

# Jungian Archetypes in Emily Brontë's „Wuthering Heights“

---

Lekić, Irena

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:626921>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-05-27**



**Sveučilište u Zadru**  
Universitas Studiorum  
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)



Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku  
Studij engleskoga jezika i knjevnosti

**Irena Lekić**

**Jungian Archetypes in Emily Brontë's „Wuthering  
Heights“**

**Diplomski rad**

Zadar, 2020.

Sveučilište u Zadru  
Odjel za anglistiku  
Studij engleskoga jezika i književnosti

Jungian Archetypes in Emily Brontë's "Wuthering Heights"

Diplomski rad

Studentica:  
Irena Lekić

Mentorica:  
dr.sc. Vesna Ukić-Košta

Zadar, 2020.



## Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Irena Lekić**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **diplomski** rad pod naslovom **Jungian Archetypes in Emily Brontë's "Wuthering Heights"** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 5. lipanj 2020.

## Table of contents:

Introduction: theoretical framework and issues.....	5
1. Catherine and Heathcliff's relationship: childhood influences.....	10
1.1. The effect of abandonment and trauma on character development .....	11
1.2. Emotional abuse and codependency.....	14
2. Behavioral discrepancies in Heathcliff.....	17
2.1. Empathy and the question of psychological credibility .....	18
3. Invisible influences: a response from the unconscious.....	24
3.1. Projection.....	24
3.2. Archetypes and archetypal ideas .....	26
4. Catherine and Heathcliff as embodiments of the anima/animus archetype.....	31
5. Social conformity and self- denial giving rise to animus possession.....	33
6. Individuation: a path towards ending archetypal influences.....	37
7. Conclusion.....	41
Works cited.....	44
JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES IN EMILY BRONTË'S <i>WUTHERING HEIGHTS</i> : Summary and key words.....	46
JUNGOVI ARHETIPOVI U <i>ORKANSKIM VISOVIMA</i> EMILY BRONTË: Sažetak i ključne riječi.....	47

**Introduction: theoretical framework and issues**

Almost two hundred years after its publication, Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847) continues to capture the interest of readers and stir heated discussions among critics. The novel seems to provoke diverse reactions with its style of narration, eerie atmosphere, emotional intensity and the outrageous, often violent nature of the characters. Just like Heathcliff's displays of boundless, inconceivable, unearthly love for Catherine strongly counteract his just as intense hatred towards his enemies, so do the readers rarely respond to this novel with indifference and usually find it either extremely appalling or absolutely amazing.

The story revolves around two families: the Earnshaws living at Wuthering Heights and the Lintons, whose home is the nearby Thrushcross Grange. The polarity articulated throughout the novel is at the broadest level mirrored in the two households, contrasting order and chaos, harmony and destruction, gentleness and cruelty, with one being "the land of storm" and the other "the home of calm" as Lord David Cecil describes it (173). Heathcliff is an orphan picked up by Mr. Earnshaw in the streets of Liverpool and brought to Wuthering Heights to join the Earnshaw family. Facing disapproval, coldness and rejection by most of the family members, he finds a true soul kinship in the relationship with Catherine, Mr. Earnshaw's daughter. However, the injustice and mistreatment experienced in his new family reach a culmination point when Heathcliff's benefactor dies and he is left on the mercy of his son Hindley. The surge of hatred that is then directed towards him in the form of abuse, degradation and deprivation of his rights magnify his attachment to Catherine. Therefore, united in a shared trauma and lack of parental love and understanding, they grow more attached to each other as the days go by.

Many critics believe that Brontë included the vivid childhood depictions in order to evoke our compassion and win the sympathies for her protagonists in one way or another. Arnold Kettle claims that “despite everything he does and is, we continue to sympathize with Heathcliff- not obviously, to admire or defend him, but to give him our inmost sympathy” (Hagan 305). Moreover, whereas Al Balola et al. argue that the sympathy is reinforced by the cruel reception by his new family members (350), John Hagan believes our sympathies to be enlisted by his pain in adulthood (320) and his “futile yearning” (321). The cause of his pain in adulthood, however, appears to have less to do with scars from childhood and more with a recent loss.

One of the major plot twists occurs when Catherine decides to marry rich and cultivated, but dispassionate Edgar Linton who lives at Thrushcross Grange. Hurt beyond expression, Heathcliff runs away and returns after three years a completely changed man. Strong, powerful and vindictive, having neither forgiveness nor compassion, his only goal is revenge. However, having no mercy for those who harmed him, Heathcliff finds himself still powerlessly governed by the feelings for his old childhood ally, Catherine. What is more, Brontë demonstrates the intensity of his feelings, clearly indicating that the monster in him is deterred solely by her presence, but ready to break free the moment he loses her and spare no one from destruction, not even their children. Subsequently, a tragic chain of events beginning with Heathcliff’s decision to marry Isabella Linton leads to Catherine’s illness and death. Left with nothing to live for, and nothing to love about life, Heathcliff’s only drive is the desire for revenge and a morbid yearning for Catherine’s ghost to haunt him.

The structural and psychological complexity of the novel, as well as the abundance of themes, motifs and symbols to be explored has resulted in much controversy surrounding the understanding of the characters and the plot itself. Critics have analysed it from various perspectives, using different approaches that have led to a diversity of possible interpretations.

Many critics emphasize the importance of Heathcliff's character arguing that the way he is understood determines the understanding of the novel itself. For instance, Melvin R. Watson sees the novel as a psychological study of Heathcliff (89). Moreover, readings which focus on him as a romanticized hero are common as well as those which demonize him. Charlotte Brontë herself described him as "a mere demon" (Bloom 7), whereas Kaitlin Brittany Wood compares his role in the first half of the novel with that of a *Bildungsroman* hero (9). Besides, various theoretical approaches have been employed by critics in the attempt to understand Brontë's fiction. In the article "The Portrayal of Heathcliff's Character in 'Wuthering Heights'", Al Balola et al. use what they call 'the descriptive analytical method', whereas, in his book *Imagined Human Beings: a Psychological Approach to Character and Conflict in Literature* (1997) Bernard Paris refers to psychology of Karen Horney aided with concepts developed by Abraham Maslow.

The main theoretical frame for my analysis of *Wuthering Heights* in this final paper will be the theory of archetypes and the collective unconscious, developed by Swiss psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Carl Gustav Jung. As Harold Bloom claims, the mutual affinity between Brontë's protagonists is essential to the understanding of the story (7) and, therefore, Jungian analysis aims to shed light on their mysterious attachment. More specifically, the controversial relationship in the novel will be explored in reference to the role and influence of the anima/animus archetype. However, since the phenomenon of archetypes is nowadays discussed by many authors for various purposes, it is not uncommon to find theories that noticeably differ from the original one. Therefore, the emphasis will be put on the work of Carl Gustav Jung, who was the first to develop this concept and coin the word *archetype*. As one of the most powerful ones in Jung's psychology, the animus/anima archetype is believed to deeply affect precisely romantic relationships. It operates on the principle of complementarity of opposites and represents two polarities within the psyche,



with the animus being the masculine principle in women, and the anima the feminine principle in men. Arguing that its hidden, unconscious influences, in fact, govern the relationship dynamic of the two main protagonists, the analysis will rely not only on Jung's work, but also on the works of his students and analysts, such as Anthony Stevens, Lucy Huskinson and Marie-Luise Franz.

According to Jung, archetypal influences are indisputable in the life of every individual, with the difference being only that of degree. Nevertheless, Brontë's characters deviate from common stereotypes in many ways. They cannot be easily labelled or categorized. Their uncontrollable, unpredictable and wild nature creates a sense of distance between them and the reader. Bordering heroes and villains, it is in many respects difficult to relate to them, but even more difficult to understand them. Moreover, it is also difficult to decide *how* to understand them. The intensity of their reactions often seems non-human and their radical behaviour calls for questioning their credibility. Bernard Paris calls them "imagined human beings", claiming that they can be understood in motivational terms, which is to say, as realistically drawn figures. However, he also argues that the failure of critics to make sense of their behaviour is often a result of not considering the fact that Brontë's intuitive knowledge of psychology may go beyond our conceptual understanding (242). Therefore, this thesis aims to examine the psychology of Brontë's protagonists' in the light of psychoanalytical theory in order to deepen the understanding of their characters. It will attempt to shed light on *what* kind of beings they are, *why* they behave in the way they do and *how* their bond can be explained.

The focus of the novel, the relationship between the main two protagonists appears to cause the major difficulties in the analysis. What is particularly striking is the fact that despite the obvious *selfishness* of both of them, they are capable to love one another *selflessly*. Moreover, the intensity of their love, as well as the degree to which they identify with each

other, somehow creates an impression that they are, in fact, one and the same person. Therefore, this paper will use Jung's theory in order to argue that Catherine and Heathcliff represent a female and a male principle of the same archetype, the *anima* and the *animus*. Therefore, they seem to form a unit without which this kind of analysis would not be possible.

