an early age Heathcliff is more at home on the moors than the family that owns them, just as Caliban is the natural master of his island. And it is precisely this near alterity that makes both figures so familiar yet threatening to the social mores they would undermine. Adopted into families that later abuse them, prevented from consummating their desires, Heathcliff and Caliban are marginalized as outsiders. Yet they are at home in their environments,

¹³ Vernon Lee, “A Dialogue on Novels,” *Victorian Criticism of the Novel* ed. Edwin M. Eigner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 225. Focusing specifically on *Wuthering Heights* to discuss the merit of novels in general, Mrs. Blake argues that the book's characters are too sullen and passionate to be real. Another character, Dorothy, counters that while not realistic the characters *are* real and suggests that they are the moors, the sunshine, and the winds. Such an assertion again redeems the characters' behavior for their affinity to nature.

creatures of a hostile expanse and a magical island respectively. And this affinity to the strange worlds we find them in further legitimizes their claims to power even as their texts seem to insistently marginalize them. Though the names *Caliban* and *Heathcliff* elicit very different images for most readers, their movements into and out of the family, their incestuous attractions, and rebellious impulses echo each other. Looking at these men together not only helps us better understand their different receptions in the nineteenth century, but by stripping away the conscious othering that both texts participate in, we can better understand the fundamental threat these men pose and why we continue to be fascinated by them.

The Systematic Othering of Sons

The role of the outsider threatening the family is not unique to Heathcliff and Caliban, nor are their descriptions as dark, bestial, and devilish. But such marginalizing language is used by other characters to obscure their claims to property, wealth, and affection, claims which our authors seem at times to validate, or at least not to refute outright. Such ambivalence toward these characters' ties to legacy, and what that legacy actually is, set these two apart as Others who stand on the periphery of the family. And where their similar situations bind them, their reception among the public reveals that it is the devil in a gentleman's clothes that frightens far more than a beast.

Discussions of “otherness” often begin with appearance, the physical markers that signal a character’s social difference. However, for Caliban such discussion is difficult because interpretations of the character have varied widely over the past four hundred years. Productions of the play have often made Caliban's description the inspiration behind his various treatments, presenting him as a hybrid between man and fish or man and ape, or simply as a demon. No

doubt the fantastic nature of the island he was born on lends itself to this sort of interpretation, as does Caliban's status as an inferior. After all, Prospero calls Miranda an infected worm (3.1.31), yet no one has ever questioned her humanity.¹⁴ As Vaughan and Vaughan point out in *Caliban: A Cultural History*, both Prospero and Miranda consider Caliban in the realm of men at certain points, but the sheer weight of insults against Caliban has buried such proof to create a man-like monster in the collective consciousness of readers and viewers.¹⁵ Yet it is unlikely that Caliban was called a devil when he was living in Prospero's home with Miranda? Prospero's appellation of Caliban as "earth" (1.2.313) itself is literally accurate, in that Caliban now lives in a cave and is no doubt dirty because of his labors, and metaphorically fitting because of his relationship to the island he once ruled. But should we assume that he was always a "thing of darkness" (5.1.275)? We cannot trust Prospero's depiction as he distances himself both from Caliban and his own failure to improve him through education, but the character Trinculo, with no prior knowledge of the island, continually describes Caliban as a monster, suggesting that he is at least different in appearance from him (2.2.150-173). Though audiences never see Caliban before he is made into a slave, the verbal abuse aligning him with darkness and earth insist on his natural inferiority as a way of justifying his treatment. His descriptors echo those Heathcliff initially receives as a child as well as when he is debased by the labor Hindley forces upon him.

When he enters the Earnshaw house, Heathcliff is described "as dark almost as if it came from the devil" (30).¹⁶ Unlike Shakespeare's Caliban, Brontë gives the reader a clear picture of

¹⁴ William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* ed. Robert Langbaum (New York, Penguin Putnam Inc, 1998). All subsequent references to *The Tempest* are cited from this edition.

¹⁵ Vaughan and Vaughan note Miranda's remark that she has only ever seen three men in her life, necessarily including Caliban in that category (1.2.446). They also argue for Caliban's humanity by observing that Caliban is able to learn human speech, serves the family as a human servant would, and is capable of impregnating Miranda, as a man would be.

¹⁶ Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Richard J. Dunn. (New York, Norton & Company, 2003). All subsequent references to *Wuthering Heights* are cited from this edition.

Heathcliff, but the emphasis on color seems less to do with appearance and more to do with expectations for the character in the future. The word *black* is used to refer to Heathcliff twenty-one times; *devil* is used to describe him eleven times (Matsuoka). It is unclear whether Heathcliff has dark skin, but his black hair and eyes, as well as his dirty appearance, serve as signifiers of the devilish character he will reveal in time. Moreover, both men are later compared to their more angelic foils in terms that conflate color and moral code. Upon first meeting Ferdinand, Miranda describes him as “a thing divine” (1.2.419), anticipating Prospero's naming of Caliban as a “*thing* of darkness” (5.1.275 emphasis mine). Heathcliff's rival, Edgar Linton, is introduced in *Wuthering Heights* with attention to his fair complexion, and Cathy later likens him to moonbeams (68).

While there is no mention of any physical deformity in Heathcliff, his humanity does come into question. His own wife insists that ““He’s not a human being”” (147), and near the end of his life Heathcliff admits that he has ““made [himself] worse than the devil”” (284), assuming some responsibility for his own inhumanity. However, this insistence on demonic origin is part of a much larger lexicon used for the Other in which foreignness is conflated with moral depravity, bestiality, and racial inferiority. Existing on the margin of the family and society, the outsiders are already a threat to both; they are unlike the rest. But what makes these two figures particularly dangerous, and mutable from one critical interpretation to another, is the mystery surrounding their births, because they could be *like* anything. In texts so preoccupied with lineage, the unknown man is limitless within a cast of, otherwise, very specific roles. But here again Heathcliff seems to excel Caliban as an agent of chaos, because something is known about the savage's lineage.

All can agree that Caliban's mother was the witch Sycorax, and according to Prospero, his father was the devil. Witches on trial in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were often accused of sexual acts with the devil, and such unnatural unions can only produce monsters. Caliban is repeatedly called a “fish,” a “beast,” and a “poor monster” to highlight his grotesque appearance. So while Caliban is *supernatural* through his association with the devil, the lack of humanity in his lineage makes him only half a man, and therefore *sub-natural*. And whether he is a beast beneath man or a threatening creature of *extraordinary* power, he cannot be treated as an equal. Both associations justify Prospero's enslavement of him. Moreover, the story of his birth, whether it is true or not, creates a context for how he should be treated. Such a context does not exist for Heathcliff.

Early in the novel Ellen Dean muses to the young Heathcliff that he might be a prince from the Orient (48). Even in a fantasy about his parentage, he is very much Other from the family, but if this were a story about a peasant who reveals himself a prince at least he would belong somewhere. But there are never any answers to Heathcliff's origin. Even his ethnicity is never made clear, but the mystery of it allows for a number of possibilities from critics and characters, even the possibility of a demonic lineage, which would suggest he has been brought as a curse upon the family. His description as a “gypsy brat” suggests that he is not white and brings to mind myths of changelings and the suggestion of supernatural powers (30).¹⁷ But he is as often associated with animals as Caliban. He is described multiple times as a dog, and when Ellen tells Heathcliff of Cathy's death, he “[howls], not like a man, but like a savage beast” (143). His difference from the family is all the more highlighted because he could so easily be one of them.

¹⁷ Deborah Nord explains that while gypsies were considered wholly foreign to mainstream culture, the myth persisted that they were close enough that they could secretly swap their own children for non-Gypsy children, placing their own kind within well-to-do families. Hindley's own feeling of rivalry with Heathcliff for his

Critics such as Q. D. Leavis have suggested that Heathcliff is Mr. Earnshaw's bastard to explain his sudden appearance and favored place in the man's affections. But the text refuses to judge where he best belongs, and unlike Caliban, who seems incapable of change, Heathcliff's adaptability defies the limits of class others would put on him. He can as easily plow a field as take tea in the parlor. So perhaps some of the ire that comes his way in criticism is not because of his difference, but because of the threat of mistaking him as one of us.

Even if Caliban is only a man, his reign on a deserted island cannot be much of a threat to the people of England. Michel de Montaigne's essay "Of Cannibals" (1580), a possible source for Shakespeare's island native, might cause some to fear the outside world, but it cannot touch them. Though Caliban might threaten to rape and murder, his physical distance allows for a certain degree of pity, and his manners and appearance label him clearly as an outsider. But urchins *do* live in the streets of Liverpool, just as gypsies, in the British imagination, do wander the countryside doing mischief. Given the Brontës' Irish heritage, a possible source of alienation for the whole family, critics like Terry Eagleton have suggested that Heathcliff might be Irish. And at the end of the 1840s the streets of Liverpool and London would see a growing influx of Irish immigrants fleeing from the potato famine. Though the famine, just beginning as Brontë began her novel in the autumn of 1845, would not have explicitly shaped Brontë's writing, audiences reading shortly after *Wuthering Heights'* publication would have undoubtedly recognized the urchin as Irish (Eagleton 3).¹⁸ However, answering the question of his origin is not nearly as important as recognizing the danger in not knowing and the proximity of all such guesses to normal, God-fearing folk. More and more the fear seems not to be the Other, but his

father's affection seems in keeping with this fear of familial displacement.

¹⁸ Eagleton notes that Branwell Brontë visited Liverpool in August 1845 and perhaps returned with stories of poor immigrants.

ability to infiltrate the majority and what his otherness reflects upon that majority, for a family may be judged by its progeny.

One wonders why any family would take in such ill-omened creatures, but their representation is limited by the subjective gaze of so many other characters. In *The Tempest*, Prospero controls the majority of exposition so that the play's events are seen from his perspective. Moreover, the text itself seems to other Caliban by entering at a point after his break from the family. Already a rapist, already reviled, Caliban only briefly mentions the years he was one of the family, but Caliban and Miranda have known each other approximately twelve years, and Miranda came to the island at the age of three. Since it is unlikely Caliban attempted rape before she was near or past puberty, one can assume a span of approximately ten years in which Miranda and Caliban grew up together, if not more. By presenting Caliban as a reprobate from the first when Prospero refers back to his crime, Shakespeare robs the creature of any sympathy and leaves him at the margins of the play, as the imp always threatening to enter.

Though presented in control of his world, Heathcliff similarly enters his text as a dark curse upon the space, and though Brontë's tale seems to justify some of his behavior, the text never gives him the opportunity to speak on his own behalf. Ellen Dean controls the majority of the story, though it is filtered through Lockwood's pen. And whether or not Caliban and Heathcliff are of a different race or species all together, their dark and devilish descriptions imply a natural baseness of character that all three controllers of text feel compelled to highlight. Even Miranda rails against Caliban as a creature incapable of anything but evil impressions (1.2.351-52), and Ellen is quick to point out Heathcliff's sullen moods from childhood. Yet Ellen herself seems unsure where her sympathies lie for her former charge. At first sight she rejects him but comes to care for him after she nurses him through the measles (32). Her ambivalence toward Heathcliff may

be accounted for by her own position; as a servant she also lies on the margins of the family realm. Compared to Prospero, the very center of authority within the text, Ellen has far more reason to support the subversive figure's plots, or at least not hinder them. Still, as Heathcliff's primary caregiver, Ellen is as guilty as Prospero of the implied accusation of the texts that families are at fault for what their children become, thus motivating Ellen to distance Heathcliff from the family, and even justify her initial cruelty to the child, leaving him on the landing of the stairs, as a premonition of what he would be (31). The idea of physical markers expressing a person's character was as widely believed in the nineteenth century, and studied in the forms of phrenology and physiognomy, as in the seventeenth century, and Prospero reinforces the idea of his slave's outward and inward deformity when he describes Caliban "as disproportioned in his manners / As in his shape" (5.1.291-92). Thus the magician avoids blame for this creature's lack of culture and morality. Yet he also claims him by the play's end. Critics have read this gesture as a stamp of ownership on Prospero's slave as well as a confession of his faults as a father. But regardless of Prospero's contrition, such a claim brings into question that Otherness so long projected onto Caliban. For if the center of authority can sire such offspring, what sort of authority can he be? Caliban's appearance may signal his difference; Heathcliff may have been vengeful from the beginning; but their plots and machinations come from their education, and so they are most fiend-like while following family traditions.

Schooling the Fiend

Caliban learned more than just how to curse from Prospero. According to the island native, when Prospero and Miranda first landed on the island, he shared his food and knowledge with them. He even seems to have acceded power to them by taking on the role of pupil. Yet by the

time the audience is introduced to him, Caliban is secretive and vindictive. He craves Prospero's power and plots his death in a comic mirroring of Sebastian and Antonio's plot on Alonso's life. Clearly this tradition of domination and treachery comes from the outside world, and this idea is further reinforced by the source of Prospero's power. Caliban reminds his accomplices, Trinculo and Stephano, that to overpower Prospero they must possess his books. Without control over the knowledge they contain Prospero is "but a sot, as I [Caliban] am" (3.2.97). Here Caliban hints at what Prospero later reinforces with the breaking of his staff, that Prospero's power over others, even though it extends to control of the weather and water, is rooted in the corrupt society that exiled him. Therefore, education itself creates the hierarchy that then motivates those beneath to rebel. And though Prospero would insist that education made no difference to his pupil, its absence seems to have shaped Caliban into the creature we see. Caliban also physically loses his home when he loses his lessons. As a result of his attack on Miranda, Caliban is relegated to a different cave and hard labor. By first giving knowledge and then taking away its privilege, Prospero teaches Caliban to recognize himself as Other, one unworthy of knowledge, and therefore power, even as he learns envy and the means to domination. However, to protect his image as benevolent patriarch Prospero employs marginalizing language to suggest Caliban was *always* corrupt, so that education, teacher, and the outer world need never be implicated. Heathcliff is similarly labeled malevolent to avoid any blame falling on the family. And while it is true there is never a time when he is genial and innocent, there is also no account of him before his education. Heathcliff comes from the streets of Liverpool, after all, hardening him to violence and insults, and though he does not then know English, he already knows his place on the margins of society. Unlike Caliban, he never holds a clear position inside or outside the family but rather from the first has his champions and enemies. His name seems to reinforce

this position, for though he is given the name of the Earnshaws' dead son, he is never given the family name (May). It is unclear what security for Heathcliff's future Mr. Earnshaw might have intended, but by forcing him into hard labor after his father's death, Hindley disinherits Heathcliff from his position with the family if not from a financial inheritance. He takes away his lessons and puts him to work in the fields, again equating family privilege with the privilege of knowledge. Like Caliban, Heathcliff uses the language he has learned to curse Hindley and even teach Hindley's son to curse his father, highlighting the cyclical tradition of one generation usurping the other. However, Heathcliff's true break with the family comes only when his true master, Cathy, proclaims him inadequate. Unlike Caliban, who loses his father, sister, lessons, and home all from one act, Heathcliff continues to receive lessons from Cathy while he works the fields. And though he certainly feels the sting of his degradation and is plotting revenge on Hindley during this time, he remains a willing "log-bearer" while his bond with Cathy remains untouched. However, Heathcliff learns his Otherness when the judgment of the outside world changes Cathy's view of him.