Since Jung's psychology in general emphasizes childhood as a strong factor in one's adult life, the analysis begins by exploring the early years in the life of Brontë's protagonists and the circumstances in which they were raised. Considering the fact that notions such as origin, abandonment and trauma are high on the scale of relevance with regard to psycho-emotional processes and the development of character, they are also explored and referred to in the analysis. Furthermore, the issue of Heathcliff's empathy is discussed with the aim of challenging Paris' claim that he is a realistically drawn figure, easily understood in motivational terms. The analysis is then taken further by connecting the notions of empathy and sympathy, extending beyond the characters and encompassing the readers as well. Sympathy in the novel is explored relying on John Hagan (1967), Al Balola et al. (2017), Wood (2018) and Catherine's hysteria with regard to the findings of Sarah Pearce (2017), Abigail Moeller (2015), Margaret Homans (1978) and others. Moreover, examining the notion of empathy, one is led to the problem of identification, which is believed to represent one of the crucial points in the reading. When Catherine says: "I am Heathcliff!" (59), what does she mean by this and what does this represent in the broader context of the novel? Therefore, this problem is tackled in reference to and by considering and connecting all the mentioned aspects of identity formation and character development. Finally, Jung's theory of archetypes is applied in the hope of explaining Catherine and Heathcliff's seemingly illogical actions, solving the riddle of their mysterious bond and "filling-in the blanks" that have led critics to doubt their credibility.

## 1. Catherine and Heathcliff's relationship: childhood influences

In an attempt to better understand Heathcliff and Catherine's relationship and the motivation behind their actions, it seems necessary to contemplate the circumstances in which they were raised. As already mentioned, Heathcliff entered the Earnshaw family as a foundling. The property of Wuthering Heights- eerie as it sounds will soon become both his refuge and his prison, a place of greatest happiness and the most awful sorrow, of love, of friendship and joy, but also a place of the worst trauma, tragedy and degradation. It will, in the course of his life, forever be the center of his strivings, either for love or hate, and to him, it will always stay, despite both joys and sufferings, just like his love for Catherine, cursed. Brontë describes his and Catherine's early years at Wuthering Heights, portraying a detailed picture of her protagonists' childhood with a remarkable precision. Her rich and elaborate descriptions provide an ideal ground for the study of character and the sense of importance with which she imbues descriptions of Catherine and Heathcliff's early years appears almost as a prophecy of the tragedy that will come upon them. There is a general impression present that every aspect of their childhood mentioned in the novel somehow becomes relevant later in their lives, in one way or another.

Furthermore, apart from being a love story and a story about revenge, from the psychological standpoint *Wuthering Heights* also seems to be a story about the 'making' of a bully. In his book *Imagined Human Beings. A Psychological Approach to Character and Conflict in Literature*, Bernard J. Paris argues that Brontë's characters can be regarded as realistically drawn figures because she clearly demonstrates that cruelty arises from misery, providing evidences that "bad treatment leads to vindictiveness" (241). This can be seen as an attempt to explain or even excuse their evil and manipulative actions, especially Heathcliff's. Nevertheless, not all critics agree on this. For instance, in the article "The Portrayal of

Heathcliff's Character in *Wuthering Heights*", although recognizing the role of psychological defense mechanisms, such as denial and repression (356), Al Balola et al. describe Heathcliff as an 'arch-villain of *Wuthering Heights*' believing his cruel nature to be inherent (355).

Nevertheless, there are several factors that really do seem to play a significant role, not only in the later development of Heathcliff's character, but also with regard to how he is perceived by the readers. Paris argues that the circumstances of his entering the Earnshaw family, his origin and early childhood had a profound effect on his identity, and, therefore, influenced his actions in adulthood. He mentions the abandonment by the biological parents, as well as the deprivation of the most basic needs as causes of a trauma that shaped his character and gave rise to his cruelty (242). Whereas Paris' focuses on psychological credibility, Wood believes that the detailed descriptions of childhood suffering represent one of several techniques that Brontë uses with the aim to evoke our sympathy for the main protagonist (3).

### **1.1.The effect of abandonment and trauma on character development**

Indeed, we are faced with the fact that Mr. Earnshaw did find him alone and abandoned in the streets of Liverpool. The narrator Nelly Dean, who is a servant at the house of Earnshaws during Heathcliff and Catherine's childhood, provides a detailed insight into the way they were raised from the moment Heathcliff came to the family until his escape and Catherine's marriage to Edgar Linton. She provides a detailed account on how they were treated and sheds light on the relationship between the two in those early years, often revealing details that seem to foreshadow their future. She begins her story by recalling that the only information about Heathcliff's origins provided by the master, when he brought him

home was “a tale of his seeing it starving, and houseless, and as good as dumb, in the streets of Liverpool, where he picked it up and inquired for its owner.” (25).

The circumstances of those first, most delicate years of Heathcliff’s life have already been marked with abandonment and suffering, prior to becoming a member of the Earnshaw family. It is revealed that he was found ‘starving’ and ‘houseless’, an information that, according to Paris, is important for two reasons. Firstly, both food and shelter belong to the most basic needs that have to be met in order for a healthy development of the child to take place (Paris 242). Secondly, it also reveals that his parents were not with him, which means that he was either neglected or completely abandoned. Both of these facts, his abandonment by the two most important figures in his life at that stage, as well as the fact that he was deprived of basic needs have to be kept in mind as causes of the state of unimaginable vulnerability and helplessness in which he must have found himself.

Such an intense state of vulnerability, however, is not sustainable. Most critics agree on explaining this (at least to some degree) with the aid of psychological defense mechanisms, which are to ensure some kind of compensation, either through hardness or indifference. In Heathcliff’s case it seems to be both. This can be traced back to Nelly’s description of his early childhood: “Cathy and her brother harassed me terribly; *he* was uncomplaining as a lamb, though hardness, not gentleness made him give little trouble.” (27). Furthermore, Heathcliff faced rejection by most of the family members from the moment he entered the house and the family of Earnshaws, with Mrs Earnshaw naming him ‘a gypsy brat’ and calling her husband ‘mad’ for bringing *it* home.

However, having brought Heathcliff to Wuthering Heights, Mr. Earnshaw displays strong fondness towards the boy, providing him with love, attention and security, which Heathcliff so much needed, and yet, spent a significant part of his childhood deprived of. Nevertheless, as soon becomes apparent, the happiness will not last for long. With Mr.

Earnshaw's death, Heathcliff is left to the mercy of his son Hindley, who is determined to impoverish his adopted brother. Moreover, hatred caused by the sibling rivalry soon gives rise to revenge and reaches its culmination when Hindley brings home a wife who dislikes Heathcliff too:

Hindley became tyrannical. A few words from her, evincing a dislike to Heathcliff, were enough to rouse in him all his old hatred for the boy. He drove him from their company to the servants, deprived him of the instructions of the curate, and insisted that he should labour out of doors instead; compelling him to do so hard as any other lad on the farm. (32)

There is no doubt that factors indicating childhood trauma could be seen as Emily Brontë's attempt to evoke the readers' sympathy. It is difficult to condemn Heathcliff, especially in the initial stages of his 'revenge', knowing that the cause of his cruelty is the fact that life was cruel to him. In the first part of the novel we are led to believe that his suffering will somehow inspire him to become a better person, that it will make him stronger and eventually result in his transformation into a hero of the novel, or in Wood's words "a *Bildungsroman* hero" (9). It is obvious that Heathcliff's degradation by Hindley in his childhood was severe and affected every aspect of his life. The fact that he was forced to work hard seems even insignificant in comparison to the damage caused by lack of education and shunning away from the family. In a way, he became an orphan and an outcast once again. Moreover, Wood's proposition that he is expected to become a *Bildungsroman* hero seems to be reinforced by the fact that his feelings of unworthiness at this point are easily mistaken for modesty or spiritual strength.

## 1.2. Emotional abuse and codependency

Without a doubt, as a neglected and abused child, Heathcliff saw Catherine as his only source of support. Misunderstood, shunned, disliked and mistreated, he sees her as his only ally:

Miss Cathy and he were now very thick; but Hindley hated him: and to say the truth I did the same; and we plagues and went on with him shamefully: for I wasn't reasonable enough to feel my injustice, and the mistress never put in a word on his behalf when she saw him wronged. (26)

Abandoned by all, it is not surprising that he becomes devoted to Catherine so much. Moreover, she seems to understand him so well presumably due to the strong resemblance between the two of them. In addition, she is an 'outcast' in the family as well. Nelly often emphasizes her naughtiness and selfishness, which is especially evident during early childhood. Because of her directness and arrogance, Nelly often doubts Catherine's ability of ever becoming lady-like. Her wild nature does not seem in accordance with the image of 'a good girl' her family expects her to be. In many ways, she is misunderstood herself: "That made her cry, at first; and then, being repulsed continually hardened her, and she laughed if I told her to say she was sorry for her faults, and beg to be forgiven." (29).