After spending five weeks with the Lintons at Thrushcross Grange, Cathy returns to *Wuthering Heights* as a proper young woman and immediately ridicules Heathcliff for his dirty appearance because she has grown accustomed to a different kind of people (144). In effect, it is Cathy's education about the outside world that teaches Heathcliff envy and a desire to control others. And his self-exile from *Wuthering Heights* gives him an education on how, for all his most villainous behavior comes after his return from the outside world. Heathcliff may have been vindictive before, but without money or manners he posed no real threat to the Earnshaws or Lintons. His manipulation of Hindley, Isabella, and the younger Catherine is only possible after learning what moves this gentry class and obtaining money to enter it.

Exposure to the outside world allows Heathcliff to change in ways that Caliban never could, so clearly education can be used as a tool. However, both texts make a distinction between the pursuit of knowledge in books, static information that has been deemed significant by society's gatekeepers to knowledge, and the more dynamic and uncontrolled realm of experience. The majority of Heathcliff's education comes from his dealings with the outside world, and as Rousseau argued in "Discourse on the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality of Mankind" the natural man learns competition, envy, and the desire for power from other men (Damrosch 241).¹⁹ Certainly, there are consequences to solitary study as Prospero's overthrow shows; even the well-intentioned Linton fails to fully protect and interact with his family by hiding himself amongst his books. Instead, both texts illustrate the improving qualities of quiet study with another, removed from other society. Miranda herself is the product of such an education, equally capable of innocence and intelligence. Moreover, she taught Caliban what she had learned so that difference is disregarded in light of a common pursuit for knowledge. In his memory of their early days together Caliban recognizes the partnership of feeling created through an exchange of ideas:

When thou cam'st first,
Though strok'st me and made much of me; wouldst
give me
Water with berries in't; and teach me how
To name the bigger light and how the less,
That burn by day and night. And then I loved thee
And showed thee all the qualities of the island. (1.2.332-37)

¹⁹ Rousseau received a good deal of criticism from writers such as Voltaire and Diderot, who took this view of

Though Rousseau's natural man is only natural if he is completely untaught, *The Tempest* seems to suggest that knowledge can as easily create unity as dissension and corruption. Affection and physical closeness are integral to Caliban's understanding of lessons.

Brontë's text also links study to the creation of affectionate bonds. Cathy and Heathcliff grow closer first by learning together and then resisting learning together when they run from their lessons. And when Hindley distances them physically by keeping Heathcliff in the servants' quarters, Cathy maintains their bond by teaching him her lessons. Hareton and Catherine also strengthen their relationship through education. Hareton's initial interest in books is tied to his infatuation with his cousin, the one intensifying the other and vice versa. Toward the end of the text Lockwood observes Catherine teaching Hareton to read, motivating him with both the threat of violence and the promise of kisses (260). Most readers see this as the successful transformation of a brute into a gentleman through education. Yet Caliban and Heathcliff received lessons and remained largely unimproved. Their scenes of education then have less to do with the lesson and more to do with the student's complete submission to instruction. Note that while Caliban has clearly attended to learning language, he exchanges the knowledge for his own knowledge of the island, thus asserting his own place as an instructor. And while Heathcliff never asserts his will over Cathy's, they both rebel against instruction itself. Hareton, by contrast submits completely to the will of his tutor:

“Con-trary!” said a voice, as sweet as a silver bell--“That for the third time, you dunce! I'm not going to tell you, again—Recollect, or I'll pull your hair!”

“Contrary, then,” answered another, in deep, but softened tones. “And now, kiss me, for minding so well” (260).

Unlike Miranda, who falls victim to her student's sexual advances, Catherine is in complete control of how much affection is allowed. Moreover, the reward of a kiss is for “minding,” or obeying. Just as Ferdinand proves his worthiness through submission to Prospero's orders, Hareton gains Catherine's affection by bowing to her rule.

The text suggests that that failure to improve stems from the student and that Caliban and Heathcliff are both *too* natural, incapable of staying within the bounds that society has set for them. Miranda rails against Caliban that his character is one “Which any print of goodness wilt not take” (1.2.352), and the image that Shakespeare employs here suggests that goodness itself is an addition to man's initial shape. Even Heathcliff, who learns the graces of society so that he may sit with the rest in the parlor, only barely conceals his savage nature, for a “half-civilized ferocity lurked yet in the depressed brows” (81). A Victorian audience might take comfort in knowing that these men remain unchanged, for though they supported education's ability to improve there remained an ingrained belief that some men are simply born bad. Studies in the nineteenth century of the size and shape of criminals' brains were used to reinforce the idea that some men are born mentally and morally inferior to others. Therefore, society may be benevolent in its wish to educate those less fortunate, but it is certainly not education's fault when their fortunes fail. The Victorian impulse to educate conceals the anxiety over increasing mobility between classes and a need to retain outward signs to distinguish a man's original state. By controlling education, society can control the degree to which men are changed and how, and Heathcliff's entrance into aristocratic circles reinforces the perceived need for gates to knowledge, proof that unsupervised education in the wrong hands allows a monster into the

parlors of fine families. But what made the monster is the knowledge of his own Otherness. And the very insistence throughout both texts on Heathcliff and Caliban's outward signs of Otherness belies the truth that sometimes there are no signs because the Other is just as much a creation of society as the groomed gentleman. The suggestion that it is Caliban and Heathcliff's wildness that motivates their violence obscures the fact that it is the outside world that first showed them their difference and taught them how to rebel.

As opposed to the quiet contemplation of books, the experiences of the world which Prospero brings onto the island and Heathcliff goes searching for outside of the Heights are the kinds of knowledge that distinguish and stratify people. It is then knowledge of society itself that corrupts. Learning Prospero's language, Caliban says, "my profit on't / Is, I know how to curse" (1.1.364). We might assume that "curse" refers to saying offensive words, and at one point the Lintons refer to Heathcliff as a "naughty *swearing* boy" (45 emphasis mine). However, if we consider how Caliban and Heathcliff might themselves be considered curses upon their families, then it is through education and that recognition of Otherness that shapes them as revenge figures. Caliban's plot to assassinate Prospero echoes the plotting of the Italian court precisely because it is that outside world's influence that has shaped him and given him the desire to be more. And Heathcliff's desire for revenge on the families that ostracized him is complicated by his desire to be *like* them and prove himself respectable to Cathy.

The largest division between Caliban and Heathcliff is the latter's ability to leave his natural space and expand his own knowledge of the world. Limited physically by his island, Caliban remains uneducated and, therefore, relatively un-threatening and comic. Clearly then, it is society's influence and not the savage man's desires which makes these men brutish. However, any discussion of knowledge creating strife for a lone man brings to mind the fall of Man.

Granted, neither Caliban nor Heathcliff seem like obvious choices as instruments of God's will, but neither the island nor the heath serves as perfect paradises. Rather, the inherent violence of these spaces reveals that the truly natural is no place for society.

Out of the Garden and Into the Woods

Given that both texts address relationships and issues of dominance in solitary natural settings, it is no wonder that both have been read through the lens of the Genesis myth. On the island, at least, Caliban is literally the first man, and interestingly the name *Adam* means "earth," an appellation Prospero gives him in the play. Heathcliff's claim as guardian of the moors is based upon his relationship to Cathy and the rambling childhood they share, but he is also equated with the dirt and the fields that he works in. Such descriptors are meant as insults in the hierarchy of men, but outside of such hierarchies they illustrate their connection to the earth. Both men submit to the wills of their masters, Caliban more willingly for a more benevolent God, and but for the limitations of those masters both men are free in their realms. Heathcliff and Caliban also resemble Adam in the incestuous nature of their feelings toward their sister companions. Just as Eve came from Adam's rib, their own love objects are part of their families, which only becomes problematic with the entrance of social distinctions and taboos. And for a moment I would like to consider the lasting images of our Eves.

As I have argued, resistance to Heathcliff and Caliban's relationship mostly stems from our own cultural re-imaginings of the figures, but it may also come from our image of their mates; Cathy and Miranda at first seem to be two very different Eve's. Both Caliban and Heathcliff are denied the female companionship they crave, but their comparison seems problematic at the surface when one considers the character of these women. Prospero's gentle

and obedient daughter seems far removed from a woman whose passions are so powerful that they ultimately kill her. However, critical reception of both has often overlooked Miranda's willfulness as well as Cathy's better nature. Character criticism in the nineteenth century often viewed Miranda as the ideal woman. Anna Jameson, in *Shakespeare's Heroines* (1832), emphatically asserts Miranda's virtues as well as the absence of vices.²⁰ "She is beautiful, modest, and tender, and she is these only" (123). Such a statement disregards Miranda's disobedience to her father when she speaks with Ferdinand, her inattention to her father's words in Act 1, and her railing at Caliban. Granted, these offenses seem minor in comparison with Cathy's wicked deeds, but the standard for violence and cruelty is less overall in *The Tempest*. After such glowing words from Jameson, a reader should expect nothing less than perfection. Yet Jameson seems to contradict herself in her own hierarchy of the play's characters. Comparing Miranda to Caliban and Ariel, Jameson writes that Shakespeare "has placed her between the demi-demon of earth and the delicate spirit of air" (114), and this summary seems to work as she is both mortal and other-worldly as the result of being raised on the island. However, Jameson continues by saying that only Ariel comes close to this woman, discounting her connection to earth and the more brutal instincts of Caliban. It is just such a mixture of unconstrained kindness and violent impulses that result in wildly varying views of Catherine Earnshaw. In reviewing *Wuthering Heights*, the *Atlas* focused upon the savagery of the book and insisted that even the women were loathsome (Allott 232). No doubt Cathy is included in the author's general condemnation, for the moments she is remembered for highlight her wickedness: hoping Heathcliff will suffer when she is dead, locking the door so that Heathcliff may more easily fight her husband, mocking Isabella's affection for Heathcliff. At the same time

²⁰ The text was originally titled *Characteristics of Women: Moral, Poetical, and Historical*, but is more commonly

she is remembered for her passion and pure feeling. W.D. Howell, in his two-volume study of literary heroines, describes Cathy as “tremendous” and powerful (233). Dobell in an 1850 review calls her “wonderfully fresh, so fearfully natural” (Allott 294). And the term *natural* seems to exonerate the girl from all her misdeeds. Both Miranda and Cathy are described as natural beings; they are truthful, frank, and refreshingly unaffected. However, Jameson’s account of Miranda would disown the less pleasant aspects of nature, represented in the figure of Caliban, and she is not alone. The 1998 Penguin edition of the play explains that editors often give Miranda’s tirade against Caliban in Act 1 to Prospero because such anger is out of character with such a meek woman. Quite apart from this idealized view, the play itself reveals Miranda’s earthly flaws intermixed with her more heavenly virtues. Similarly, Ellen Dean gives a summary of Cathy’s character as a child to insist upon her good intentions:

Her spirits were always at high-water mark . . .singing, laughing, and plaguing everybody who would not do the same . . . I believe she meant no harm; for when once she made you cry in good earnest, it seldom happened that she would not keep you company. (34)

This early passage is easily forgotten in light of Cathy’s adult sins, but in the same way that Heathcliff has opportunities for revenge that are denied Caliban, Cathy has time to fall. We cannot know what Miranda becomes when exposed to the wide world, for her stay stops short of the fall. But taken for what they are in the texts, Cathy can be viewed in a more forgiving light, just as Miranda can be allowed a few mortal flaws, shrinking the difference between them.

Critics have often viewed both Cathy and Miranda as “feminized conception[s] of nature” (Slights 359). They act on pure emotion and lack any of the artificiality that society teaches, and

for this they have been lauded while the equally “natural” Heathcliff and Caliban are reviled. In his 1850 review for the *Palladium*, Sydney Dobell applauds the creation of Catherine Earnshaw as wholly original and pure while bemoaning the Heathcliff that might have been. He argues that by giving such detail the author allows too much “familiarity with her fiend” (Allott 294).²¹ Instead of a mysterious figure with the potential for wickedness, Heathcliff appears to him as a devil worthy of disgust. To be “natural” and male seems to invite contempt while natural women are deified. Charlotte Brontë herself had nothing redeeming to say about her sister’s “hero,” but she did confront the problem of gendered scales of judgment in her preface to the 1850 edition of *Wuthering Heights*. She explains that sometimes the “esteemed virtues in the daughters of Eve, become foibles in the sons of Adam” (Brontë 27).²² Granted, it is not merely for their gender that critics castigate these characters; both embark on violence deserving of censure. But perhaps another reason Cathy and Miranda appear in a better light is because they accept the larger world when it comes to them while Caliban and Heathcliff can never fully lose their naturalness for the culture and manners of society. As permutations of the creation myth, the two texts demand obedience to society and its edicts even while recognizing its corrupting influence. No matter how much respect critics may give to the “natural” order, society must always love itself more.

As Eve figures, both Miranda and Cathy bring knowledge into the world, and sexual desire precedes Caliban and Heathcliff’s falls. However, unlike the Genesis myth neither relationship is consummated. Rather than sexual knowledge driving these men from paradise it

²¹ At the time Emily Brontë’s identity remained unknown. Within the review Dobell asserts that Currer Bell is a woman and that the same woman wrote all of the Bell novels.

²² Here Charlotte argues for the virtues of characters like Nelly Dean and Edgar Linton but in doing so recognizes that the effeminate tenderness of a character like Edgar is sometimes seen as a flaw. She insists that her sister Emily did not recognize a gendered conception of virtues, but critics responding to Cathy and Heathcliff, both

is sexual frustration and the knowledge of their un-desirableness which causes their falls. Caliban's sin is more distinct, the violence of the act simply illustrating the fact that he is unfit as a suitor. Heathcliff never even fully articulates his suit, but the knowledge he gains from an overheard conversation is the same as Caliban's from his attack on Miranda: he will never belong to the family because he cannot participate in the reproduction of the family. And he is just as surely exiled from his paradise, defined by the presence of Cathy, as Caliban is when Prospero imprisons him in rock. Heathcliff takes himself into the wilderness of the world, characterized by more people and a lack of order, or rather an order that can easily be manipulated. However, because Caliban's Eden is an island, Prospero (serving as God) does not throw the creature completely out of the garden. Instead, he makes Eden a bit smaller by excluding his slave from the family home and creating a physical barrier between the realm of belonging and not belonging.

Barring the natural man from society and education, Prospero reinforces the idea that a garden, as opposed to the wilderness, is cultivated and therefore controlled and artificial. And for as wild and violent a landscape as *Wuthering Heights* seems, the patriarch Hindley serves as a reminder that rules must still be obeyed. Certainly, the Judeo-Christian God is believed to have also created wilderness, but this idea of ordering rejects the Romantic notion that natural man is the closest we can come to true innocence. The cultured man is favored over the natural, who defies control, because what God wants most is obedience to his will. Rather than give Paradise up for lost, both narratives seem to insist that such an idyllic existence can be maintained if the edicts of society are obeyed. And since Miranda and Cathy remain free from sin, all that is lacking is a more obedient Adam.

Ferdinand in *The Tempest* and Linton in *Wuthering Heights* represent the refinement and gentility that come with proper birth and upbringing. Though Miranda retains grace in spite of her absence from society, she explains its importance to man when she first beholds her future husband. On meeting Ferdinand she says “nothing natural / I ever saw so noble” (1.2.419-20). She herself is a natural, but the contrast is made between the kind of husband society offers to the kind found in the wild. Not only is Ferdinand gentle and polite; he can also offer Miranda money and power through his family. But most importantly, and in direct contrast to Caliban, Ferdinand follows Prospero’s orders. In fact, Prospero manages the entire courtship, and the only reason he stands in the lovers’ way is to prove that Ferdinand will be obedient. The young suitor only briefly shows him any sign of rebellion and goes on to say that the sight of Miranda makes his labor light. David Sundelson argues that carrying logs makes Ferdinand just another Caliban, but the lesson in thwarted love is that despite all the emphasis given to Caliban’s outwardly different/dirty/low appearance, under Prospero’s control the only real difference between slave and suitor is obedience.

Furthermore, Miranda obstructs Caliban’s claim to the island. Though Prospero has already admitted Caliban was the first man on the island (1.2.281-84), Miranda later tells Ferdinand that she’s never seen “More than I may call men than” (3.1.51) him and her father. Dehumanizing Caliban this way not only serves to justify his enslavement; it robs him of his place as natural guardian of the island. Ferdinand, raised in the court of Naples, is in no way natural man, but by labeling him “first man,” Miranda marks him as her Adam, a better Adam than the first because he will prove obedient to the father.

We see something similar in Heathcliff’s double, Hareton, who labors and is rough in manner but serves both his mistress and his father figure dutifully. His own test of obedience

comes when his dual loyalties conflict and Catherine forces him to choose between her and his guardian. Rather un-romantically, Hareton falls back on his first loyalty to the father, something we can never imagine Heathcliff doing. Under the terms of the father both Hareton and Ferdinand offer the promise of marriage, in and of itself an artificial construct, in contrast to the threat of rape. As a dutiful daughter, the natural Miranda knows when to prefer the artificial, and the second Catherine goes so far as to train Hareton into a man cultivated enough so that she may accept him.

After becoming acquainted with the natural violence of the Heights, nothing could seem more angelic than young Edgar Linton, whose handsome face ignites Heathcliff's jealousy. Moreover, his family's civilizing influence is evident from the effect it has on Cathy. Edgar Linton represents not only gentility, but also a chance at rehabilitation for Cathy, who has grown up too naturally. Hindley is too young and selfish to offer much guidance to his sister, but he does approve the match, validating the wealth and position that the Lintons offer. More importantly, Linton can be controlled. In the absence of a protecting father, Cathy will control Linton herself with her tempers and illnesses. Like Miranda, who understands her own lack of social experience, Cathy is attracted to Linton's difference from the natural world. Recognizing her affinity to Heathcliff, Cathy tells Ellen Dean, "Whatever our souls are made of, his and mine are the same, and Linton's is as different as a moonbeam from lightning, or frost from fire" (68). Lightning and fire here illustrate their "natural" dispositions as passionate and active forces; Linton's connection to the natural world is expressed as passive and distant through the intangible qualities of light and temperature. While Linton shines, Heathcliff and Cathy burn and strike. Conflating his light coloring with light itself and its source from above, Cathy's description links Linton to the divine, though not as explicitly as Miranda does Ferdinand when

she calls him “a thing divine” (1.2.419). By extension, the learned and civilized world Linton and Ferdinand come from also declares itself divine so that the wilderness remains a godless space for those too sinful to choose salvation.

The texts that house Caliban and Heathcliff are not satisfied to leave them there on the margins; by verbally othering them their texts re-imagin them as devils. And in fact, there are just as many readings of Heathcliff as Satan as readings of him as Adam, the most influential of these being Gilbert and Gubar's “Looking Oppositely: Emily Brontë's Bible of Hell.” Using Cathy's own dream as an entry point for interpretation, Gilbert and Gubar interpret the fall as Cathy's. By betraying her mate she falls out of hell into heaven, for which she finds herself completely unfit. Near the end of her life she refers to herself as “an exile, and outcast, thenceforth, from what had been [her] world” (107). Such an inverted framework does help to explain moral outrage at a figure like Heathcliff as well as the violence of a landscape that Heathcliff and Cathy view as a paradise. But the Satan Gilbert and Gubar imagine on the moor is specifically Milton's proto-Byronic figure of *Paradise Lost*.

Though there are no direct references to the text in *Wuthering Heights*, Brontë was certainly acquainted with *Paradise Lost*, as it was among both her father's library and the library at Roe Head. And given her earlier romantic heroes, like Julius Brenzaida, imprisoned and pining over lost days with his love, Milton's Satan, who builds sympathy for himself in the way he suffers, seems a natural source for inspiration (Chitham).²³ However, Heathcliff's most demonic moments and violent sorrow come in the second half of the novel when he has returned

²³ Separated from his love and waging war for the throne of Gondal, Julius is considered by most to be a prototype of Heathcliff.

to take control of his world, so while it does seem to be Cathy's sin which causes their fall, Heathcliff in the first half is merely a pawn of greater powers just as Caliban is.

In fact, if any character were to take on the agency of Satan, it would be Prospero himself, who creates an opportunity for Antonio and Sebastian to plot against the king. One might read Caliban's proximity to Miranda as yet another opportunity to test the will (Leininger). And Ferdinand is likewise tested. *The Tempest* may suggest a clean division between the divine (Ariel) and the earthly (Caliban), but as the director of his world, Prospero serves as both creator and tempter just as Heathcliff will when he takes on the patriarchal mantle. Literally invading the garden of Thrushcross Grange, he tempts Isabella Linton with the general goal of causing as much pain as he himself has felt, and his power over her seems to come from an inexplicable "thrill of perverse sympathy" (Howell).²⁴ I will continue the exploration of such sympathy in the third chapter, where Caliban cannot follow, but for now our Adams are left upon the borders of society.

The retelling of these Adams as Satans seems part of both texts' narrative projects by not only evicting them from their respective gardens but also refashioning them as interlopers to the gardens. Raised alongside their adoptive sisters, these men's childhoods complicate the idea of Otherness, but Cathy and Miranda remain under familial and societal control while Heathcliff and Caliban never do. Therefore, these natural rebels are rewritten in the family narrative as irredeemable, but by pushing them out of the family framework the opportunity for rebellion is created. Unlike Eden, which only ever has one ruler, the island and the moor exist as fluid spaces that allow power to shift. And in this way Caliban and Heathcliff serve as far more subversive and rebellious figures than an Adam. By considering the natural flux of their

²⁴ While discussing Cathy and Heathcliff's relationship, Howell expresses the odd reaction of pity for such a

environments and their relationships with the land, we begin to understand Caliban and Heathcliff's power as something quite separate from the order of men.

The Wild Man's Realm

Perhaps the reason readers are so consistently directed to the otherness of Caliban and Heathcliff is to compensate for civilized man's own sense of displacement, for in both spaces it is very clear the savage rules. Caliban is the only earthly native of the island and is wholly accepting of the spiritual forces at work on the island that he cannot see. And while Heathcliff is not born to the Heights, from his youth he is perfectly resolved to the violence of the place and the violence between people within the harsh landscape. Ellen characterizes Heathcliff as “hardened . . . to ill-treatment” when “he would stand Hindley’s blows without a wink or shedding a tear” (31); though vengeful against his enemies, coming to an abusive environment does not surprise Heathcliff. The island of *The Tempest* and the moors of *Wuthering Heights* are both so elemental to their texts that critics have considered them as separate characters, shaping plot through their remoteness. By setting these narratives outside the realm of society, Shakespeare and Brontë invert the idea of the outsider.

Outside of society's control, both spaces possess the power to collapse and rearrange hierarchies. In Brontë's novel money and power shift to bring fine families low, and Heathcliff's ownership of Thrushcross Grange is not even legitimate, but who is there to stop him?²⁵ The island of *The Tempest* is likewise a place where control is continually undermined. Miranda and

villainous character.

²⁵ C. P. Sanger, “The Structure of *Wuthering Heights*,” *Critical Essays on Emily Brontë*, Ed. Thomas J. Winnifrith (New York: G.K. Hall and Co., 1997) 132-43. C.P. Sanger explains that Edgar Linton's death results in Isabella taking possession of Thrushcross Grange, which would then pass to her sons, not Heathcliff. And because before the Inheritance Act of 1833 fathers could not serve as heirs to their sons, Linton Heathcliff's will would not be

Caliban disobey Prospero's orders; Sebastian and Antonio would make an attempt on their sovereign's life; even the shipmates disregard the authority of their passengers in light of the greater power of the storm: "What care these / roarers for the name of the king?" (1.1.16-17). Though Prospero retains control of the island, it is only through the alien power of his books, as Caliban tells us, that he holds an otherwise chaotic space (Flagstad 213). However, Caliban, and Heathcliff before he returns from the outside world, fully embody the spaces they inhabit rather than attempting to rule them.²⁶ And such a close relationship between their power and their environment echoes the symbiotic relationship between man and forest in the medieval figure of the Wild Man.

In *Shakespeare's Caliban: a Cultural History*, Vaughan and Vaughan describe the wild man as a figure who lacks true language but demonstrates "a knowledge of nature's secrets" (63) and go on to interpret Caliban as an Early Modern descendant of this myth. Caliban only has language because Prospero taught him, but sees no use in it other than cursing. Moreover, Caliban knows the dark secrets of the island and is linked to magic through his mother. Heathcliff does not fit physical representations of the Wild Man, covered in hair, dirt, or leaves, but he speaks a strange language when he first arrives at the Heights, and his association with gypsies immediately calls to mind fortune-telling, magic, and a borderless existence (30). Later Isabella says he resembles "the son of the fortune-teller" (41), reminding us of his swarthy appearance and mysterious origins. And while Heathcliff eventually gains an intimate knowledge of the heath, it is his complete resignation to the violence of the Heights that makes him so akin to it.

legally binding.

²⁶ Because Heathcliff embraces certain aspects of the educated and civilized world, his likeness to Caliban is

As a character within Elizabethan masques, the Wild Man illustrated his strength and powers as a real threat to the procession's order only to bow down before the monarch. The greater his strength, the greater the monarch who controls him (Vaughan and Vaughan 65-69). Similarly, Caliban conceives of a plot to overpower his master but repents in Act 5. Finally recognizing the power of his master, he swears to “be wise hereafter, / And seek for grace” (5.1.295-96). As with the scripted roles of the masque, Caliban's bid for power is only a device for reaffirming Prospero's own authority at the end. But while Caliban's plot indulges the audience in the fantasy of subversion, Heathcliff plays out the consequences of placing a savage in power so that the text turns tragic as it argues for the need to contain such wild elements.

In the tradition of the Wild Man, Heathcliff also concedes power by placing Cathy's wishes before his own. His treatment of Isabella makes it very clear what he is capable of, so that the degree of restraint he shows with Cathy proves how much he is in her power. However, fealty to Cathy, a chaotic figure in her own right, hardly reaffirms a traditional power structure. And after the death of Cathy, Heathcliff is left with even less restriction on his behavior, so that in a sense he represents the threat of the unbound Wild Man, a Caliban with no magician to control him.

The medieval Wild Man, living on the edges of settlements as a wandering hunter, is characterized by “linguistic confusion,” “sin, and physical aberration” (White 16). He both hates and is drawn to society; his aim is never power for himself, but the destruction of existing power structures, as is Heathcliff's. Moreover, the Wild Man is a solitary being. Hayden White explains that the Wild Man may take a mate, producing the threat of rape in the public's

complicated by the second half of the novel. Claims upon his place within the Heights, in nature, and in relationship to Caliban are only true before Heathcliff returns educated.

imagination, but he is never imagined as a father. To head a family means being complicit in the order that surrounds it. And while Caliban dreams of his offspring roaming the island (1.2.350), Heathcliff, a father and husband, seems to resist all such familial connections. His wife and son are merely pawns in the game. Once again, on the surface Heathcliff might seem the more cultured and refined, but his impulses are wilder than the savage that Shakespeare envisioned. White makes the distinction between the barbarian, the threat of an *alien culture* from afar, and the more insidious Wild Man, who lives on the margins but has *no culture*. For Prospero and Miranda, surely, Caliban fits this role as an ever-looming threat. However, given his physical distance from an English audience, the threat is largely removed. And because he actively seeks Prospero's power and sovereignty over his children, from afar he seems more a barbarian than a Wild Man, just one more figure in the long line of usurpers.²⁷ Heathcliff, on the other hand, threatens this line and all lines of progress and/or inheritance because of his own voluntary separation from society. And this threat is particularly relevant to a Victorian readership, who historically placed their faith in society's ability to help those less fortunate. Without society's controls, what might a man be?

Reading the natural and supernatural qualities of Caliban and Heathcliff through the lens of Adam, Satan, and the Wild Man reveal both their threat to society and their attraction. The Romantic attachment to untouched nature remains in reviews of *Wuthering Heights* as well as criticism of Caliban in the second half of the nineteenth century. And though our fascination and distance from the truly natural is not *exclusively* the domain of the Romantics, nineteenth century

²⁷ In support of the view that an empowered Caliban would fall into the same vices of a tyrant as Prospero, M. Renan's play *Caliban* imagines the characters of *The Tempest* returning to Milan where Caliban becomes a revolutionary figure, overthrows Prospero, and then finds himself sympathizing with the pressures of ruling under which Prospero suffered. Rather than kill him, Caliban puts the magician to work for him, fully inverting their earlier relationship.

responses to both figures seem to comply with Andrew Radford and Mark Sandy's summation that Victorian audiences, in response to Romantic ideals, tempered them, the extremes of passion and wild freedom of the self, with the constraints of social decorum. The *Examiner* says as much in its critique of *Wuthering Heights* when the author celebrates the novel's wild originality while reminding that “[i]t is the province of an artist to modify and in some cases *refine* what he beholds in the ordinary world” (Allot 222). This author and others suggest that it is their naturalness that threatens, but through their plots for power their naturalness, and subsequently the reader's sympathy, are diminished. For the Wild Man is never king of his land; he *is* his land. And their movement toward envy and revenge illustrates Rousseau's vision of natural man's movement toward vice through his interactions with society.

However, these texts do not simply criticize society's shortcomings; instead they implicate society in the creation of the Other by recognizing his beginnings within the influence of the family. And though Caliban and Heathcliff's rebellion may seem like invasion into an otherwise stable line of rule, they are simply continuing the family tradition of one generation usurping the other. Just as Caliban continually threatens to replace Prospero, the son replacing the father, Heathcliff vows to overthrow his oppressor, Hindley. The only difference is our Adam of the moors succeeds, where Caliban does not, and becomes the great manipulator, both God and the devil. Caliban and Heathcliff are thoroughly othered so as to seem exceptions to this order, but the implication of both texts is that there is little difference between one oppressor and another. They are simply one more link in the chain of domination.