The fact that Brontë allows us to witness this and similar scenes is suggestive of an endeavor to portray Catherine's character as psychologically convincing and maybe again evoke our sympathy, justifying her later actions by showing that she was misunderstood and rejected. Explicitly stating that Catherine first cried, but then in the course of time started reacting sarcastically to any attempt of moralization can be traced back to Paris' claim that the lack of proper care and understanding in childhood leads to cruelty and moral decadence in adulthood. Throughout the novel, her reactions are often so extreme that many critics discuss

her behavior in terms of mental illness. In her article “Why am I So Changed?: Witnessing the hysteric’s trauma narrative through movement in place”, Abigail Moeller analyses Catherine’s sudden mood swings and intense reactions in the light of hysteria, whereby her feelings, as well as her reactions become ridiculously exaggerated (3). The intensity of her reactions and radical nature of her actions are by various critics often discussed also in reference to social conformity and feminism. Similarly, Moeller argues that her ‘hysteria’ stems from the rage caused by her “awakening to the social restraints placed on her” (3).

The notion of social conformity in the novel is, indeed, far from irrelevant. Catherine becomes more eloquent and socially aware due to the education that Heathcliff was deprived of. She even seemingly starts to appear softer, gentler, as if the tomboy in her had vanished completely. Moreover, the first indications of her attempt to conform in order to meet the standards of society are mirrored in the decisiveness to repress her arrogant and aggressive nature only to be accepted by Edgar and Isabella Linton. In her article “Reading (not-) eating in the works of Emily and Charlotte Brontë” Pearce links this to an eating disorder (Catherine ‘willed’ herself into a terminal illness by refusing food) that reveals her desire to live up to the Victorian ideal of femininity (9). However, interesting and relevant as it is, the notion of social conformity will be discussed later in more detail with regard to Jung’s theory.

Shifting the focus again on the aspect of childhood, it is relevant to acknowledge the fact that Heathcliff and Catherine were unified in a shared trauma, and recognized each other as the only sources of support. Although Catherine’s degradation after the death of both of her parents was not as severe as Heathcliff’s, Hindley was as far from a father figure to her, as he was to Heathcliff: “The master’s bad ways and bad companions formed a pretty example for Catherine and Heathcliff.” (46). Therefore, their interdependency began at a very early age. However, perhaps more than their mutual understanding, it is important to notice the striking resemblance in the way they see the world and interact with people in those early years. In the



course of their lives, depending on the circumstances, their behavior and manners significantly change and seemingly start to differ. It could, nevertheless, be argued that any careful reader, regardless of the differences in their behavior, and at various phases of their lives, in social status, could by no chance miss how, at their very core, they seem to remain absolutely alike.

It could be concluded that some critics see Catherine and Heathcliff as two abused and misunderstood children who, due to shared trauma, became overly attached to each other. Therefore, their childhood pain is an explanation, if not an excuse, for their manipulative and often cruel actions, their complete lack of consideration for those around them, their insensitivity, their vanity and their selfishness. On the other hand, rejection, abandonment and trauma they both suffered as children is believed to have created such a strong bond between the two of them, that explains their passionate love and intense need for each other. Moreover, the idea that Brontë attempts to evoke our sympathy by allowing us to witness the pain that was inflicted on them or create a *Bildungsroman* effect is far from unlikely. However, instead of becoming a *Bildungsroman* hero, as it later on becomes evident, Heathcliff develops into one of the most controversial hero- villains in the history of literature. As Paris notices, his victimization led him to become a victimizer, and his misery to make others miserable (242).

Valuable as it is, Paris' analysis still fails to fully explain the controversial bond between the two protagonists. He argues that the childhood trauma, affected Heathcliff's relationship with Catherine in a way that has caused him to become overly attached to her (242). However, the reason why this explanation seems unsatisfactory is the fact that it does not address the problem of identification. He does not state *why* Catherine says that she *is* Heathcliff: "Nelly, I *am* Heathcliff! He's always, always in my mind: not as pleasure, anymore than I am always a pleasure to myself, but as my own being." (59). Moreover, even if one accepts childhood trauma as an explanation of their extreme attachment to one another,

there are still serious inconsistencies in both of their characters. One of the most obvious ones is the difference in Heathcliff's behavior towards Catherine compared to his behavior towards other characters. Even before Mr. Earnshaw's death and in the course of his childhood, Heathcliff shows signs of severe lack of empathy (e.g. the way he blackmails Hindley, his behavior towards Edgar and Isabella). On the other hand, his empathy for Catherine seems boundless, prompting him to abandon his most important plans (revenge) just to avoid hurting her. Therefore, behavioral inconsistencies such as these call for questioning the credibility of his character.

## 2. Behavioral discrepancies in Heathcliff

In all his power after his return to Wuthering Heights, Heathcliff is, nevertheless, completely powerless when it comes to his feelings for Catherine. It seems that, if his reality was to be split in two, she would be on one side and the whole world and everything in it would be on the other. Precisely this discrepancy has stirred heated discussions among critics. The contrast between Heathcliff's behavior towards Catherine and his behavior towards everyone else around him is prominent to such an extent that it calls for questioning the psychological credibility of his character. Heathcliff displays extreme cruelty towards everyone, yet astonishing gentleness towards Catherine. Moreover, he is hateful and vindictive to his core, but unimaginably forgiving and loving towards her. He is *selfish* at all times, and yet, in his love for Catherine- boundlessly *selfless*.

The question of whether such exclusive treatment can be attributed to love, although completely reasonable, is a philosophical one. It fails to provide a ground on which an objective discussion could be based, simply because there is rarely anything objective about romantic love. One cannot help but wonder, whether it is possible to love only one person in

life and detest absolutely everyone else. However, posing a question like this would be senseless, as it is very doubtful that such question can be answered at all. Heathcliff's feelings of intimacy, admiration, affection and closeness are also reserved exclusively for Catherine, but at the same time considered subjective and, as a result, cannot be seriously considered in the analysis. Therefore, in contemplating the psychological credibility of Heathcliff's character, it seems necessary to direct our attention to something in his psycho-emotional processes that *can* be analyzed and explained. The subject of empathy appears to be gaining on popularity in modern psychology, presumably because it operates on principles that can be tested, measured and analyzed. Therefore, it could be deemed worthwhile to delve into the question of Heathcliff's seemingly selective emphatic capacity and how it reflects on the credibility of him as a character.

### **2.1. Empathy and the question of psychological credibility**

In order to explore the subject of empathy in Brontë's novel, it is inevitable to take a look at the definitions first. Hatfield et al. write:

Most clinical and counseling psychologists agree that true empathy requires three distinct skills: the ability to share the other person's feelings, the cognitive ability to intuit what another person is feeling, and a "socially beneficial" intention to respond compassionately to that person's distress. (Decety & Jackson, 2004)

Applying this definition to Heathcliff, it is not clear whether he is able to "intuit" what the other person is feeling. It is even very likely that he is, having in mind that he appears to have a considerable knowledge regarding human emotions. The reason why he is believed to understand emotions so well is the fact that he intentionally attempts to trigger the exact same emotional responses in others that he felt in his childhood. There are many examples that

prove this; however, one of the most obvious ones is his behavior towards Hindley's son Hareton. He degrades him and deprives him of his rights in the exact same way Hindley had done that to him years ago. He makes Hareton feel ashamed in front of younger Catherine for not being educated, just like he felt years ago before her mother. He practically recreates the same circumstances that led Catherine to abandon him and marry Edgar. Moreover, he attempts (and succeeds) in creating the same feelings of unworthiness and rejection that he felt in his teenage years. The reason why he does this takes us back into his childhood: I 'm trying to settle how I shall pay Hindley back. I don't care how long I wait, if I can only do it at last." (42). His statement, indeed, turns out to be prophetic.

Furthermore, with regard to whether Heathcliff can "share the other person's feeling", it is highly unlikely that he can. It seems that he is so disturbed in his vindictiveness that he fails to realize the severity of damage he is causing to his innocent victims. His vicious plan for revenge is so amoral and ill-intentioned that it leaves no doubt about his inability to feel another's pain or "share" another person's feeling. Moreover, the determination to recreate the circumstances of his pain and make others suffer in the exact same way he did is actually perverse. He despises his own son with Isabella only because he resembles her and not him: "Thou art thy mother's child, entirely! Where is my share in thee, puling chicken?" (151); "...I'm bitterly disappointed with the whey-faced whining wretch!"(152). Nevertheless, he is still prepared to exploit him for causing pain to the Lintons. He reveals this in one conversation with Nelly:

...my son is prospective owner of your place, and I shall not wish him to die till I was certain of being his successor. Besides, he is *mine*, and I want the triumph of seeing *my* descendant fairly lord of their estates: my child hiring their children to till their fathers' lands for wages. (151)

Heathcliff's plan is to force Catherine's and Edgar's daughter, also named Catherine to marry his son who is severely ill just to ensure his ownership of Edgar's property Thrushcross Grange. In doing so, he does not care who will be hurt in the process, nor does he have any remorse for causing pain to those who are innocent (e.g. Cathy 2, Hareton). It is evident that, although perhaps able to conceptualize or understand the pain of another, he most certainly does not have feelings for them, let alone "a 'socially beneficial' intention to respond compassionately to that person's distress". Therefore, it can be concluded that Heathcliff most certainly lacks two out of three crucial skills in order to be characterized as an empathic person.