CHAPTER 3

LEGACY OF THE FATHER

Most critics writing on *The Tempest* in the nineteenth century promote the idea that Prospero, as the creator of all the illusions and tricks we see, is in fact Shakespeare bidding farewell to his audience.²⁸ As Gary Taylor notes in *Reinventing Shakespeare*, by the nineteenth century the bard's "artistic supremacy had ceased to be debated; it was simply assumed" (168). His characters had long been immortalized in operas, ballets, and paintings, while praise for the man himself often took the form of religious zeal. It is no wonder, then, that negative criticism of his literary incarnation is rare, at least at this time.²⁹ Critics have since noticed the way in which Prospero also acts as a usurper, so while a nineteenth-century audience would never recognize his affinity to Heathcliff, the two tyrants are worthy of study.

The passionate wanderer of the moors seems even more at odds with the fatherly magician than with his slave, but narratively these men run fairly similar courses. Returning to *Wuthering Heights* without explaining where he has been, Heathcliff manipulates his enemies, using their own vices to trap them. He faces his betrayer/sister and forgives her in much the same way as Prospero does his brother. Heathcliff enters the novel controlling his stormy realm as well

²⁸ John Garnett, *Irving Shakespeare*, reprinted in *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & co., 1892), 369. Dr. Garnett's work *Irving Shakespeare* serves as a good example of the hyperbolic praise Prospero, and by extension Shakespeare received. He is acknowledged as having, "Conscious superiority untinged by arrogance, genial scorn for the mean and base, mercifulness into which contempt enters very largely, serenity excluding passionate affection, etc."

²⁹ Charles Cowden-Clarke in his *Shakespeare's Characters* (1863) serves as an exception, characterizing Prospero as a selfish and vengeful tyrant who usurps Caliban.

as the perverse family he has gathered to himself, just as Prospero is presented as controlling the weather and the people of his island. Both men retain servants who act as surrogate sons, devise revenge plots that they later abandon, and bring together young lovers through their opposition (in Prospero's case, feigned opposition) to the matches. Yet while Heathcliff's actions in this half of the novel are largely the fodder that critics of the nineteenth century used when denigrating his character, Prospero's critics called him the symbol of "forgiving wisdom," the "representative of wise and virtuous manhood in its true relation to the combined elements of existence, a being "perfectly wise and gracious, scarcely distinguishable in purity and benevolence from what we believe of God" (qtd. in Furness's *Variorum*).³⁰ Paul Edmondson first suggested Heathcliff's resemblance to Prospero through his domination of Hareton in his essay "Shakespeare and the Brontës," but nineteenth-century audiences rarely considered Prospero a tyrant even if they admitted some sympathy for Caliban. Predictably for two texts so concerned with heredity, the difference in these two figures' reception seems to stem from their origins, but is equally shaped by their conscious self-representation.

Though both men are introduced as rulers of their tiny realms, Prospero's tale to his daughter affirms the naturalness of his superior position. He was born to it, while Heathcliff's claim to his lands is more questionable. Brontë does depict scenes from the orphan's childhood geared toward creating sympathy, but his lack of legitimacy makes his seizure of ancestral lands ultimately villainous and subversive. We might reasonably expect an Elizabethan text to reinforce the prescribed status, even the prescribed morality transferred from parent to child, of every man in or out of society. But almost 250 years later, we find the same outward signs of Otherness, the same resistance to mobility outside of bloodlines. One might also argue that

³⁰ Quotations are attributed within *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* to Horace Furness, Fanny Kemble and

Prospero and Heathcliff are separated by intention, as one man seeks his daughter's happiness while the other seeks his adoptive son's ruin, but neither man is fully open about his intentions, and a closer evaluation of their revenge plots will reveal their similarity. Rather it is these men's conscious representations of themselves that obscure their connection. Heathcliff still might have swayed readers to forgive his lack of lineage if he had only wished to gain their favor, but much of his villainous reputation is his own making. Ultimately, Prospero's reception in the nineteenth century is shaped by both his origin and the persona he presents to the public; he puts forth his pedigree and displays his virtues to their best advantage, not surprisingly given how self-conscious the play itself is. Prospero was able to convince, at least a nineteenth-century audience, of his benevolence. And while Heathcliff never appears fully conscious of what he is doing, he takes joy not only in being a villain but presenting himself as such.

Making Their Own Masks

Critics have long viewed both Prospero and Heathcliff as directors of their own dramas, but that role often obscures the acting both of them do. The assumption seems to be that they are simply playing themselves with a few exceptions, most notably when Prospero pretends to suspect Ferdinand of being a spy and usurper of his island (1.2.456-57). To cultivate his own daughter's sympathy and affection for the man Prospero falsely accuses the man he knows to be his enemy's son and enslaves him through magic. But he explains to the audience, "I must uneasy make, lest too light winning / Make the prize light" (1.2.452). Since Prospero rarely reveals his plans, we might assume that the rest of his actions are sincerely done without thought for his own self-portrayal, but Prospero has as much reason to enchant his audience as he does

Edward Russell respectively.

the inhabitants of the island. Heathcliff also displays his prowess as an actor when he leads Ellen Dean and Catherine to his door under the guise of helping his son through the threshold, only to imprison them there. We might assume he briefly wore a mask for his own ends and reveals his true nature once she is caught. However, Heathcliff later admits that he has “*made* [himself] worse than the devil” (284 emphasis mine). The agency within such a statement suggests that his more devilish moments were all conscious choices of representation. Heathcliff emerges as a fiend because he wants to be one, just as Prospero insists on his virtues.

“Prospero with his magical powers, his superhuman wisdom, his moral worth and grandeur, and his kingly dignity, is one of the most sublime visions that ever swept with ample robes, pale brow, and sceptred hand before the eye of fancy” according to Anna Jameson (128). Most critics in the nineteenth century similarly praised Shakespeare's magician. Even his imperfections are listed as proof of his humanity and his ability to overcome vice.³¹ And Frederick James Furnivall fully conflates Prospero with his creator when he remarks how “the poet uses his magic to wield the fairy-world” (qtd. in Furness's *Variorum*). That ability to shape perception is revealed in Prospero's creation of the two masques within the play. Ariel seems in control of the banquet of demons that plague Prospero's enemies, but if there were any doubt who the mastermind behind the show is, Prospero dispels such thoughts when he creates a pageant of goddesses and nymphs for his daughter and Ferdinand, proclaiming a message of chastity. Clearly, he works with as much purpose as Shakespeare himself.

Prospero is a showman and begins to shape the “fabric of this vision” (4.1.151) from his first appearance on stage. His explanation to Miranda of their past conveys his determination to regain his position, as is only fair, while assuring the audience with his calm replies that he is not

³¹ Both Richard Garnett and Edward Russell note Prospero's limitations as a mark of Shakespeare's skill as a

motivated by blood-lust. Though the storm, which Miranda reveals as her father's doing, illustrates Prospero's power over men's lives, he immediately takes on the cooing tone of a doting father: "Tell your piteous heart / there's no harm done . . . No harm. / I have done nothing but in care of thee" (1.2.14-16). What follows is Prospero's explanation of all that has come before to motivate this storm. Acting as both plaintiff and judge, Prospero controls his own story and casts himself as a comic revenger, simply putting things back in their place and placing himself back amongst his people (Anderson). Unlike a tragic revenger, who only plans as far as his own retribution, Prospero plans on returning to the life he once had. Though his island is far from anything resembling "civilization," Prospero continues to live within the rules of power and legacy because he hopes to return to society. In his tale to Miranda, they might have both been murdered but the rebels "durst not / So dear the love my [Prospero's] people bore me [him]" (1.2.140-41). Fearing the masses turning against them in light of their ruler's death, Prospero's enemies put them to sea instead. Knowing the power of public acceptance, Prospero very clearly shapes the kind of tale he would like audiences to see, and unlike Shakespeare's other plotters, keeps quiet about his own ideas and plans.³² Even at the play's end when all has gone according to his plan, he still asks for the audience's support as a kind of release from his bondage on the island. Though a convention of the theater to ask for applause as a form of public approval, Prospero's request reinforces his own understanding of social norms.

Heathcliff more actively works against society's norms, but that should not suggest that he is unaware of them. Though he never seems as aware of his audience as the showman Prospero, Heathcliff still understands that much of his power comes from his ability to evoke

dramatist.

³² Iago and Richard III come to mind as villains who openly present their evils, and interestingly Heathcliff has been likened to both.

fear. And just as Prospero works to be accepted by the majority, Heathcliff highlights his own work toward subversion to both increase his victims' dismay and guarantee his status as a villain. Though he insists that he never lied to his wife, Heathcliff consciously seduces Isabella by fulfilling her own expectations of the dark heroes of romance novels. He briefly puts on his gentlemanly graces, proving that he is well aware of the face he presents to others. Part of Heathcliff's devilish persona is a constructed nonchalance for what others think, but he is just as committed to the role of the Byronic hero while wooing Isabella as he is of convincing her that he is evil after their marriage. When Ellen Dean comes to visit Mrs. Heathcliff he expresses how hard he has worked to make her hate him, "a positive labour of Hercules" (129). His words would suggest that when his ends are met, he becomes himself once more without bothering over who knows he's a villain, but this persona is just one more of his guises.

Heathcliff may seem to care only for Cathy's opinion, for she is essentially the only master he recognizes. There are several instances throughout the novel in which Heathcliff seems unconcerned with what people say. However, he also takes extreme pleasure in shocking Ellen Dean with his own wickedness. He delights in telling her how he has degraded Hareton so that he feels all that he himself felt as a child (186). Musing to himself, he bids Ellen Dean stay to hear him say how he could crush his enemies but has lost his will to do so, although he is insistent that this is not because of some long hidden virtue within him (274). Even on his deathbed, Heathcliff tells her that he repents nothing (283). Since Lockwood pens the story of *Wuthering Heights* after Ellen Dean tells it, some of her closeness to the character is necessary, but she also serves Heathcliff's ends to be remembered as a villain, no doubt fulfilling the role others had set for him. Brontë must have understood, even if Heathcliff does not, that there is no sense in breaking society's contract if there is not a society nearby to gasp. True, the man's

actions are enough to condemn him regardless of his reasoning, but it is worth noting that it is difficult to discover Heathcliff's redeeming qualities precisely because he has hidden them, just as Prospero has highlighted his own virtues.

The Manipulator's Means

While Caliban, Prospero, and Heathcliff all attempt to control other men, they seem to recognize that it is through control of women, and therefore bloodlines, that such domination is achieved. Clearly asserting himself as a sexual threat, Caliban bemoans his lost opportunity to rape Miranda, saying "Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans" (1.2.350-51). Though Caliban's claim effectively destroys sympathy with his audience, critics have since pointed out that his retort to Prospero has less to do with sexual desire than with overthrowing his oppressor (Leininger).³³ How else does one make himself king than to make his subjects his sons? Prospero's dialogue with his slave categorically relegates Caliban to the status of villain, but Prospero attempts the same kind of control in his arranged courtship between Ferdinand and his daughter. Prospero's plot may, as he says, be intended for Miranda's sake, but this presumed relinquishing of control, the breaking of his staff and drowning of his books at the play's end, comes with being reinstated as Duke of Milan and holding influence over the future King of Naples. Though Prospero has choreographed his own play to look like a comedy ending in marriage, he has through his daughter invaded Naples more fully than an army ever could. And as if the point were not yet clear, Shakespeare presents the young lovers playing at chess, itself a symbolic representation of warfare, to illustrate that courtship is but one more political tool.

Though the scope of Heathcliff's empire is exponentially smaller than Prospero's, he uses a similar method of “infecting” his enemies through both his own sexual energies, as Caliban would, and the more removed sexual threat of a father positioning his progeny. By forcibly impregnating Isabella and overseeing the courtship between his son and Edgar Linton’s daughter, Heathcliff combines the estates of Wuthering Heights and Thrushcross Grange under his control. He also mirrors Prospero as a blocking father figure in his “adopted” children's romance. Granted Prospero shrewdly creates obstacles between Miranda and Ferdinand to cultivate their affection while Heathcliff is only dimly aware that Hareton and Catherine *have* affection for each other. But the end is the same.

By degrading Ferdinand to the level of log-carrier, making him both a Caliban and a kind of second son, Prospero creates a more controlled version of the seduction of Miranda while asserting his power over his inferiors (Sundelson).³⁴ Similarly, Heathcliff degrades the son of his enemy through work and lack of education and inadvertently creates a second version of himself. Heathcliff becomes the tyrant father as he recognizes Hareton as his “natural,” though not biological, son. And just as Ferdinand serves as a more cultivated Caliban, Hareton is a slave/suitor with the right bloodline. Through his marriage to Catherine, he will repossess his ancestral home and status the way Miranda will regain her earlier status. Two kingdoms are joined and passed on to the next generation. It is inconsequential whether Heathcliff intended to bring the young lovers together or not. As Northrop Frye explains in “The Argument of Comedy,” New Comedy for the Greeks, a tradition that continues to shape narrative today, often centered around a young man overcoming obstacles to his love object. Whether a romantic rival

³³ Leininger argues that Prospero's biased telling of both the rape and Caliban's character makes it impossible to know his initial relationship with Miranda or if he is violent by nature.

³⁴ Sundelson argues that Ferdinand's words contain a submerged rape fantasy, supporting the idea that all

to the young man or simply a disapproving father or guardian, an older man traditionally worked to block the match. By serving as this traditional romantic block, Heathcliff unwittingly reinforces his own role as patriarch.

However, while both Prospero and Heathcliff use their control of the younger generation for their own ends, only Prospero recognizes that power must then *pass to* the younger generation. As evidence of his humility and wisdom, and perhaps a covert hint that Shakespeare himself was thinking of his death, critics point out that “Every third thought shall be my [Prospero's] grave” (5.1.312). That's not to say that the other two will not involve the management of Naples and Milan, but Prospero recognizes that death will eventually depose him, even if nothing else does. Therefore, his power can presumably live on in his grandsons, but as we have seen, for Heathcliff the continuation of the family line is only a means to continuing his revenge. He speaks to Ellen Dean about making the most of his son, and when he is ill and of no more use, Heathcliff refuses to send for a doctor because “his life is not worth a farthing” (248). Heathcliff's lack of concern for his son's life proves that his ultimate goal was only ever for power in his own right. And though he also muses on his death more and more, it is without the calm assurance that his efforts will live on. Never fully removed from the Wild Man, Heathcliff both refutes the importance of heredity through his own advancement in society and inadvertently supports it by becoming a family man in the midst of his plotting. The power of legacy is further emphasized when one considers that Heathcliff's revenge, punishing the son for the sins of the father and using patriarchal inheritance law to gain power, makes him just one more piece of the system. Yet Heathcliff only ever plays the head of the family mockingly and prefers solitude, especially toward the end of his life, when he becomes aware of how

men are in some senses Calibans, 125.

meaningless his goal of revenge is in light of his separation from Cathy. It is this ever-present sense of longing which most separates Heathcliff from the magician Prospero, for while a father can find renewal in his family, the abandoned lover never can.