However, what appears as strikingly unrealistic is that, despite Heathcliff's inability to have any kind of empathy for any of his victims or any human being whatsoever, he is extremely compassionate when it comes to Catherine. Apart from an intuitive belief that it is not possible to have empathy exclusively for one person, but not for others, the discussion of psychopathy, for instance, suggests that empathic ability may have a neurological basis. The lack of empathy is one of the representative characteristics of psychopaths (Blair 1, 2). Therefore, studies that investigate the functioning of their brains could be regarded as indicative of the correlation between empathy and the neurology of the brain. In his article "A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective on Psychopathy: Evidence for Paralimbic System Dysfunction" Kiehl writes: "The few structural brain-imaging studies in psychopathy suggest that hippocampal regions (i.e., paralimbic) are implicated in the disorder (Laakso et al., 2001; Raine et al., 2004)" (16). In other words, certain brain centers of individuals diagnosed with psychopathy are impaired.

Of course, one may want to inquire on which basis Heathcliff is to be deemed a psychopath. Nevertheless, it could be argued that, whether he is or is not a psychopath does not even have to be considered. The relevance of the condition of psychopathy is not so much

in deciding whether it applies to Heathcliff, but rather in establishing empathy as an ability that could be correlated to the specific brain centers. The functioning of these centers determines an individual's empathic capacity. Consequently, this ability could hardly be regarded as selective. It seems highly unlikely that one can display extremely strong empathy towards one person and yet stay completely insensitive to the pain of others.

It seems that true villains, like psychopaths are genuinely incapable of empathy. They might become attached to, care for or even love another person (at least the contrary has not been yet proven), but they are not able to feel another's pain as if it were their own. Yet, there are various instances in which Heathcliff demonstrates his capacity for exactly that- feeling Catherine's pain as if it were his own. In one conversation with Nelly, he clearly states that he refrains himself from murdering Edgar Linton solely out of fear that it might cause pain to Catherine: "I wish you had the sincerity enough to tell me whether Catherine would suffer greatly from his loss: the fear that she would restrains me." What follows afterwards is one of the epic passages of the novel in which Heathcliff describes not only how his love for Catherine differs from the Linton's, but also how the fear of hurting her prevents him from acting on his violent impulses:

And there you see the distinction between our feelings: had he been in my place and I in his, though I hated him with a hatred that turned my life to gall, I never would have raised a hand against him. You may look incredulous, if you please! I never would have banished him from her society as long as she desired his. The moment her regard ceased, I would have torn his heart out and drank his blood! But, till then- if you don't believe me, you don't know me- till then, I would have died by inches before I touched a single hair of his head! (108)

What appears to be most striking in this description is the contrast between the love for Catherine and hatred for Edgar, as well as the intensity of both. Furthermore, the seeming

selflessness with which he loves appears unfathomable in combination with the selfishness with which he hates. Could it be the same person who would so selflessly tolerate the presence of their rival in one moment, but be ready to kill in the cruelest of ways and without a trace of remorse in another? Such a strong contrast, between love and hate, gentleness and cruelty, strong empathy on one hand, and a complete lack of it on the other, could maybe even pass as psychologically credible if one was to adopt a 'romanticized' view of the situation and regard it as an extreme example of an emotionally charged love triangle.

Nevertheless, one cannot avoid wondering about Heathcliff's utter insensitivity towards absolutely everyone else with whom he comes into contact. It is not only Edgar whom he wants to hurt. Perhaps the most striking is his complete lack of remorse and sympathy for the suffering he causes to those who in no way wronged him and are completely innocent, such as his son, Catherine's daughter and Hareton. His tyranny and cruelty is so extreme and so radical that it makes Isabella Linton to question his humanity. The doubt about the psychological credibility of Heathcliff's character (as an 'imagined human being', as a realistically drawn figure) can be traced back to her letter to Nelly in which she wonders the following: "Is Mr. Heathcliff a man? If so, is he mad? And if not, is he a devil?" (99).

Many critics approve of her doubt in his humanity. Even Charlotte Brontë questions the legitimacy of his character, wondering whether it is "right or advisable to create beings like Heathcliff" (Al Balola et al. 356). Nevertheless, her choice of words, the fact that she calls him 'a being' instead of 'a person' somehow creates an impression that she does not consider him to be a *human* being. On the other hand, Bernard Paris argues that the interpretations in which Heathcliff is romanticized, and seen as a gothic character, a projection, a symbol, in some interpretations even as a demon or a 'devilish being' are unnecessary because he can be understood in motivational terms (241). Presumably this

means that the childhood trauma somehow created 'a split' in his personality, causing him to become what he is and behave as inconsistently as he does.

Having explored the notion of empathy, however, it becomes even more questionable that the discrepancies in Heathcliff's behavior can be explained solely as a result of childhood trauma. Nevertheless, whereas one may not understand the characters in the way Paris does, it must be acknowledged that he does have a point in claiming that considering advanced psychological phenomena is absolutely required in the analysis. Therefore, contemplating his reminder not to underestimate Brontë's intuitive knowledge of psychological phenomena, one cannot help but wonder, whether Catherine and Heathcliff really are the same person? What is more, what if one could pose this question without denying their human status, without even having to resort to metaphysical explanations? Leaving the sphere of the 'fantastic' behind, it is, in fact, possible to argue that the strong impression of Catherine and Heathcliff somehow being one and the same person does not necessarily indicate an unrealistic component of their character. Instead, a slight change in perspective leads to the question of *in what sense* it seems that they are the same 'person'.

To conclude this chapter and summarize the arguments so far, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the questions that have started the discussion in the first place: Is Heathcliff a man, a realistically drawn figure, an "imagined human being"? If so, could he then be characterized as one having empathy, given the pain he has caused to those around him, especially fragile and innocent children that could not defend themselves? The answer to this question would be- yes, he could, indeed retain his 'human' status, as Paris argues, and- no, he could in no way be deemed as possessing any kind of emphatic ability whatsoever. Lastly, considering this to be true, how can his behavior towards Catherine be explained? How is it possible, having all this in mind, that he displays empathy exclusively towards her? The answer is that it cannot be explained because he does not. As a matter of fact, he is more



selfish than ever. What appears to be empathy is, in fact, something else. It is a psychological mechanism that enables him to see her, not as a separate individual, an autonomous person, but rather as an extension of him.

### 3. Invisible influences: a response from the unconscious

#### 3.1. Projection

Having established the fact that Heathcliff's exaggerated sensitivity towards Catherine's feelings and well-being cannot be attributed to empathy, the question of how his concern *can* be explained remains to be answered. Furthermore, exploring the mystery of their bond in Brontë's novel, it becomes apparent that, not only is this kind of concern reciprocated by the normally equally selfish Catherine, but it is also expressed with a remarkable intensity. As already mentioned, Catherine says she *is* Heathcliff. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that their attachment is not even a matter of empathy anymore, but rather of identification. Catherine sees herself in Heathcliff, which consequently makes the two of them in her psychological experience inseparable. In *Collected Works of C.G. Jung: Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (1968), Jung argues that everything unconscious or repressed tends to be projected outwards until it becomes conscious; the inner drama of the psyche becomes accessible to consciousness through a phenomenon called *projection* (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 6). This indicates that one sees a reflection of oneself, either in their environment or in another individual. The unconscious, projected part of the personality is, therefore, 'waiting' to be discovered and recognized as one's own:

Now, as we know from psychotherapeutic experience, projection is an unconscious, automatic process whereby a content that is unconscious to the subject transfers itself

to an object, so that it seems to belong to that object. The projection ceases the moment it becomes conscious, that is to say when it is seen as belonging to the subject. (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 60)

Not only is this phenomenon described and recognized as highly valuable and relevant for psychoanalysis in Jungian psychology, but it is also emphasized as distinctively apparent precisely in romantic relationships. Moreover, it can be argued that both protagonists are affected by it. When Catherine falls severely ill, Heathcliff expresses his despair by saying: “Do I want to live? What kind of living will it be when you- oh, God! Would you like to live with your soul in the grave?” (117), whereby it is evident that, it is not only that he cannot accept the possibility of losing her, emphasizing emptiness and meaninglessness of life without her, but he also refers to her as his *soul*. Therefore, since one’s soul is considered to be unique and inseparable from one’s own being and existence, Heathcliff’s reference to Catherine as his soul seems to once again indicate that he, in fact, *identifies* with her. As one explores Jung’s theory, it becomes evident that the terms ‘soul’ and ‘psyche’ in fact merge together and even become difficult to differentiate. In Jungian terminology, Heathcliff is projecting the unconscious contents of his own psyche to the object (Catherine).