Heathcliff's Byronic Distance

Andrew Elfenbein suggests that Victorian readers' rejection of Heathcliff was essentially a rejection of the Byronic hero whose untenable position can only produce sorrow and that Brontë's book embraces the tradition of Byron's fallen angels within the first half before exposing the consequences of so much romantic sorrow in a domestic setting in the second half. Critics have used any number of dialectic oppositions to frame their interpretations of text: heaven and hell, the natural vs. the cultivated, innocence vs experience, chaos vs order.³⁵ But what continually complicates their easy symmetry is Heathcliff's resistance to his own transformation from rebellious youth to patriarch.

As Heathcliff never fully accepts his transition within the novel, the relationship to Prospero may seem to fit better with Heathcliff's foil Edgar Linton, who very willingly retires into the role of wise father. In fact, some critics might view the bookish master of Thrushcross Grange as a more likely match for Prospero. Just as Prospero ignored his duties in pursuit of his studies, Edgar neglects his daughter and dying wife by burying himself amongst his books (Brontë 103-4).³⁶ And though he grieves as Heathcliff does for Cathy, he calmly exchanges the

³⁵ Gilbert and Gubar's "Looking Oppositely: Emily Brontë's Bible of Hell" discusses Thrushcross Grange and Wuthering Heights as representations of heaven and hell. Dorothy Van Ghent in "On *Wuthering Heights*" recognizes Cathy and Heathcliff's relationship with nature and rejection of culture. Marielle Seichepine "Childhood and Innocence in *Wuthering Heights*" notes the odd movement from experience to innocence in the two generations of the book.

³⁶ After Cathy's fit Ellen Dean tells her that her husband is "continually among his books" (103), for which Cathy becomes enraged, interpreting it as indifference toward her.

role of suitor for father. Heathcliff, by contrast, resists his fatherly role, denying any affection for his own son. And what emotion he does reveal for Hareton is overshadowed by his obsessive love for Cathy. Though he is proud to play the tyrant, Heathcliff never relinquishes his own sexual energies. He plays the lover by writing his son's letters to Catherine and even removes the side of Cathy's coffin so that when he dies he can lie beside her.³⁷ Heathcliff is practically a satyr compared to the asexual Prospero, whom Kevin Pask deems anti-pastoral in his control over Miranda and Ferdinand's courtship.

Conjuring a masque for the two young lovers, Prospero presents Juno, goddess of marriage, while Venus and Cupid, who would have made "Some wanton charm upon this man and maid" (4.1.95), are purposely excluded. The intruding thought of Caliban's assassination attempt dispels Prospero's illusions, rejecting, as Pask reads it, the magician's attempt at containing sexuality. However, Prospero would not eliminate sexuality, as he must hope for heirs from his daughter's match. Rather, his control is politically motivated since he continues to play the game under the rules of patriarchal authority. Just as Shakespeare himself began to move from the tangled lives of lovers to the domestic struggles of fathers in his later plays, Prospero is first and foremost concerned with the advancement of his family. Yet Prospero also retains some of the tragically romantic aspects of the Byronic hero with whom Heathcliff is so often associated.³⁸ They are both long sufferers, troubled by memories of happier times, capable of extreme emotions, and therefore slightly dangerous.

³⁷ Heathcliff's confession to Ellen of bribing the sexton this way comes right after Catherine asserts her own position as preferable, though imprisoned at the time by Heathcliff, because she loves and is loved. As if in response to the text's insistence on a new generation of love stories, Heathcliff contends that his story is still not over.

³⁸ For example Helen Brown, "The Influence of Byron on Emily Brontë," *Modern Language Review* 34 (1939), 374-81. Winifred Gerin, "Byron's Influence on the Brontës," *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin* 17 (1966), 1-19.

While not the Byronic antecedent most would envision for Heathcliff, the conjurer Manfred serves as an illuminating link between the two. Manfred has the magic of Prospero but the troubled romantic relationship of Heathcliff, and critics have noted both Byron and Shakespeare's influence on Brontë. Therefore, using one of Byron's "fatal men" can help illuminate the relationship between Shakespeare's magician and Brontë's puppet master (Praz 40).³⁹ In *Manfred* we find a character who fluctuates between the self-controlled master and the slave to suffering. And though Heathcliff's sexual energy may also be modeled after *The Corsair* or the world weary *Childe Harold*, what Heathcliff himself refuses to accept by the second half of the novel is that his time as a lover is over while his time for suffering and regret expands beyond limits just as Manfred's does. Though Heathcliff beats his head against a tree at the fresh loss of his love (143), the man Lockwood initially meets has had eighteen years to grow comfortable with both his grief and his power.

Heathcliff has no literal magic, unlike Prospero and Manfred, yet his links with the supernatural and his ability to manipulate others place him in the company of such powerful wizards. All three control the worlds they inhabit, though Manfred's does extend furthest into the realm of spirits. And perhaps this world of spirits further explains Heathcliff's derision by the critics. Though Prospero threatens Ariel with imprisonment and Manfred forces spirits to submit to his will, Heathcliff's domination remains fixed on the physical world amongst men and women who openly suffer because of him. Moreover, Prospero and Manfred's pursuit of power is also a pursuit of knowledge which distances them from the rest of society. Their calling to greater knowledge is noble, and in this sense, we have to reconsider how individual study and more worldly experiences have shaped these men.

³⁹ Praz and Davidson use the term "fatal men" to refer to the sympathetic fallen angels descended from the

Prospero and Manfred gain supernatural powers through solitary study, seeking something beyond the knowledge of men. By their actions they have essentially othered themselves as much as the Wild Man, and both plays allude to the impractical position of rulers who refuse to rule. Prospero, of course, takes his studies to such an extreme that he neglects his duties and loses his position, and Manfred can barely relate to the common men who watch him grow strange. However, their origins inform the nature of their efforts. Both men pursue knowledge as a means to dominate others, just as Heathcliff does, but Prospero and Manfred already possess a hereditary *right* to domination. Their status comes not from their deeds but from their family lines, and so their excesses are forgiven as mere eccentricities.

Heathcliff's knowledge, on the other hand, includes the outside world and greater association with men for the sole reason of enacting his revenge. He *begins* his journey strange and solitary and works steadily toward invading the aristocracy's realm. Though he is no less manipulative in reaching his goals than Prospero, without the semblance of seeking truth or the authority of blood, his goals seem villainous. Some might argue that Heathcliff's villainous reputation is deserved because he openly seeks others' pain, while Prospero only seeks resolution, but it is unclear within the play if the magician's merciful reprieve is what he initially intended. Elizabeth Freund argues convincingly that his actions suggest a vengeful nature and that even his show of mercy is competitive.⁴⁰ When Ariel reports how Prospero's enemies fare and admits that, were he human, he would have pity for them, the spirit inadvertently challenges the magician to prove his humanity. Prospero's mercy, however, is conditional when he says,

tradition of Milton's Satan.

⁴⁰ She notes that the phantom hounds sent to chase Trinculo and Stephano are named Tyrant and Fury and that Antonio fails Prospero's test, suggesting that he has lost his opportunity at mercy.

“they being penitent, / The sole drift of my purpose doth extend / Not a frown further” (5.1.28-29). But what new tortures might he have devised if they had *not* been penitent?

All three men represent the power of the individual will fighting against society's attempts to subdue it, and yet for all the power they possess, they are motivated by, and therefore slaves to, the relationships and conflicts of their pasts. Manfred can bend spirits and witches to his will, but all he asks of them is to help him forget. No amount of power will satisfy him until he can find closure with his dead sister. Similarly, Heathcliff's efforts to mimic the aristocracy are as much for his revenge on them as it is to finally receive the blessing of Cathy's good opinion. Though not under Miranda's sway in the same way, Prospero does proclaim that all he does is for his daughter's sake (1.2.16). Yet the conflict that truly shapes his actions throughout the play is his brother's betrayal. He has the power to enact swift justice, to kill his brother at any time throughout the play; instead he leads him into temptation again. Under Prospero's direction Ariel plays a song which lulls Alonso's royal party to sleep with the exception of Antonio, Prospero's brother, and Sebastian, Alonso's brother. By granting them the opportunity to plot and implement murder, Prospero essentially tests his brother. Reciting his earlier collusion with Alonso to overthrow Prospero, Antonio convinces Sebastian to kill his own brother. Though far from the court that encourages such treachery, these men remain under its influence. Betrayal is at the heart of all three texts, though Heathcliff and Prospero consider themselves victims, while Manfred is the traitor wracked with guilt. And for all three such betrayal is particularly damaging because of how each man's identity is tied into his relationships.

Manfred and Heathcliff share in the ignominy of incestuous relationships with their sisters, a common enough trope within Romantic poetry to facilitate discussions of identity.⁴¹

⁴¹ Shelley's *Laon and Cythna*, Byron's *Bride of Abydos*, and Coleridge's *Osorio* are a few examples.

Neither ever explicitly confess to sexual consummation, but Manfred's sister presumably dies as a result of their sin: "The deadliest sin to love as we have loved" (2.4.123). And while Cathy is not biologically Heathcliff's sister, their close relationship as children problematizes their sexual awareness of one another.⁴² Critics disagree whether Cathy and Heathcliff's relationship is transcendental, sadistic, or a representation of the greedy affection of children, but regardless of its nature, it is a bond that must be broken for Cathy to achieve adulthood.⁴³ Their resulting separation shatters their former identities because, as Cathy explains, they are one person (70). For the Romantics, the love between brother and sister was best suited to the goal of complete self-knowledge by giving one a "solipsistic reflection" altered only by gender (Mink).⁴⁴ In his reminiscences of his childhood, Manfred recounts how Astarte's features mirrored his own. She reflects a better version of himself because all of these aspects are "temper'd into beauty" (2.2.108), but after her death, he cannot fully know himself.

Similarly, Cathy defines herself through her affinity to and divergence from Heathcliff, and once separated from him cannot know herself. The image of the mirror is employed here also, for when Cathy is near death she looks at the mirror on the wall and does not recognize herself. Heathcliff and Manfred enter their respective stages wracked with regret. But while Manfred's guilt accepts his relationship with his sister as socially taboo, the sin of *Wuthering Heights* is Cathy's acceptance of another suitor. Therefore, Heathcliff's sense of betrayal is at variance with society's view. Manfred seeks his sister's forgiveness after death, while Heathcliff

⁴² As mentioned earlier, critics like Q. D. Leavis argue that Heathcliff is the son of Earnshaw, but the text does not explicitly state this.

⁴³ James Phillips, "The Two Faces of Love in *Wuthering Heights*," *Brontë Studies* 32 (July 2007), 96-105. Wade Thompson, "Infanticide and Sadism in *Wuthering Heights*," *Everitt* 138-51. Marielle Seichepine, "Childhood and Innocence in *Wuthering Heights*," *Brontë Studies*, 29 (November 2004), 209-15.

⁴⁴ Valerie Sanders also notes that amongst literary families this idea of complementarity continues into the nineteenth century but that same sex pairs are rarely noted in the same way.

still attempts, by taking off one side of Cathy's coffin, complete integration with his other half. Such fidelity might be applauded, but readers at the middle of the nineteenth century would expect a clear causality of suffering for such transgressions as traditionally “incest is attended by death” (Richardson 743).⁴⁵ For while many Victorian texts depict incestuous relationships, they also include appropriate punishment to remind readers of the forbidden nature of such relationships.

In comparison to the extremes of longing and despair that Manfred and Heathcliff suffer, Prospero's sense of betrayal is subtly expressed in a few angry epithets for his brother when explaining his past to Miranda. However, the same damage to the self exists as in the former texts, for the root of his anger comes not from being deposed (Prospero does, after all, come from a world of factions continually repositioning for power), but from his brother's disloyalty. By likening his brother to the ivy that feeds on another tree (1.2.86), he characterizes their relationship as parasitic, but clearly this is not what Prospero would expect from a brother. His outrage at Antonio's betrayal implies a belief in shared goals when instead their shared lineage allows one to replace the other. Antonio takes on all of the trappings and “outward face of royalty” (1.2.104), in effect replacing Prospero with his own visage. He even seems endowed with magical powers in the way Prospero describes his brother at court, who “new created / The creatures that were mine, I say – or changed 'em, / Or else new form'd 'em” (1.2.81-83). Given that Antonio possesses such creative powers, all the authority of the dukedom, and the face of royalty, there is little to indicate a difference between them, at least on the surface. Reinforcing the idea of power as external and even part of the market's exchange, Antonio refers to his new status in the form of clothing and says “look how well my garments sit upon me” (2.1.276).

⁴⁵

In an analysis of the Romantics use of incest, Richardson notes the pattern continuing into the

However, Prospero's recognition, and Caliban's, that his own powers come from his book, robe, and staff illustrate that offices of state are only outward show and do not make the man.⁴⁶

Shakespeare's canon is filled with sibling doubles, both same sex pairs as in the sets of twins in *Comedy of Errors* and Sebastian and Viola in *Twelfth Night*; in these cases the pairs are both physically and mentally so similar as to make them almost indistinguishable from one another. Prospero, by contrast, is quick to point out the difference in natures between two brothers, and Miranda colludes with the statement “[g]ood wombs have borne bad sons”(1.2.119), thus disallowing the importance of bloodlines. However, Prospero's retelling of his overthrow is dubious at best; it is only natural that he would distance himself from the man who betrayed him. But doing so complicates his earlier claim that he loved his brother best after his daughter and his outrage at being betrayed. If in fact, heredity has no influence over who one can trust, and Antonio was born with an evil nature, then how can Prospero be truly hurt and surprised at his treasonous behavior? Rather, it would seem that the brothers are quite similar, both maneuvering for power in the text. Antonio's methods may seem more extreme within the play: given the chance he would have murdered Alonso in his sleep, but Prospero may, in fact, be plotting his own brother's murder, granting mercy only at the last minute. Such an end would be in keeping with the long line of usurpation and the play's recognition that status and power are transitory qualities that a man can wear but never become.

In her article “Sibling Bonds and Bondage in (and beyond) *The Tempest*,” Naomi J. Miller notes the dearth of critical focus upon sibling bonds within the play, yet for a Restoration audience such conflicts of the play were so appealing that Dryden and Davenant doubled them

Victorian novel.

⁴⁶ Caliban recognizes the fluidity of power in his plan: “Remember / First to possess his books; for without them / He's but a sot, as I am” (3.2.95-7) and Prospero confirms it when he rejects magic: “Now my charms are all

by creating new pairs in their embellished edition. Not only did they add a sister apiece for Miranda and for Caliban, but the very illusions sent to plague Prospero's enemies repeatedly mention the betrayal and death of brothers.⁴⁷ Such a multiplicity of sibling bonds highlights both the expectation of solidarity within those bonds and the more frequent tensions and conflicts found there. Though far removed from the Romantic icon of a man mirrored in his sister, Prospero's own expectations of a brother's loyalty create a similar sense of mirrored personae that shatter when tested. As Miller notes, in *The Tempest* such connections easily become forms of bondage for all three men. For while Manfred may command spirits and demons, he is utterly submissive to the phantom of his sister. Though Heathcliff gains land and power, making himself one of the richest gentlemen in the county, Cathy remains out of his reach. And though power is restored to the rightful duke by the end of *The Tempest*, Prospero still cannot name Antonio as brother (5.1.130). Interestingly, by denying their bond he more completely underscores its existence, mutilated though it is. In a sense, such bonds for these men expose the limits of their powers.