Furthermore, the term *soul* is understood by Jung in a quite unorthodox fashion. One would normally conceptualize a soul as a part of and belonging to the individual, under the assumption that the individual and their soul are one and the same (the same with individual and his psyche). Nevertheless, according to Jung, a soul is “the living thing in a man”, it designates “something wonderful and immortal” and “lives of itself and causes life” (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 26). Particularly interesting is the claim that the soul “lives of itself”, which implies that it possesses a certain agency. This indicates that, despite belonging to the individual, the soul is also autonomous in a sense, which is to say not completely subservient to the individual and not entirely under their control. Moreover,

returning to the hypothesis that in Jungian psychology the soul and the psyche are one and the same, the unconscious part of the psyche could then be seen as “living of itself”, precisely because it cannot be controlled by the individual. Therefore, Heathcliff’s reference to Catherine as his “soul” is even ambiguous in a sense. On the one hand, it can be interpreted as an insinuation that she, although being a separate and autonomous, is also a part of him; or, that the part of him (the part of his soul/psyche) that she represents is beyond his conscious control. The Latin word for soul, *anima*, is also used to denote a concept in Jungian psychology that refers to the feminine principle in a man’s psyche. By analogy, since the feminine principle in a man’s psyche is his soul, then Catherine being Heathcliff’s soul actually implies that she is the representation of the feminine principle in his psyche.

### **3.2. Archetypes and archetypal ideas**

In order to understand that which is beyond consciousness, and before introducing the term *archetype*, it is necessary to first understand Jung’s concept of the *unconscious*. Jung argues that the psyche consists of a conscious and an unconscious part, whereby the unconscious can again be divided into two categories- the *personal unconscious* and the so called *collective unconscious* (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 3). According to him, everything that one can experience and know belongs to consciousness, whereas everything beyond one’s cognition belongs to the sphere of the unconscious. Moreover, unlike the personal unconscious, the collective unconscious does not owe its existence to personal experience, which means that the contents from the personal unconscious have once been in consciousness, but were later repressed or forgotten, whereas the contents of the collective unconscious have not, because they are not individually acquired, but rather hereditary (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 42).

Therefore, when one refers to primordial images or motifs, there is a presupposition that they originate from this 'realm' of the collective unconscious. Jung himself claims that he chose the word 'collective' precisely to indicate that it is universal or inherent in the human nature, common to all people (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 3). He also calls it "a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us" (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 4).

Nevertheless, the idea that one is born with a set of images or motifs is probably among the most controversial ones in Jungian psychology. One would assume that we are aware of primordial images only due to exposure to literature and mythology. However, this is not what Jung believed. Instead, he claimed that these motifs and images are only represented in myths and fairytales (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 5), but, as already mentioned, originate from the collective unconscious, which implies that they are an integral part of one's being and have the potential to enter one's awareness without exposure to literature or mythology. Moreover, the term *archetype* is often identified with primordial images, but it is also, on the other hand, not uncommon to find definitions in which it is described as 'an experience', or as 'a pattern of behavior'. Frattaroli understands it as a psychological/motivational pattern (173), whereas Jung himself describes it as "a typical basic form, of certain everrecurring psychic experiences" (173).

Due to complexity of the term *archetype* and for the sake of simpler understanding, Jung encouraged simply recognizing it as having its universal features represented in myths and fairytales. For instance, typical anima-myths are those of Eros and Psyche, Pluto and Persephone, Perseus and Medusa (Stevens 173). This recognition, however, enables an understanding of the term only in a 'nominal sense', as Jung claims, but the matter of what exactly it is *psychologically*, is slightly more complicated (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 5). For this reason, he made a distinction between an *archetype* and *archetypal*

*ideas*, whereby an archetype signifies precisely a “pattern of behavior” (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 5). The reason for emphasizing this is the fact that the analysis will be for the most part focused precisely on the archetypal influences on the behavior of Brontë’s protagonists. Therefore, focusing more on the behavioral effects than on the psychological causes, the exact and detailed description of what an archetype really is psychologically, will be left out. As Jungian analyst Anthony Stevens writes: “Ultimately, you cannot define an archetype, any more than you can define meaning. You can only experience it.” (76).

Furthermore, Fratarolli writes that the unconscious part of man’s psyche, the anima, can be seen either as a general form – an archetype – or as a particular embodiment of the archetype in an individual (173). According to this, Heathcliff and Catherine seem to represent the latter, whereby they both embody the unconscious personality traits of another and, at the same time, project the unconscious contents of their own psyche. The hypothesis is that this explains the problem of identification, as well as the chaotic dynamic that governs their relationship. The analysis of Catherine and Heathcliff’s childhood opened up a possibility of explaining their bond as a result of a shared trauma that, on some level, led them to feel rejected and resulted in shared feelings of being misunderstood in the world. However, the feeling of unity in pain and suffering could hardly be deemed a satisfactory explanation of their attachment depicted as so strong, so profound, but above all, so destructive that it is often described as ‘demonic’. Nevertheless, precisely the destructiveness of the relationship may provide crucial hints of clarifying it in the light of Jung’s theory. As Jungian analyst Anthony Stevens writes: “Inherent in every archetype is the notion of unfulfilment: an inner awareness of need” (77). Therefore, Catherine and Heathcliff’s individual incompleteness can be interpreted as a motive, a cause of the inclination to seek completion in one another, and their own unfulfillment as a justification for feeling fulfilled *only* in each other’s presence.

However, in order to fully explore the dynamic that shaped their relationship one must first understand the underlying influences of the archetypes, which can be explained by the concept of complementarity of opposites. In other words, intricately connected with animus/anima archetypes is the idea that every individual possesses two complementary principles in their personality, the feminine and the masculine one: “A man therefore has in him a feminine side, an unconscious feminine figure—a fact of which he is generally quite unaware. I may take it as known that I have called this figure the "anima," and its counterpart in a woman the ‘animus’” (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 284).

Variations of this concept can be found across cultures, philosophies and religions. In ancient Chinese philosophy, for instance, the dualistic nature of reality is expressed through the concept of yin and yang, with yin representing the feminine and yang, representing the masculine principle. Greek philosopher Heraclitus mentions it in his theory about the unity of opposites, while in Hinduism, for instance, it is referred to as Shiva and Shakti. The crucial point is, however, that these aspects are opposite in nature, but, at the same time, interdependent in practice, since, as Jung’s student and analyst Lucy Huskinson, claims, “the interplay of opposites is crucial to Jungian psychology” (35).

However, it has to be mentioned that the notions of the feminine and the masculine principle should by no means be mistaken or mixed with the stereotypical ideas of femininity and masculinity. These principles, more than anything else, represent a state of mind and a state of being. Although it may be argued that the yang, masculine principle-characteristics are generally more dominant in men, and that yin characteristics are more prominent in women, it has to be kept in mind that these concepts are not used to explain the difference between men and women, but rather as a description of opposite and complementary qualities within individuals:

...but the universal experience of mankind is that yang is more highly developed (more conscious) in men and yin more highly developed in women. The complementary principle is nevertheless still present and functional in both sexes, and it was to these contrasexual propensities that Jung gave the names Animus (the yang in women) and Anima (the yin in men), knowing them to be vitally important factors in the psychic economy of us all. (Stevens 209)

However, the question of why yin is generally more active in women and yang more apparent in men is very broad and complex. It can, nevertheless, be observed that it is so, at least to a certain extent, owing to society that encourages the development of yin in women more than in men and vice versa.

Stevens describes the yang principle as “energetic, dynamic and assertive, with an essentially centrifugal, out-going, extraverted orientation” (208). On the other hand, the yin principle is passive and containing; “its movement is centripetal, in-turning and introverted” (Stevens 209). While yang is connected with aggressiveness, combativeness, dominance and self-assertion, yin is expressed in the need to become involved with individuals rather than things or abstract ideas; it is personal and subjective, corresponding to Jung’s Eros principle (Stevens 210). Moreover, the dynamic yang is labeled by Whitmont after Mars and the dynamic yin is represented by Aphrodite (Stevens 210). Contemplating the meaning behind Whitmont’s labels, it can easily be concluded that Mars, being the god of war, can broadly be associated with forceful action, whereas Aphrodite is mostly connected to beauty and pleasure. Consequently, if yang symbolizes action and initiative, then its counterpart yin stands for passivity and receptivity.