However, Manfred stands alone as a figure lacking clear motivation. Though he wishes to forget Astarte, his bid for complete power remains separate from his love for his sister. Critics like Alan Richardson take Manfred's claim "I loved her, and destroy'd her" (2.2.117) as one of cause and effect. The details of how are unimportant; "Astarte is annihilated, in a fashion left to our imaginations, by her brother's literally consuming love" (Richardson 751). Regardless of how Manfred blames himself for her death, as the offending party he does not seek revenge upon anyone. Moreover, since it is his love, as opposed to his aspirations for power, that was fatal, the

o'erthrown, / And what strength I have's mine own, / Which is most faint" (5.1.1-3).

⁴⁷ For example, in describing tyrants crimes the second Devil describes "barb'rous Monarchs . . . who their Brothers to death have betray'd" (2.3).

text has no lesson to teach about humility. Rather than a returned *balance* of power, Manfred's drive is simply for more. Prospero and Heathcliff, on the other hand, are very much focused upon returning to an earlier state; they have a very clear sense of what is their due and how to reach it. Yet both men lose momentum as they close in upon the destruction of their enemies, perhaps because of the way in which their affections are linked to their plots.

Repackaging Revenge

Neither Prospero nor Heathcliff are usually read within the context of traditional revenge figures. It is Prospero's role as a father and patriarch that critics usually explore, and Heathcliff is always remembered as the lover. Moreover, both men abandon their plots when one of the defining tropes of revenge narratives is that the revenger can never rest until he reaches his goal. Rather, the rebellious and harassed figure of Caliban, fixated upon his claim to the island, seems more suited to a study of revenge. In *A Wild Kind of Justice*, Linda Anderson discusses Shakespeare's treatment of revenge within his romantic comedies. She explains that conflict usually arises from a vengeful character "alien to the world of the play" (57) and has this to say about his treatment:

Although there is frequently a gesture of reconciliation extended toward the victim of the revenge, the emphasis is on punishing the erring character in an appropriate fashion, exposing his crimes or follies both to himself and to society, and ensuring his behavior will change. (57)

Though Anderson makes no mention of Caliban specifically, his punishment and repentance seem in keeping with such a description. But perhaps Anderson's lack of discussion on *The Tempest* in general is proof that it does not easily fit into such patterns. Focusing upon Caliban's

failed revenge would disregard the larger point that Prospero is also in the midst of a plot to punish his brother. Though on the surface Caliban and Prospero are diametrically opposed, it is precisely at the moment of implementing his plot that Caliban reveals his kinship to Prospero, asserting his place in the line of usurpers. And recognizing this transformation from the impotent rage of the slave to the cold and reasoned vengeance of the tyrant in a figure like Heathcliff further illustrates the cyclical nature of both texts.

Revenge is by its very nature an attack upon the state; such recourse implies that the state itself is incapable of dispensing justice (Simkin). However, Prospero is the only real authority of the play, so it may be argued that rather than enacting revenge, Prospero is simply regaining balance and harmony for both his states. In controlling his own narrative, the magician certainly wants his acts to seem justified, to appear as the disinterested policies of a benevolent minister. As Meredith Anne Skura points out, such dispensers of justice are common within the Shakespeare canon. However, the guiding principle for Prospero's actions toward both his brother and Caliban is to reinforce his distinct place above them because such boundaries are constantly threatening to dissolve.⁴⁸ Even his mercy at the play's end is set to distinguish him from his foes, yet all of Prospero's actions amount to the usurpation of the throne in Naples, and Caliban's attempted overthrow is the result of what Prospero has taught him. Because he is so quickly thwarted, audiences are never given the opportunity to see what Caliban with power might have been. Rather it is through a figure like Heathcliff, once rebellious and unlearned, that audiences are able to see the consequences of revenge as Heathcliff becomes a Prospero figure, the very patriarchal presence he had hoped to destroy.

⁴⁸ Skura goes on to discuss the benevolent figures of earlier plays who retreat from life, as in the self-exiled dukes of *Measure for Measure* and *As You Like It*, but lash out excessively at subordinates who illustrate their own flaws.

Though both *Wuthering Heights* and *The Tempest* demonstrate the damaging effects of revenge, they simultaneously offer the audience a vicarious experience of retribution as popular in the nineteenth century as in the early modern period. Despite their different beginnings, Prospero and Heathcliff serve the same function as movers of their plots, motivated by vengeance. However, while readers still clearly enjoyed revenge in the nineteenth century, their relationship with revengers was markedly more distant than it was for early modern audiences, who were still attracted to the idea and practice of revenge. Certainly, Elizabethan tragedies denounced the pursuit of revenge by punishing its agents by play's end, and Shakespeare himself would have heard the Church of England's homily against contention and brawling, which asked that men control their desire to retaliate. Fredson Bowers notes in his *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* that dueling and private revenge were less of a problem under Elizabeth primarily because of the firm grip she kept on her courtiers. It was only under James I that the practice of dueling became such a problem that he addressed it directly in a tract entitled *The Peacemaker* (34).⁴⁹ However, even if the problem of dueling only became serious in the seventeenth century, the presence of so many tracts against it reveal that in some ways revenge was very much a part of life. For instance, the Oath of Association, a declaration signed by Elizabeth's supporters to pursue her killers should she be murdered, is essentially a pledge of state sanctioned revenge (Keyishan 7). Therefore, while a law-abiding citizenry might pay lip service to the sinfulness of revenge, the politics and plays of the time reveal that sometimes vengeance is an appropriate response. Prospero serves this ambiguity perfectly because he makes

⁴⁹ Interestingly, both Bower and Eleanor Prosser mention that concern over dueling increased with the ascension of James I to the throne and the subsequent influx of Scots to England. Whether this concern was caused by a true increase of dueling instances or simply an ingrained prejudice against the more brutal Scots is unclear, but Bower and Prosser illustrate through their qualification that even in the Early Modern period revenge was held as a foreign custom imported by less civilized cultures. Such a belief is more explicitly stated in tracts from the

a conscious choice to forgo vengeance after manipulating his enemies and illustrating what he *could* do to them. But such an argument for mercy must have appealed even more so to an audience that put its faith in its own government and society's controls.

The nineteenth century is astonishingly full of tracts on the subject of revenge and hatred, yet most are quick to point out the obsolescence of such passions and insist that revenge belongs to a more barbarous time, or if it still exists, it does so in less civilized places.⁵⁰ Ethnographers of the time were quick to point out the violence used to end disputes in other cultures.

Christopher Lane explains in his book *Hatred and Civility* that such a preoccupation with hate resulted from Victorian society's advocacy of charity and the rehabilitation of criminals. In order to understand fully how to help society, one had to understand its malcontents. This fascination with the darker end of humanity's spectrum extended into the period's novels, as Daniel Hack has noted.⁵¹ His article "Revenge Stories of Modern Life" speculates that the lack of critical attention in this area is due to the fact that such plots are not at the center of the texts, but merely used as "convenient, conventional source[s] for motivation" (277). More surprising than the presence of so much revenge in a period that insists on its extinction is the acceptance of such motivation by characters and readers alike as an understandable, if not justifiable, response. William Hazlitt's essay "The Pleasure of Hating" (1826) offers a more nuanced, and for its time more scandalous, view. Rather than a blanket statement about the absence of hatred, Hazlitt declares that "The spirit of malevolence survives the practical exertion of it" (112) and uses the

nineteenth century.

⁵⁰ Some examples include "The Decay of Revenge" (1880), *The Solitudes of Nature and of Man* (1867), and "The Natural History of Revenge" (1871), which claims that "a keen and determined hater almost always has in him a tinge of Semitic blood" (116). When time and space failed to distance readers from the impulse of revenge, there was always the division of race.

⁵¹ Hack offers the following examples, though his article focuses mostly upon *Mill on the Floss* (1860) and *Basil* (1852): *Frankenstein* (1818), *Wuthering Heights* (1847), *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859), *Great Expectations* (1861), *Our Mutual Friend* (1865), *A Study in Scarlet* (1887), *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1891).

example of an innocent spider to illustrate our natural aversion. He characterizes the generosity and benevolence of society as a veil hiding our darker impulses and explains that the popularity of Sir Walter Scott's novels stems from his ability to “carry us back to the feuds . . . and the revenge of a barbarous age” (114). Hazlitt reveals the pleasure of experiencing these violent passions vicariously, but he fails to mark the importance of distance, for many of Scott's novels are set in the distant past and in remote areas of Scotland, a land quite apart from his English readers. And though many of Scott's novels use history's backdrop to comment on present-day upheavals, his distance softens such criticism. Brontë herself was a great admirer of Scott; critics, like Florence Swinton Dry have even noted Scott's novel *The Black Dwarf* as a likely source for *Wuthering Heights*. However, the events of Brontë's narrative end with Heathcliff's death in 1802 in a pocket of the Yorkshire moors (P. Thompson). Having fully absorbed the passions of Scott's novel, Brontë fails to fully shield her readers with the deceit that *these things* could never happen *here*.⁵² In light of the Victorian fascination and denial of revenge and hatred, critical animosity toward the text, like the reaction to Hazlitt's essay, is not surprising.

Furthermore, the ambiguous ending of *Wuthering Heights* leaves readers unclear as to whether Heathcliff is punished or rewarded through his death. While early modern tales of revenge included both revenge villains and heroes, nineteenth-century revenge figures most often exist as dark foils of the protagonists, for example, Mannion in Wilkie Collins' *Basil*, or peripheral characters who shape events for good or ill for the protagonists, such as Hortense in Dickens' *Bleak House*. Heathcliff, however, is a protagonist who shapes his own events;

⁵² Descriptions othering Heathcliff do work to distance audiences from him, but I argue that his villainy is not remote enough for audiences to safely reflect upon it. Edward Chitham has noted in *The Life of Emily Brontë* that one of Emily's early artistic differences with her sisters was a desire to set their stories in a more realistic, English setting. An anonymous reviewer for *The Examiner* (1848) suggested that setting her novel so close makes it less believable, but the instinct toward disbelief reveals the threat of such brutality in our backyards.

Wuthering Heights simply catalogs his villainies and finally his death. And while many a villain dies without remorse for his deeds, the “life-like gaze of exultation” (284) that Ellen Dean describes upon discovering his corpse hardly fits the reader's expectation that crimes will be punished in this world or the next. The revenge genre, though subversively questioning the justice of the state, always reinforces the presence of an unerring natural law so that by a text's end balance is re-established and evil is punished. This system is as much in place in nineteenth-century novels as it was in the early modern dramas that surely influenced them.⁵³ No doubt Heathcliff's grand escape from punishment contributed to criticism that *Wuthering Heights* is an “inartistic” book (*Atlas* 1848); for, he makes his death his own reward, distorting our ideas of retribution. But then Prospero, in a sense, cheats death by presenting his revenge as a comedy (Freund 194). Neither man fully completes the revenge they have imagined, but only Prospero is praised for this break from tradition, a sign of how well he has shaped his own narrative. By rejecting a traditional end, both texts bring into question the beginnings of revenge. Instead of an isolated period of injustice that must be resolved, the tradition of brothers and sons usurping power seems to go on without an end in sight.

In order to conclude a traditional revenge plot, characters must first identify clearly who is in the wrong. Revenge tragedies operate under the assumption that there is an inherently good power structure that, before the initial wrong was committed, had sustained a steady social balance. Whether political or domestic, this power structure is toppled, resulting in general misery. The ultimate goal of such a narrative is not only punishment for malefactors, but also a return to a previous, idyllic state. But was the senior Earnshaw or Hindley a better head of house? Was Prospero a better ruler than Antonio? Rather than supporting a divine or even

⁵³

Mannion (*Basil*) falls to his death; Frankenstein's creature says that he will burn himself on a pyre;

hereditary right to rule, both *The Tempest* and *Wuthering Heights* suggest that one ruler is almost indistinguishable from the other. Prospero comes from a world where political factions jockey for position, and on his island Prospero proves that he is just as skilled at manipulation as Alonso and Antonio. Within a more domestic scope, *Wuthering Heights* represents a succession of tyrannical fathers, making little distinction between legitimate (Hindley) and illegitimate (Heathcliff) rule. Even the apparently more refined Edgar Linton proves a restrictive figure against which his daughter rebels (Mink).⁵⁴ The greater scope of *Wuthering Heights* makes this repetition more apparent as one ruler mirrors the other's behavior. Perhaps this is why in the restrictive time frame of *The Tempest* brothers, Sebastian and Antonio, imitate and replace brothers, while sons, Caliban and Ferdinand, only hint at the eventual overthrow of their fathers.

Although Prospero himself seems to obscure the cyclical nature of usurpation within the play, the transition and fluidity of power is still suggested through language and the material nature of rule. When Prospero first takes off his robe, he refers to the garment itself as “my art” (1.2.24), thus separating the man from the magic.⁵⁵ Antonio also refers to his position as Duke by saying “how well my garments sit upon me” (2.1.276), and Caliban adamantly declares in his own bid for power that Prospero's books are the key to his power (3.2.91-99). As Prospero himself has revealed, his power exists in moveables and not the man himself. Rather than figures of chaos justifying the need for control, Caliban and Antonio illustrate that the murdering slave and the civilized man are only separated by a robe and a book. Caliban is never given the chance to prove what a ruler he would be, but while plotting Alonso's murder, Antonio uses an argument

Hortense (*Bleak House*) will be executed for her crimes.

⁵⁴ Joanna Mink points out that though Catherine never explicitly labels her father as repressive, her existence under his control is bound by the dimensions of the park (42).

⁵⁵ Furness's *Variorum* notes several similar instances that precede *The Tempest* in which figures of state and religion take off the clothes of their office and refer to those clothes as the position itself.

that reinforces the savage's own claim that the mantles of power obscure the fact that all men are equally and naturally brutal. To convince Sebastian that nothing in his brother is intrinsically royal, he tells him he is “No better than the earth he lies upon” (2.1.285). Though hidden within a myriad of insults, Caliban's own connection to earth is echoed here, reminding the audience that Alonso was Antonio's ally in usurping Prospero. This absence of clearly defined malefactors and benefactors complicates the idea of a return to balance. However, a common dilemma for the revenger to face is recognizing that in order to give as well as he gets, he must become the thing he hates most.⁵⁶

In his discussion of revenge elements within the Shakespeare canon, Harry Keyishan explains that the impetus for revenge, a crime against the protagonist, normally damages the victim's identity. Prospero ceases to be Duke of Milan, while Heathcliff ceases to be Cathy's other half when she rejects him. Whether to regain an earlier identity, as Prospero would regain his dukedom, or refashion one's self entirely, as Heathcliff does, the victim takes on the identity of the revenger. However, unlike most revengers, who must use subterfuge and work outside of the realm of authority, Prospero and Heathcliff create their own authority. Prospero and Heathcliff negotiate their new identities and from them eke out new realms to control. As reigning authorities neither fully fits the mold of the subversive rebel; they cannot subvert the state because they are the state. From the first act, Prospero makes clear that he alone controls who will live and die and who is free or imprisoned. He reminds Ariel of how he freed him from Sycorax's prison in the cloven pine; he reminds Caliban how he once kept him in his house before exiling him; and he tells Miranda that no one on the sea is harmed from his tempest because he has complete control over the storm. Heathcliff also emerges as an authority of sorts.

⁵⁶ Vindice of *The Revenger's Tragedy* is a clear example of a man who sacrifices his own morals in pursuit of

Though he stores up wrongs as a Caliban would, his vengeance resides within the limits of the law. Heathcliff never steals from Hindley; he simply uses his own vices against him, and though some of his actions are legally questionable, they are the actions of a gentleman who plans rather than a criminal who violently takes what he wants.⁵⁷ Both men succeed in matching their oppressors, on some level recognizing what they have become.

Prospero has no hatred for the patriarchal system of rule. He was once in charge and hopes to be again. Yet Prospero makes a distinction between his own, *laissez-faire* style of rule and the machinations of his brother, which pit members of the court against each other for his favor. Is it then the knowledge that he too uses his powers to create havoc that stays Prospero's hand from a more vengeful end, the knowledge that he would in fact be no better than his brother if he committed fratricide as retribution? In one of his rare disclosures of thought, Prospero compares his own humanity to Ariel's, even though Ariel is not human. Such a comparison both suggests his own spiritual superiority over man and avoids a comparison with his brother. Still there is a recognition within the magician that revenge has made him something Other. Having limited knowledge of both Prospero and Antonio's thoughts makes it quite difficult to recognize Prospero's movement toward corruption. Yet what we do know of the magician is that he once ignored the citizens of his realm to pursue his studies whereas on the island all of his attention is centered upon its inhabitants. He has created a court of sorts through Ariel and Caliban and lords over them the due they owe him as we would expect Antonio to do. Bribing Ariel with the promise of freedom while plaguing Caliban with cramps and stitches resembles his brother's own practice of deciding "who t' advance, and who / To trash for overtopping" (1.2.80-81).

revenge. He lies, kills, and at one point persuades his own mother to prostitute his sister.

⁵⁷ C.P. Sanger observes that it is unclear how Brontë would have gained a knowledge of property law, but even if she made a mistake by making Heathcliff hold Thrushcross Grange illegally, it is clear that she meant for

Paradoxically, Prospero has become more involved, and therefore corrupted, in the world of men on his deserted island than he ever was in Milan. Yet it is still clearly the outside world, which includes the rules of revenge, that causes this change.

Heathcliff fares no better at remaining himself, though he seems less aware of his transformation than Prospero is. At first only mimicking the men of leisure he despises, Heathcliff fully inhabits the role of the courting and gambling gentleman and finds himself as much a tyrant as was Hindley, the adoptive brother he vowed to destroy. Pitied for the loss of his wife and dependence on alcohol, Hindley is sometimes forgotten as the tyrant who taught Heathcliff how to be one, but consider Ellen Dean's exclamation after Hareton's father drops him over the stair railing: "He hates you—they all hate you—that's the truth! A happy family you have; and a pretty state you've come to!" (64). A similar judgment might be made on Heathcliff and the perverse family that surrounds him when Lockwood first enters the Heights. How then can Heathcliff be an outsider when he is simply continuing the tradition of violence and neglect? He purposely mirrors Hindley in his own degradation of Hareton, but unwittingly follows the pattern of class bias when he cultivates a relationship between Catherine and his son Linton but obstructs a relationship between Catherine and Hareton. And while Heathcliff recognizes himself in Hareton, he seems utterly unaware of how he, as *pater familias*, is simply reprising the script that separated him from Cathy. He even goes so far as to forbid Catherine from being friends with Hareton, unabashedly threatening that "your [Catherine's] love will make him [Hareton] an outcast" (272). It is precisely this insensitivity to others, his very surprise at finding the spark of rebellion amongst his subjects, that confirms Heathcliff's transformation into the patriarch. Even

Heathcliff to exact his revenge using the tools and methods of the aristocracy he hates.

if Prospero and Heathcliff are not aware of what they have become, they nevertheless must renounce their positions or die. And for Heathcliff the former can only result from the latter.

Though the revenge tragedy provides an exploration into subversion of the state, by the play's end the characters' rebellious drive must be contained. And having surrendered to the passions of vengeance, for most revengers the only possible conclusion is death: "The logic of revenge tragedy thus maintains that the fated, vicious self-perpetuating circle of revenge will come to an end only when there is no one left to perform further acts of revenge" (Freund 203). Prospero avoids this fate by voluntarily surrendering his magical powers and shaping his own narrative into a revenge comedy ending in marriage rather than a pile of corpses. As Anderson notes in her discussion of Shakespeare's comedies, comic revengers tend to only *observe* initial wrongs or are affected only indirectly. Rather than the personal drive toward retribution, comic revengers are better able to accomplish impartial justice. Punishment for offenders tends to be light and functions to regain a previous state of balance and order. As an objective stage manager of the play's resolution, Prospero most resembles Vincentio, the retiring Duke of *Measure for Measure* who puts everything to rights by the play's end.⁵⁸ Both plays end with all characters onstage to hear how justice has been served, and we can assume that such a self-aware director as Prospero staged the scene to emphasize his authority and benevolence. But unlike Vincentio's, Prospero's actions are personally motivated, and it is unclear whether his plot truly ends with the play. Though Prospero formally forgives his brother that is not to say legally administered retribution will not follow upon their return to Milan. There is even doubt that Prospero has fully renounced his role as revenge plotter when he merely alludes to his brother's

⁵⁸ Often labeled as one of the problem plays *Measure for Measure* resists this assumption that all is resolved, but at least from the Duke's point of view order is naturally restored when he returns to hand out punishments and rewards.

attempt to assassinate Alonso, no doubt holding this information for leverage later (5.1.127-29). One might even argue that his revenger's death is in proportion to his vengeance as Prospero expects his death will be soon. Still the trappings of the revenge comedy are convincing enough to relieve him from any critical mutterings about the sin of revenge. Balance is restored, and audiences can remember Prospero as a symbol of mercy.

Balance for Heathcliff, however, is more complicated because his earlier identity, defined by his relationship to Cathy, has been destroyed. Inexplicably, Heathcliff notes a growing apathy toward his own goal of revenge, and possibly he has realized that destroying his enemies will bring him no closer to that earlier state of unity. But Brontë denies her readers the chance to forgive him his past, for he flatly denies that he has mercy for his enemies. Yet his own words reveal sympathetic feeling that he barely admits to himself. Once, after passing Hareton in the hall, Heathcliff muses, "It will be odd if I thwart myself . . . But when I look for his father in his face, I find *her* every day more!" (257). Compared to Caliban's complete relinquishment of his claim to power or Prospero's conscious choice to break his staff, Heathcliff's reflection on his lack of motivation hardly qualifies him for leniency. As an unrepentant revenger, he must die. But within his death there is a certain kind of surrender, to Cathy's power over him, to the natural order of things and the inevitability of legacy. And strangely, it is by denying power over others that these men are rewarded. Caliban retakes his island, Prospero his dukedom, and Heathcliff is reunited with Cathy in death. Unlike most ghosts in revenge stories, they are not there to avenge some wrong. Spirits roaming the earth are traditionally being punished for past wrongs or else seeking retribution. Only when things are set to rights can they rest in peace, but Cathy and Heathcliff are finally at peace *because* they can wander their moors for all eternity. This is an unenviable position for readers, since Cathy's earlier dream indicates that neither one was fit for

heaven. As an adolescent Cathy recalls a dream to Ellen Dean in which she died and went to heaven but was so miserable there that the angels threw her back onto the heath of Wuthering Heights. Just as Cathy cried for joy at the end of her dream to find that she was not in heaven, so we can imagine Heathcliff and Cathy overjoyed to be on the moors. After Heathcliff's death, a small boy with his sheep tells Lockwood that he saw "Heathcliff and a woman" (286) and is scared to continue on the road. The idea that the two are akin to something devilish that spooks sheep is consistent with their characters, and now there are no social boundaries to limit them. Only now are Cathy and Heathcliff able to cut themselves off from the outside world, and by becoming literally immured in the natural world their *supernatural* powers are fully realized.

Heathcliff's Triumphant Regression

Death returns Heathcliff to an existence Cathy earlier describes as "half savage and hardy, and free" (107), so in essence he has returned to his position as a Caliban figure. Moreover, if Heathcliff and Cathy are children again, which admittedly is unclear from the text, than they have regressed fully to a time before they were parted as if Paradise were regained, Gothic and violent though it is. This period would be analogous to Caliban's Edenic years of study under Miranda and Prospero's tutelage, before he was aware of his otherness. By returning to the relatively more innocent and sympathetic Caliban figure of his youth, Heathcliff manages to both satisfy reader's expectations of justice and the novel's inevitable drive toward Cathy and Heathcliff's reunion. But does Heathcliff win or has he thwarted himself? Compared to Prospero, a figure defined by his ability to control others, Heathcliff consciously relinquishes his hold over

his enemies and their property when he dismisses the idea of writing his will. Sensing his approaching death, Heathcliff announces to Ellen Dean,

“When day breaks I’ll send for Green,” he said; “I wish to make some legal inquiries of him while I can bestow a thought on those matters, and while I can act calmly. I have not written my will yet; and how to leave my property I cannot determine. I wish I could annihilate it from the face of the earth.” (282)

For all Heathcliff’s mastery over his environment, his plot has been decidedly shortsighted. By prolonging his enemies’ suffering, he has inadvertently created an opportunity for the two families to regain what they have lost. Moreover, by denying the power of legacy, Heathcliff has left no natural successor to continue his reign. Or perhaps he has, for while not biologically linked, Heathcliff has shaped Hareton in his own likeness to be a child of nature. We cannot assume Heathcliff is considering making Hareton his heir, yet he must be aware of the difficulty that the only person to care for him is also the last person he should reward. Heathcliff’s exclamation that he would rather see the property annihilated illustrates that the creation of his empire was only the means to others’ destruction. But through its creation the power of legacy is reinforced.

A moment later, Heathcliff tells Ellen that he will not send for Green. Unlike Prospero, who highlights his own virtue, Heathcliff is quick to insist that he does not repent his earlier actions; his priorities have simply shifted. Still he must know the consequences of *not* leaving a will. As C. P. Sanger explains, Heathcliff has wrongfully taken possession of Thrushcross Grange; upon his death the property will return to Catherine, the only surviving heir of Edgar Linton. And though Heathcliff does own the mortgage on Wuthering Heights, Hareton, as Hindley’s heir, would be entitled to the “equity of redemption” (139). Assuming that Heathcliff

knows this, he shows the most fatherly feeling to Hareton through inaction, as if recognizing the full scale of the course he is on. He also ceases to block the young lover's courtship, even sending Hareton back to Catherine when he bids Heathcliff to eat his meal. Therefore, Heathcliff does thwart himself, unknowingly working toward his enemy's happiness. However, as Heathcliff returns to his earlier self, we must use his earlier goals to gauge his success.

As a Caliban figure, Heathcliff is powerless both because of his low status in the family and because of the subordinate position he willingly takes in relation to Cathy. Even then he seeks revenge on Hindley but never power for its own sake. So while a return to his stable boy status may seem like a regression, Heathcliff explains that this is his version of heaven (283). His eternal reward comes by accepting his own Otherness and the cycle of power and inheritance that even he, an outsider, is subject to. And while we cannot know Prospero's vision of an afterlife, he similarly imagines his approaching death as a release and transference of power.

Critics in the nineteenth century generally have read Prospero's renunciation of magic as the heralding of a different kind of rule under the next generation. Ferdinand has "all the chivalrous magnanimity with which man, in a high state of civilization, disguises his real superiority" and Miranda, as a reincarnation of Eve will surely help him to succeed as a fair and just guardian (Jameson 126; Lowell, from Furness's *Variorum*). Dowden takes the comparison between Shakespeare and Prospero one step further in suggesting that Ferdinand, as the heir to Prospero's power, is suggestive of Fletcher, who collaborated with Shakespeare and went on to become a successful dramatist (from Furness's *Variorum* 364). Ferdinand and Miranda, as yet uncorrupted, will bring mercy and justice to their lands, but why might we expect that when Ferdinand is only a slightly more cultured Caliban? Prospero threatens to continue his manipulations, teaching them how to rebel under his oppressive controls, and the charming scene

of Ferdinand and Miranda playing chess is suggestive of the plots they themselves will devise. Similarly, Brontë's text ends with Ellen Dean's promise that Hareton and Catherine will be married on New Year's Day, literally beginning a new era for both families. It would seem that having contained Heathcliff's subversive force in death, Brontë returns to convention to convince her audience that all is well. Observing the couple going out for a walk, Lockwood notes, "Together they would brave satan [sic] and all his legions" (286). This puts us back in mind of Heathcliff as the devil and refigures Hareton and Cathy as champions against evil. But for all practical purposes, they are still the *children* of the devil. The cyclical nature of usurpation illustrated in both texts suggests that the next generation will prove just as corruptible as the former. Neither text offers a clear stance on whether these vices are hereditary or taught, but that discussion is immaterial in light of the fact that the Other, which threatens the family, is always created by the family and that rebellion is a natural phase in the cycle of power.

Distance ultimately shapes audiences' perspectives, for though both *The Tempest* and *Wuthering Heights* question the legitimacy of traditional power structures, *The Tempest* convinces its audience that the threat to order is contained by the island while *Wuthering Heights* leaves it wandering the moors, ready to jump out at unsuspecting sheep herders. By returning most of its cast to a recognizable world, *The Tempest* allows everyone to think that vice, in the shape of Caliban, has been left behind. Heathcliff and Cathy, on the other hand, are only separated from the living by a thin veil. But by recognizing the family traditions of rebellion and repression in both texts, we can see that the subversive Other is never far away. The inequalities of man are wholly man-made and serve to obscure the fact that naked, we are all Calibans. Prospero merely hints at this truth by claiming Caliban reluctantly as his own (5.1.275-76). Such

a statement reinforces Prospero's and Heathcliff's bond, but by putting it in the mouth of a wise mage instead of a fiend, Shakespeare has packaged truth into a form we can stomach.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

Caliban and Heathcliff offer readers an in depth analysis of devils at a safe distance, but compared to the other characters of each respective text their bestial, demonic, and racial descriptors seem to emphasize only a surface difference. Their texts other them in order to obscure how very much they are a part of their families. From a critical standpoint in the nineteenth century, one might identify more with Caliban precisely because of his physical markers as Other whereas Heathcliff is dangerously devoid of obvious difference. Compared to the New World native, Heathcliff is nearly indistinguishable from other men, which explains the insistence on denying him his humanity. Furthermore, his geographic closeness to readers makes him a very real threat to the traditional family structure. However, examining the ways in which their texts and their critics have othered them reveals audiences' complicated attitudes toward the figure of natural man. In the nineteenth century Heathcliff and Caliban are both lauded and reviled for their affinity to the earth; when they speak well they are newly-made Adams, and when they act poorly they are ignorant beasts. But many of their crimes are learned behaviors. They are first subjected to and then blamed for the vices of the outside world from which natural men should be exempt.