#### 4. Catherine and Heathcliff as embodiments of the anima/animus archetype

Frattaroli summarizes very articulately the importance of the anima and animus archetypes with regard to romantic relationships:

In any relationship with a woman, a man will tend to project elements of his anima-complex, as an image, onto the woman – perceiving her through filtering lenses that reveal only those aspects of the real woman that conform to the unconscious prototype in his anima. (173)

In other words, what appears to be a genuine romantic love can often, in fact, be a projection. The stronger the projection of the unconscious is, the more destructive the personality becomes. Whenever the personification of the unconscious takes possession of our mind, we become so identified with it and, as a result, unable to see it for what it is. As Jung explains: “One is really "possessed" by the figure from the unconscious” (*Man and his Symbols* 193).

Catherine and Heathcliff’s teenage years in Jungian terms reflect the development of the feminine principle in Catherine and the masculine principle in Heathcliff, representing a condition that will enable the influence of the animus/anima archetype. Every individual has both feminine and masculine side, or, as Jung said: “...in the unconscious of every man there is hidden a feminine personality, and in that of every woman a masculine personality” (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 284). As already mentioned, the idea of the feminine and masculine principle as complementary and interconnected is not new. It has been present in philosophy from the ancient times and expressed in many ways, whereby one of the most famous models is represented by the yin and yang concept. Most of these traits, however, can be clearly observed in Brontë’s protagonists’ behavior, with yin being more highly developed in Catherine and yang evidently more developed in Heathcliff. Therefore,



the different qualities they develop increases the strength of the opposite polarities, which, as a result, prompts and gives force to the archetypal influences in them.

Yin is described as impersonal, nonindividual and collective (Stevens 210) which could be observed in Catherine's increasing focus on the collective, instead on the individual. She is becoming aware of what society wants her to be and what expectations and norms it places on her, whereas Heathcliff, shunned from the society, is becoming increasingly self-centered. Unlike Catherine, he is not concerned with the collective at all. As a matter of fact, completely losing connection with the collective, he becomes focused almost exclusively on the individual, which could be traced back to a 'yang- tendency' for self-assertion. The way this manifests itself in their lives could be mainly seen in the different ways they spend their time. Heathcliff spends more and more time alone, not socializing, talking less and less and becoming rougher as opposed to Catherine's strivings to become more sophisticated and eloquent. In contrast to his roughness, she starts to appear gentler and in comparison to his solitude and social isolation, she starts to socialize more. In Jungian terms, the aggressive, combative yang is contrasted with gentle, connecting yin. This new behavior, as it will become evident later on, fulfils Catherine's need for social recognition. On the other hand, Heathcliff painfully notices her estrangement, in fact, to an extent that he begins counting days she spent with the Lintons and those spent with him.

Moreover, the contrast between a "centripetal, in-turning and introverted" yin movement and centrifugal, out-going, extraverted" yang orientation can also be recognized in Catherine and Heathcliff's behavior. In contrast to Catherine, whose pain is directed inwards, because she directly hurts only herself (others are hurt only indirectly, due to their sadness for having to lose her), Heathcliff projects his pain outwards and directly affects many lives (Edgar, Hareton, younger Catherine). This is again mirrored in the yin-yang concept, with yin being projected inwards, whereas yang is considered to be projected outwards. He causes

destruction by doing, whereas Catherine causes it by not-doing (reflecting a yin-yang contrast between passivity and activity). She is not eating, not talking, not solving her problems, and not moving through space at all. Moreover, she is receptive (again a yin principle) in being compliant and not rejecting the expectations society placed on her. Once she finally turns to rebellion, it is already too late and she can no longer escape the destruction of her own passivity. On the other hand, Heathcliff inflicts pain by doing too much. He is trying to influence and decide a course of other people's lives, he meddles into everyone's business to pursue his selfish goals. His action in attempting to determine the course of the lives of others is directed towards all aspects-estates, finance, love relationships, marriages, emotions. As has already been mentioned, he uses younger Catherine and his son to ensure his ownership of Thrushcross Grange, forcing them to marry without love, he intentionally manipulates Hareton's emotions, consciously inflicts pain to Edgar, etc.

##### **5. Social conformity and self-denial giving rise to animus possession**

As Helene Moglen claims in her article "The double vision of 'Wuthering Heights': A clarifying view of female development", *Wuthering Heights* is a novel about loss and repression, the loss and repression of self (391). Like Heathcliff, Catherine cannot develop fully, as society imposes its expectations on her and she is urged to live up to them. At the same time, the opportunity to express her true nature is denied to her. She is encouraged to act fragile and passive, which means refraining herself from free unrestrained play with Heathcliff and engaging in a more passive activities with the Lintons. As a result, she is forced to repress one larger part of the self and it is precisely the one she connects to Heathcliff. This part of her psyche is mirrored in their wild play, their naughtiness, the moors, the freedom, everything that was once her reality, but later became something she had to let

go of and forget. Even when she falls severely ill and starts hallucinating, her drive never ceases to be to return to the moors.

In her article “Repression and Sublimation of Nature in *Wuthering Heights*”, Margaret Homans argues that for Catherine, nature is representative of Heathcliff (17). At the same time, however, it also represents her own wild side. To demonstrate this, she analyses Catherine’s first return to *Wuthering Heights* after spending a few weeks at Thrushcross Grange. The fact that she is repulsed by seeing Heathcliff coming from his “dirt and wildness” and repulsed by his life of “a savage in nature”, reveals her own shame due to possessing the same tendencies as Heathcliff (17). Homans argues that, having spent some time with the refined, cultivated Lintons, she learns that “dirt is bad and that therefore her own savage past was bad and that therefore any relic of that past, such as Heathcliff’s perennially dirty person, is to be avoided” (17). Therefore, she represses not only the satisfaction that she used to draw from nature and from her relationship with Heathcliff, but also the aspects of her personality that are just like Heathcliff- uncultivated, unrefined and ‘raw’.

Catherine longs for Heathcliff and for the moors, but in fact, she longs for the lost part of herself, the one she gave up in order to meet society’s standards. Her behavior mirrors the animus possession and is characterized by falling into delirium states, behaving as if she has gone mad, refusing food and finally willing herself to illness and death. Critics describe Heathcliff’s pain that prompts him to get revenge as demonic, but her pain is hardly anything less than that. It is only that he expresses his pain through destructive activity, whereas she expresses hers through lethal passivity (she refuses food and stays locked up in her bedroom). In refusing food she refuses life, as Sarah Pearce writes. If aggression and exploitation are regarded as representing masculine principle and action itself in its negative aspect (Heathcliff), then Catherine’s behavior’ could be seen as representing feminine principle in its

negative aspect, which is the destruction by inaction and passivity: “A strange passivity and paralysis of all feeling, or a deep insecurity that can lead almost to a sense of nullity, may sometimes be the result of an unconscious animus opinion. In the depths of the woman's being, the animus whispers: ‘You are hopeless.’” (Franz 191).

Furthermore, Pearce writes that the refusal of food can be interpreted both as rebellion and acquiescence (3). She argues that, on the one hand, it expresses a desire to be identified with Victorian ideal of femininity, suggesting that having a thin, almost wasting body was desirable and attractive because it was associated with control and self-possession (4). Rejection of her own appetites was to be one of the top priorities for a Victorian woman if she was to meet society's standards and serve others (take up a role of a good wife and a mother). We witness this in Catherine's choice to marry Edgar, bear his child, be financially secure and, in general, live a socially accepted life, which all meant having to repress a part of herself. On the other hand, food refusal also represents rebellion. According to Pearce, in rejecting food, Catherine actually rejects the life that was imposed on her (14). Since food is life, in controlling the intake of food she attempts to exert control over her life.

Moreover, it could hardly be a coincidence that Catherine falls into a delirium and starts having mad, uncontrollable need for Heathcliff (passion) and the moors (freedom) precisely at a time when she was pregnant. She seems unable and unwilling to accept her new role of a mother-to-be. Moreover, the idea that she locked herself up in a room refusing to eat, becomes even stronger act of rebellion considering her pregnancy. Reaching the pinnacle of her selfishness, she resembles a stubborn child who makes tantrums in order to achieve what it wants, disregarding both Edgar and her unborn baby:

But the animus does not so often appear in the form of an erotic fantasy or mood; it is more apt to take the form of a hidden "sacred" conviction. When such a conviction is preached with a loud, insistent, masculine voice or imposed on others by means of

brutal emotional scenes, the underlying masculinity in a woman is easily recognized.

(Franz 189)

It seems that her emotional development stopped at the age of fifteen, with Heathcliff's disappearance and her marriage to Edgar. As Joyce Carol Oates claims, even married and pregnant, Catherine Linton has never been anything other than a child (439). She behaves in a spoiled and entitled manner, and yet, Brontë will not let us despise her. As her illness progresses, Brontë uses emotionally charged language to vividly portray Catherine's misery, pain, helplessness and despair. As a result, one is left with the impression that no matter how childish, spoiled and selfish her actions may appear, they are, nevertheless, beyond her conscious control.

Moreover, it seems that Heathcliff as her animus embodies her (most) regretted repressed part of herself, which is her 'fire', her passionate nature. This becomes evident in her growing intolerance for Edgar's lack of passion: "What is that apathetic being doing?" she demanded, pushing the thick entangled locks from her wasted face. 'Has he fallen into a lethargy or is he dead?' (87). It becomes evident that his passive nature irritates her. Furthermore, it is impossible for her to truly love him, since, being animus- possessed, she yearns for very specific character traits in a partner. Nevertheless, the character traits that Edgar exhibits are opposite of those represented by her animus. Edgar is calm, passive, unaggressive, composed and dispassionate, whereas Heathcliff as embodiment of her animus is rough, wild, uncultivated, raw and unpredictable. These are, nevertheless, *her* traits. If we revisit once again her early childhood and remind ourselves of the repeated scorns both by Nelly and her parents for being 'naughty', 'bad-behaved' girl, we are left with no doubt that she once *did* live the later repressed character traits.

It is also interesting to notice the contrast that is apparent in Catherine's reactions to external expectations as a child compared to approaching adulthood. In her early childhood,

she was hurt by non-acceptance only at the beginning and later started to laugh at it, whereas later that same non-acceptance led her to change drastically, to abandon a part of herself in order to conform. Furthermore, seeing her at the final stage of her illness, Heathcliff tells her: “You teach me how cruel you’ve been- cruel and false. Why did you despise me? Why did you betray your own heart, Cathy?” (117). Interestingly, he uses the word ‘false’ indicating that she was not *fully* herself, implying that he is aware that she has not only betrayed him, she betrayed herself, “her own heart” in not acknowledging and repressing her own nature, denying her own “inconvenient” impulses (again destruction by inaction). As a result, the urge to play a role of an Angelic Victorian woman destroyed her; the role killed the life.

## 6. Individuation: a path towards ending archetypal influences

Brontë’s protagonists illustrate the worst of the negative anima/animus influences, becoming increasingly disconnected from reality, facing self- denial, suffering and even death: “Insanity is possession by an unconscious content that, as such, is not assimilated to consciousness, nor can it be assimilated since the very existence of such contents is denied” (Jung, *Alchemical studies* 36, 37). Their behavior is uncontrollable and their reactions mad. As Jung argues, one is not his own master, as long as one is not able to control one’s own emotions and moods (Jung, *Man and his Symbols* 83). However, what is the alternative?

According to Jung, the ultimate development occurs only when the unconscious becomes conscious. It is through this process that the person becomes fully autonomous and whole: “I use the term "individuation" to denote the process by which a person becomes a psychological "in-dividual," that is, a separate, indivisible unity or whole” (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 275). Therefore, it becomes clear that, in order for a woman to become a “whole”, “indivisible” individual, she must first become conscious of her animus

and recognize it as part of herself, as part her own person and her own being, therefore integrating it in her personality:

But if she realizes who and what her animus is and what he does to her, and if she faces these realities instead of allowing herself to be possessed, her animus can turn into an invaluable inner companion who endows her with the masculine qualities of initiative, courage, objectivity, and spiritual wisdom. (194 Franz)

The same, of course, applies to men, with the animus being the unconscious aspect of a woman's personality and the anima the parallel unconscious female part of a man's.

Furthermore, contemplating Heathcliff's circumstances, it is not difficult to notice that he is, owing to Hindley's treatment, forced to become 'a brute'. He is deprived of education and his social development is completely impeded. Every access to cultivated and enlightened aspects of life is denied to him. Therefore, he cannot develop fully; his path towards the 'individuation' is severely hindered. On the other hand, at this same period, Catherine is living her 'transformation', where she undergoes a change in which she starts to develop precisely those traits in her character that Heathcliff is forced to suppress in his. She socializes more with the Lintons and becomes more sensibilised to society's expectations. Obviously portraying her as 'a tomboy' in childhood, Brontë now reveals her capacity to act and behave quite lady-like. Moreover, Catherine becomes eloquent, educated, elegant and sophisticated, which is the exact opposite of Heathcliff's becoming more and more 'savage' (deprived of education and denied the opportunity to become elegant, eloquent and sophisticated). The relevance of this period in their life, and the opposite 'lifestyles' that they lead during this time, can be seen as making them susceptible to archetypal influences, since, as already mentioned, the notion of lack is inherent in every archetype. Both are developing what the other one also once had, but had to repress (personal unconscious), whereas simultaneously denying certain aspects of their own character.

Projection in Jungian sense seems to begin precisely in the period in which Catherine and Heathcliff started to develop in different ways. The two obviously very similar children (both naughty, entitled, misunderstood, selfish, passionate), due to the specific circumstances were compelled to take two separate ways in life, or, more specifically two opposite paths. Catherine is developing her 'cultivated, civilized nature' and simultaneously repressing her 'wild, even savage nature', whereas the opposite is true for Heathcliff. The reason why this is important is the idea that, in their early childhood, they managed to balance both aspects (civility and wildness), but were, nevertheless, later conditioned to make a 'split' in their personalities, therefore losing one part of themselves. However, whereas their wild nature seems to be obvious, one may question the claim that they were both once 'cultivated' or 'civilised'. Nevertheless, it can be argued that they exhibited an astonishing persistence in keeping up their pride (even as children) and that they were most certainly *vain*, which may be regarded as indicative of a desire to at least appear cultivated.

There are instances in which Heathcliff clearly shows that he is proud of the personality traits in Catherine that he also possesses, but is not able to fully integrate. Such example can be noticed in a scene where he observes her in one of her first interactions with the Lintons. The main sentiment and the one that is crucial for the understanding of his projection is *his* feeling of pride for *her* 'superiority': "I saw they were full of stupid admiration; she is so immeasurably superior to them- to everybody on earth, is she not, Nelly?" (35). Of crucial importance is that this particular scene took place after Mr. Earnshaw's death, when Hindley was responsible for the family. Therefore, Heathcliff does not have the opportunity to display *his* superiority, although he, without a doubt, has a strong tendency to act superior (the evidences of this are numerous- his treatment of Hindley before Mr. Earnshaw's death, his behavior in adulthood towards Isabella, Hareton, Edgar). However, Heathcliff's endeavor in adulthood to improve his status along with the constant attempts to



exert influence on his immediate environment reveal that he actually struggles with self-assertion in society. Therefore, the essence of the problem in his teenage years seems to be caused by a more positive inclination, which is, in fact, Heathcliff's desire for society's approval. Nevertheless, he is unable to ensure society's admiration and respect for *himself*, but is, as a result, amazed seeing Catherine succeed in doing this. In this case, he compensates his own lack with an unconscious identification with her, activating the anima, the feminine, yin aspect of his psyche that is focused on the collective and yearns for belonging.

Jungian analyst Stevens argues that the archetype ever seeks its own completion, and when activated reveals that which remains to be attained on the tortuous path forward to individuation (77). As it has become evident, the outcome for Catherine was tragic, as her animus, indeed, turned out to be "a demon of death" (Franz 189). However, what choice is Heathcliff left with? From a Jungian perspective he has two paths to choose from after Catherine, a living personification of his anima, has abandoned him. Either he is to embark on a path of individuation, attempting to make the unconscious conscious and integrate the repressed parts of his personality, or he is to increase the strength of the anima possession, 'sinking' deeper into illusion and unconsciousness. At first it appears quite odd when Heathcliff says that he loves *his* murderer, but cannot love Catherine's (117). However, if we consider that he is aware of what she had done, she denied a part of herself, she denied him (who is representative of her own nature) in her, she betrayed "her own heart", it becomes clear that he condemns society as her killer. On the other hand, he claims that he loves his murderer, which is in fact, her personification, anima in him represented by her. He 'stands' before that "which remains to be attained on the tortuous path forward to individuation" and yet, he chooses not to. He decides not to 'embark' on this path and become a better and a more complete individual. Instead, he clings to Catherine's image in his mind, keeping the anima in him 'alive', even deriving a certain masochistic pleasure in being tortured in this

way. What is more, his despair is so intense that he prays that Catherine's ghost haunts him and, in doing so, he chooses to stay unconscious, preferring the destruction over order, illusion over reality.