Considering these two figures in relation to the Wild Man helps clarify Caliban and Heathcliff's separate projects. While Caliban hopes to replace Prospero, Heathcliff threatens to destroy the position itself. Besides the general fear of miscegenation and unauthorized movement between classes, Heathcliff mostly threatens the patriarchal order that shaped him.

Though he focuses his revenge upon the two families who ostracized him, his work is symbolic of a larger desire to tear down all lines of inheritance and heredity. And yet he eventually finds himself in the role of the patriarch. His affinity to Prospero reveals that regardless of his initial rebellious impulse he is as much a part of the order of succession as Earnshaw's biological son, Hindley. The motivation behind both texts' project to other Caliban and Heathcliff is to obscure the fact that making the Other is a family tradition. Instead of a stranger from a strange land, the outsiders of these texts are homegrown and rise up against their perceived oppressors as a response to their neglect. In this way rebellion is kept within the family circle, normalizing it from the sensational and violent exception to an every day occurrence of transferring power within families.

A close analysis of *The Tempest* and *Wuthering Heights* reveals a tradition of neglectful and abusive fathers resulting in the next generation's rebellion. Earnshaw bemoans the shortcomings of his children, most notably on the eve of his death when he asks Cathy why she cannot always be a good girl, but Earnshaw takes no responsibility for making her behave better. In fact, Cathy's reply, "Why can't you always be a good man, father?" implies that the mischievous children are simply following the example of their elders (Brontë 36). And though we cannot know whether Cathy refers to a specific vice of her father's, we do know that Earnshaw's favoritism for Heathcliff causes Hindley to feel displaced within his own family. In reaction to this feeling of Otherness, Hindley others Heathcliff, continuing his father's tradition of being at once strict and largely uninvolved with Cathy and Heathcliff's upbringing. And though Heathcliff may resist the role of father, he falls right into the Earnshaw line by othering Hareton, for it is precisely the *lack* of fatherly affection that makes Hareton so resemble him. Lest one believe this neglect to be a product of the more wild *Wuthering Heights*, we should

recall that Edgar Linton also neglects his wife and daughter for his books. Had he been more aware he might have stopped Cathy's rebellious death or Catherine's marriage to his enemy's son. While clearly the text reveals the dangerous results of negligent fathers, othering Heathcliff suggests that the family misfortunes are solely his responsibility when he is simply a part of the tradition.

By contrast, Prospero seems the perfect father, even taking charge of his daughter's education, but his exclusion of his adopted son from the family circle creates a rebel who threatens his life just as Heathcliff threatens the life of the Earnshaw name. Prospero also neglects his subjects in Milan, and his preference for study opens the door for his brother's treachery. His neglect not only provides the opportunity for transgressions, but by pushing Caliban outside of the realm of his concerns, literally forgetting about him while putting on a masque for Ferdinand and Miranda, he creates the rebel's desire to invade. And though critics have long discussed the connection between Caliban and Heathcliff, because the savage never succeeds in his scheme, Heathcliff serves as a model for what Caliban might have been as he transforms into the patriarch and master of his plot.

Significantly, by shaping their own narratives, Prospero and Heathcliff attest to their own unique positions. Prospero asserts himself as a benevolent ruler in contrast to the thieving murderers who surround him while Heathcliff encourages his reputation as a devil and curse upon an otherwise upstanding family. Though presenting opposite positions, they both insist on their distance from the norm, obscuring the fact that these men are simply re-inscribing the traditions that shaped them. The dictates of revenge support their stance as men uniquely wronged. The revenger assumes a fair and balanced beginning that can only be regained through violence. In her discussion of *The Tempest*, Elizabeth Freund reads the anagram of Caliban's

name (canibal) as supporting “the notion of revenge as self-devouring” (203). Within most revenge tragedies, wrongs can only be amended after the deaths of those involved. True, the families of these texts continually damage themselves through their actions, but Freund's observation suggests that revenge creates its own inescapable end. Instead the families of both texts seem to foster its legacy from generation to generation. And yet the desire for closure within the narrative pushes audiences toward a reading that each text ends with a regime change. Both texts have revealed that legacy is not limited to bloodlines; the actions of the past will surely inform the next generation's. Hareton is just as flawed as his adoptive father, and Ferdinand and Miranda will return to a world of intrigue and manipulations. How can we possibly expect them to remain uncorrupted?

Rather than a triumphant victory for either Caliban or Heathcliff, these men regress into their earlier states, victors by default. Caliban regains his island while Heathcliff gets his Cathy and his moor, but only because society has devalued their spaces in the same way *they* were once devalued. Catherine and Hareton may control Wuthering Heights, but Ellen Dean tells us that they have chosen to live at Thrushcross Grange. Compared to Prospero's move from desert island to Milan, the distance of four miles down the hill is insignificant, but the young couples' choice is still a movement away from the wilderness. Given Caliban and Heathcliff's close association with their environments, this denunciation not only repeats their earlier ostracization; it highlights the fact that neither text ever fully accepts the Other as its own. Therefore, the cycle of neglect and rebellion will most likely continue. As Brian Sutton puts it, “the forces of disorder remain intact and largely unrepentant” (228), but such a statement ignores the fact that the forces of disorder are always present though disowned and distanced from the families that made them.

WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED

Allott, Miriam Farris. *The Brontës, the Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Anderson, Linda. *A Kind of Wild Justice: Revenge in Shakespeare's Comedies*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1987.

Anonymous. "The Natural History of Hatred." *Littell's Living Age*, 111. Boston, Mass.: E. Littell & Co., 1871.115-17.

Barker, Juliet. *The Brontës: A Life in Letters*. New York: The Overlook Press, 1998.

Brontë, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Richard J. Dunn. New York: Norton & Company, 2003.

Brown, Helen. "The Influence of Byron on Emily Brontë." *Modern Language Review*, 34 (1939): 374-81.

Bowers, Fredson. *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Byron, George Gordon. *Selected Poems*. Ed. Susan J. Wolfson. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Chitham, Edward. *A Life of Emily Brontë*. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1987.

- Daileader, Celia R. "Handsome Devils: Romance, Rape, Racism, and the Rhet(t)oric of Darkness." *Racism, Misogyny, and the Othello Myth: Inter-racial Couples from Shakespeare to Spike Lee*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Damrosch, Leopold. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Restless Genius*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2005.
- Dry, Florence Swinton. *The Sources of "Wuthering Heights."* Folcroft, Pa.: Folcroft Press, 1969.
- Eagleton, Terry. "Myths of Power in *Wuthering Heights*." *New Casebooks: Wuthering Heights*. Ed. Patsy Stoneman. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993. 118-30.
- Edmondson, Paul. "Shakespeare and the Brontës." *Brontë Studies*, 29 (November 2004): 185-98.
- Elfenbein, Andrew. *Byron and the Victorians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Everitt, Alastair, comp. *Wuthering Heights: An Anthology of Criticism*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967.
- Fielder, Leslie A. *The Stranger in Shakespeare*. New York: Stein and Day, 1972.
- Flagstad, Karen. "'Making this Place Paradise': Prospero and the Problem of Caliban in *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Studies*, 18.(1986): 205-33.

Freund, Elizabeth. "The Wrath of Prospero." *Hebrew University Studies in Literature*, 6 (1978): 194-215.

Frye, Northrop. "The Argument of Comedy." *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory, 1945-2000*. Ed. Russ McDonald. Malden, Mass.:Blackwell, 2004. 89-99.

Gerin, Winifred. "Byron's Influence on the Brontes." *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin*, 17 (1966): 1-19.

Gilbert, Sandra M, and Susan Gubar. "Looking Oppositely: Emily Brontë's Bible of Hell." *The Madwoman in the Attic: the Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. 111-32.

Girdler, Lew. "Wuthering Heights and Shakespeare." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 19:4 (August 1956): 385-96.

Gonzalez Campos, Miguel Angel. "The Portrayal of Treason in The Tempest: The Fourfold Role of a Machiavellian Duke." *Sederi*, 14 (2004): 207-16.

Griffiths, Trevor R. "'This Island's Mine': Caliban and Colonialism." *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. New York: Macmillan, 1998. 130-51.

Hack, Daniel. "Revenge Stories of Modern Life." *Victorian Studies*, 48.2 (Winter 2006): 277-86.

Hazlitt, William. "The Pleasures of Hating." *The Oxford Book of Essays*. Ed. John Gross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 112-25.

Howell, W. D. *Heroines of Fiction*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1901.

Jameson, Anna. *Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women Moral, Poetical and Historical*. New York: Gramercy Books: 2003.

Keyishian, Harry. *The Shapes of Revenge: Victimization, Vengeance, and Vindictiveness In Shakespeare*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1995.

Lane, Christopher. *Hatred & Civility: The Antisocial Life In Victorian England*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Leavis, Q. D. "A Fresh Approach to *Wuthering Heights*." *Lectures in America*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1969. 86-104.

Leininger, Lorie Jerrell. "The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's *Tempest*." *The Tempest*. Ed. Robert Langbaum. New York: Penguin, 1998. 21-33.

Lootens, Tricia. *Lost Saints: Silence, Gender, and Victorian Canonization*. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 1996.

Lutz, Deborah. *The Dangerous Lover: Gothic Villains, Byronism, and the Nineteenth-century Seduction Narrative*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2006.

MacLean, Kenneth. "Wild Man and Savage Believer: Caliban in Shakespeare and Browning".
Victorian Poetry, 25.1 (Spring 1987): 1-16.

Mackay, Angus M. "Shakespeare's Younger Sister." *Emily Brontë: Wuthering Heights, A Casebook*. Ed. Miriam Allott. London: Macmillan, 1992.

Matsuoka, Mitsuharu. *The Victorian Literary Studies Archive Hyper-concordance*. Nagoya University. 6 May 2009. <http://victorian.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/concordance/>.

May, Leila Silvana. "And the Air Swarmed with Catherines': Identity and Desire in *Wuthering Heights*." *Disorderly Sisters: Sibling Relations and Sororal Resistance in Nineteenth-century British Literature*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2001. 34-42.

Michie, Elsie. "From Simianized Irish to Oriental Despots: Heathcliff, Rochester, and Racial Difference." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, 25.2 (Winter 1992): 125-40.

Miller, Naomi J. "Sibling Bonds and Bondage in (and beyond) Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Sibling Relations And Gender In the Early Modern World: Sisters, Brothers And Others*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2006. 46-58.

Mink, JoAnna Stephens. *The Significance of Sibling Relationships in Literature*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1993.

Nord, Deborah Epstein. *Gypsies and the British Imagination, 1807-1930*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

- O'Gorman, Frank. *The Victorians and the Eighteenth Century: Reassessing the Tradition*. Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2004.
- Ohmann, Carol. "Emily Brontë in the Hands of Male Critics." *College English*, 32.8 (May 1971): 906-13.
- Orgel, Stephen. "Prospero's Wife." *Representations*, 8 (Autumn 1984): 1-13.
- Pask, Kevin. "Caliban's Masque." *ELH*, 70 (2003): 739-56.
- . "Prospero's Counter-Pastoral." *Criticism*, 44.4 (Fall 2002): 389-404.
- Phillips, James. "The Two Faces of Love in *Wuthering Heights*." *Brontë Studies*, 32 (July 2007): 96-105.
- Poole, Adrian. *Shakespeare and the Victorians*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004.
- Praz, Mario, and Angus Davidson. *The Romantic Agony*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Radford, Andrew, and Mark Sandy. *Romantic Echoes in the Victorian Era*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008.
- Richardson, Alan. "The Dangers of Sympathy: Sibling Incest in English Romantic Poetry." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 25.4 (Autumn 1985): 737-54.

Sanders, Valerie. *The Brother-sister Culture in Nineteenth-century Literature: From Austen to Woolf*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Sanger, C. P. "The Structure of *Wuthering Heights*." *Critical Essays on Emily Brontë*. Ed. Thomas J. Winnifrith. New York: G.K. Hall and Co., 1997. 132-43.

Schille, Candy B. K. "'Man Hungry': Reconsidering Threats to Colonial and Patriarchal Order in Dryden and Davenant's *The Tempest*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 48.4 (Winter 2006): 273-90.

Seichepine, Marielle. "Childhood and Innocence in *Wuthering Heights*." *Brontë Studies*, 29 (November 2004): 209-15.

Shakespeare, William, and Horace Howard Furness. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1892.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Robert Langbaum. New York: Penguin Putnam Inc., 1998.

Shakespeariana. 15. Reprint, New York: AMS, 1965.

Shin, Hiewon. "Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda." *SEL*, 48.2 (Spring 2008): 373-93.

Simkin, Stevie. Introduction to *Revenge Tragedy: Contemporary Critical Essays*. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 1-23.

Skelton, John. "Fierce Poetry." *Emily Brontë: Wuthering Heights, A Casebook*. Ed. Miriam Allott. London: Macmillan, 1992.

Skura, Meredith Anne. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*." *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. New York: Macmillan, 1998. 67-90.

Slights, Jessica. "Rape and the Romanticization of Shakespeare's Miranda." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 41.2 (Spring 2001): 357-79.

Stein, Atara. *The Byronic Hero in Film, Fiction, and Television*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Stoneman, Patsy. *Emily Brontë: Wuthering Heights*. . New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Sundelson, David. *Shakespeare's Restorations of the Father*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1983.

Sutton, Brian. "Virtue Rather Than Vengeance": Genesis and Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Explicator*, 66.4 (2008): 224-29.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Thompson, Paul. "Timeline." *The Reader's Guide to Wuthering Heights*. <http://www.wuthering-heights.co.uk/timeline.htm>. March 2010.

Thompson, Wade. "Infanticide and Sadism in *Wuthering Heights*." Everitt, 138-51.

Thorslev, Peter L., Jr. "Incest as Romantic Symbol." *Comparative Literature Studies*, 2.1 (1965):
41-58.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. "On *Wuthering Heights*." Everitt, 156-71.

Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*.
New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. "'Something Rich and Strange': Caliban's Theatrical Metamorphosis."
Shakespeare Quarterly, 36.4 (Winter 1985): 390-405.

Velie, Alan R. *Shakespeare's Repentance Plays: The Search for an Adequate Form*. Rutherford,
N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1972.

Watson, Melvin R. "Tempest in the Soul: The Theme and Structure of *Wuthering Heights*."
Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 3 (1949-50): 87-100.

White, Hayden. "The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea." *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Ed. Edward Dudley and Maximillian E. Novak. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972. 19-52.

Wolff, Cynthia Griffin. "The Radcliffean Gothic Model: A Form for Feminine Sexuality." *The Female Gothic*. Ed. Juliann E. Fleenor. Montreal: Eden Press, 1983. 87-101.

Yogev, Michael. "Being There: Prospero's Place in *The Tempest*." *Journal of Theatre and Drama*, 4 (1998): 55-71.