In *Psychology of Loneliness in 'Wuthering Heights'*, Levy argues that, as a consequence of the distrust of love painfully acquired in childhood, the only love Heathcliff and Catherine can accept in adulthood is one sustained by fantasy (160). He, therefore, excuses Heathcliff's unwillingness to eliminate the destructive archetypal influence by facing reality with emotional suffering experienced in childhood. Moreover, Jung himself claimed that anima is as attractive as it is destructive:

Everything the anima touches becomes numinous—unconditional, dangerous, taboo, magical. She is the serpent in the paradise of the harmless man with good resolutions and still better intentions. She affords the most convincing reasons for not prying into the unconscious, an occupation that would break down our moral inhibitions and unleash forces that had better been left unconscious and undisturbed. As usual, there is something in what the anima says; for life in itself is not good only, it is also bad. Because the anima wants life, she wants both good and bad. (Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 28)

## 7. Conclusion

One may argue that Brontë's novel, which has been written almost two hundred years ago, as well as Jung's theory, developed over a hundred years ago, are outdated and wonder about their relevance for contemporary audience. However, the numerous publications that continually keep emerging and offering fresh and new perspectives on these readings indicate that their influence is far from losing its power. This is the case, presumably, due to the fact

that they tackle primordial human tendencies, which seem to be the ongoing subject of interest. Jung founded his theory on the idea that we do not really know ourselves: “But how much do we know of ourselves? Precious little, to judge by experience” (*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 21). In drawing attention to this, he actually emphasized the need to explore the unconscious, to take a look at the roots of our anxieties, fears, seemingly illogical reactions and inner dramas. He called it ‘a path of individuation’, but in essence, it is a path towards becoming a more aware, more conscious and more complete individuals. It is a mission more important than any other, a life purpose, an ultimate goal of personal development.

Nevertheless, whereas Jung invites on a path of individuation, Brontë offers an insight into what happens when one does not embark on this path, painting a picture of two tortured individuals who could not rise above their projections to see the unconscious parts of themselves. Her novel could, in many ways, be regarded as an admonition, both on a societal and on an individual level, of the dangers that come from neglecting the importance of the psyche. Moreover, it serves as a reminder that the focus should be directed inwards, instead of outwards and instead of seeking happiness, growth and prosperity in external things, these should first be discovered in one’s own being. Everything else is nothing more than a consolation, a temporary tranquility and an elusive sense of peace. For this reason, the two works are complementary, with one being ‘the way’ and the other being ‘the warning’.

If Jung’s philosophy had to be deduced to one single statement, arguing that the quality of the external life depends on the quality of the internal one would encompass the most significant aspects of his theory. Nevertheless, there must be willingness to see and recognize and learn in order to be able to perform an ‘alchemy of transforming metal into gold’, which is to say to transform the unconscious into conscious and, in doing so, to achieve a personal growth: “But one must learn to know oneself in order to know who one is” (Jung,

*Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* 21). We witness the truth of this in Catherine's desperate need for Heathcliff, as well as in his 'demonic' obsession with her image and a morbid desire that her ghost haunts him. In the end, Heathcliff's presence cannot save Catherine from destruction and death, just like his vision of her, years after she had died, cannot save him from madness and bring him back to sanity. As Jung argued, every projection is only an opportunity to notice and transform a part of ourselves. Therefore, only they had the opportunity to 'save' themselves by "learning to know themselves", in other words, by seeing the illusory nature of their own projections.

## Works cited

Abdulkareem, Ala'a. *A Psychoanalytical Reading of Emily Brontë's 'Wuthering Heights'*.

MA Thesis. Dalarna University, 2011.

Al Balola, Amal M. F., Ibrahim, Idrees. "The Portrayal of Heathcliff's Character in 'Wuthering Heights'". *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2017, pp. 349-356.

Blair, R. "A Cognitive Developmental Approach to Morality: Investigating the Psychopath." *Cognition*, vol. 57, no. 1, 1995, pp. 1-29.

Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Guides: Wuthering Heights*. Infobase Publishing, 2008.

Brontë, Emily Jane., and John Stuart. Whitley. *Wuthering Heights*. Wordsworth Classics, 2000.

Cecil, Lord David. *Early Victorian Novelists*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1935.

Decety, Jean, Icke, William and Hatfield, Elaine, Rapson, Richard L., Le, Yen-Chi L. "Emotional Contagion and Empathy". *The Social Neuroscience of Empathy*, A Bradford Book, 2009.

Hagan, John. "Control of Sympathy in 'Wuthering Heights'". *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1967, pp. 305-323.

Homans, Margaret. "Repression and Sublimation of Nature in 'Wuthering Heights'". *Modern Language Association*, vol. 93, no. 1, 1978, pp. 9-19.

Huskinson, Lucy. *Nietzsche and Jung: the Whole Self in the Union of Opposites*. Brunner-Routledge, 2004.

Jung, C. G., et al. *Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 9 (Part 1): Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton University Press, 1968.

Jung, C. G., et al. *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung Volume 13: Alchemical Studies*. Princeton University Press, 1967.

Jung, C. G., and Franz, Marie-Luise. *Man and his Symbols*. Doubleday, 1964.

Kiehl, Kent A. "A Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective on Psychopathy: Evidence for Paralimbic System Dysfunction." *Psychiatry Research*, vol. 142, no. 2-3, 2006, pp. 107–128.

Levy, Eric P. "The Psychology of Loneliness in 'Wuthering Heights'". *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1996, pp. 158-177.

Moglen, Helene. "The double vision of 'Wuthering Heights': A clarifying view of female development". *The Centennial Review*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1971, pp. 391-405.

Oates, Joyce Carol. "The Magnanimity of 'Wuthering Heights'". *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 9, 1982, pp. 435-449.

Paris, Bernard J., and Bernard J. Paris. "Wuthering Heights." *Imagined Human Beings: a Psychological Approach to Character and Conflict in Literature*, New York University Press, 1997.

Pearce, Sarah. "Reading (not-)eating in the works of Emily and Charlotte Brontë". *Outskirts*, vol. 36, 2017, pp. 1-21.

Stevens, Anthony. *Archetype Revisited: an Updated Natural History of the Self*. Taylor & Francis, 2004.

Frattaroli, Elio and Young-Eisendrath, Polly, Dawson, Terence. "Me and my anima: through the dark glass of the Jungian/Freudian interface." *The Cambridge Companion to Jung*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Watson, Melvin R. "Tempest in the Soul: The Theme and Structure of 'Wuthering Heights'". *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1949, pp. 87-100.

Wood, Kaitlin B. "'Prince in Disguise' or 'Imp of Satan'? (Mis)Reading Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights*". *The Foundationalist*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2018, pp. 1-51.

**JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES IN EMILY BRONTË'S *WUTHERING HEIGHTS*:****Summary and key words**

This final paper explores the effects of archetypes on a romantic relationship portrayed in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*. Focusing primarily on the two main characters in the novel, Heathcliff and Catherine, the aim is to explain the nature of their controversial relationship in the light of the psychoanalytical theory, i.e. the theory of archetypes and the collective unconscious first developed by Swiss psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Carl Gustav Jung. The paper puts emphasis on the role and influence of the anima/animus archetype, which is considered rather important in romantic relationships. This archetype represents two polarities within the psyche, with the animus being the masculine principle in women, and the anima the feminine principle in men. Applied to Brontë's protagonists, Jung's theory is used to argue that, contrary to popular belief, their love is actually not genuine. Instead, it is suggested that their mutual affinity can be traced back to a psychological mechanism which reveals that they are not really in love with each other, but rather with the living embodiment of their anima/animus. Consequently, it is argued that the struggle of critics to explain their 'mysterious bond', as well as the lack of consensus concerning the psychological credibility of their characters can also be attributed to an oversight of the animus/anima archetype governing and shaping their relationship.

Key words: *Wuthering Heights*, Jung, archetype, romance, psychoanalysis

## **JUNGOVI ARHETIPOVI U *ORKANSKIM VISOVIMA* EMILY BRONTË: Sažetak i ključne riječi**

Ovaj diplomski rad istražuje utjecaj arhetipa na romantični odnos prikazan u *Orkanskim visovima* Emily Brontë. S primarnim fokusom na dva glavna lika u romanu, Catherine i Heathcliffa, cilj je objasniti prirodu njihovog kontroverznog odnosa na temelju psihoanalitičke teorije, odnosno teorije o arhetipovima i kolektivnom nesvjesnom koju je prvi razvio švicarski psihijatar i psihoanalitičar Carl Gustav Jung. U radu se stavlja naglasak na ulogu i utjecaj anima/animus arhetipa koji se smatra vrlo značajnim za romantične odnose. Ovaj arhetip predstavlja dva polariteta u psihi, pri čemu je animus muški princip u psihi žene, te anima ženski princip u psihi muškarca. Primijenjena na protagoniste u romanu Emily Brontë, ova teorija podupire tvrdnju da se, suprotno popularnom mišljenju, ustvari ne radi o iskrenoj i pravoj ljubavi. Umjesto toga, korijen njihovog uzajamnog afiniteta se krije u psihološkom mehanizmu koji otkriva da nisu uistinu zaljubljeni jedno u drugo, nego u živuću personifikaciju vlastite anime, odnosno vlastitog animusa. Prema tome, sve poteškoće s kojima se kritičari suočavaju u pokušajima da objasne ‘misterioznu vezu’ između ova dva lika, kao i nepostojanje konsenzusa što se tiče psihološke uvjerljivosti njihovih karaktera mogu također biti objašnjeni kao previd utjecaja anima/animus arhetipa na formiranje i razvitak njihovog odnosa.

Ključne riječi: *Orkanski visovi*, Jung, arhetip, romana, psihoanaliza