

Please cite this paper as follows:

Shafiee, Abd-o-R., & Hanif, M. (2021). The Society of Villains in *Wuthering Heights*: A New Perspective on the Element of Villainy. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 9 (38), 155-164.

DOI: [10.52547/IJFL.9.38.165](https://doi.org/10.52547/IJFL.9.38.165)

Research Paper

The Society of Villains in *Wuthering Heights*: A New Perspective on the Element of Villainy

Abd-O-Rashid Shafiee^{1*}, Mohsen Hanif²

¹M.A., Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran
shafiee.kord@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran
mohsen.hanif@gmail.com

Received: January 08, 2021

Accepted: May 18, 2021

Abstract

Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* is so fraught with real-life experiences that the reader is unsure about recognizing any single character as the villain. Since the events in the novel take place in the Victorian era, and the attitude of the Victorian English towards the racial "other" was that of a vindictive better towards their slaves, this paper attempts to examine the role of villainy in the novel. Despite the general viewpoint that considers Heathcliff as the sole source of malice in the novel, this paper looks to build on a social approach in identifying the villain(s) of the novel. Drawing on Bhabha's (2012) theories, such as "hybridity", "mimicry" and "third-space", which will serve as the main source of investigation, we will organize the argument so as to identify the villain(s) in *Wuthering Heights*. The purpose of such an investigation, therefore, will be to explain why and how a colonial "other", that is Heathcliff, becomes a villain in a society whose practitioners consider themselves righteous.

Keywords: *Emily Bronte, Homi Bhabha, hybridity, mimicry, third space, Victorian, villain, villainy, Wuthering Heights*

رویکرد اجتماعی برای شناسایی ضد شخصیت رمان بلندی های بادگیر

رمان بلندی های بادگیر، نوشته ی امیلی برانته، چنان سرشار از تجربه های حقیقی است که خواننده برای تشخیص دادن یک شخصیت واحد به عنوان ضد شخصیت دچار تردید می شود. از آن جایی که رویداد های این رمان در دوره ی ویکتوریا اتفاق می افتند و دیدگاه انگلیسی های دوره ی ویکتوریا در مورد "دیگر" نژاد ها دیدگاه یک ارباب کینه جو مقابل برده های خویش است، این تحقیق تلاش دارد تا نقش ضد شخصیت را در این رمان مورد بررسی قرار دهد. اگرچه که دیدگاه عمومی هیفکلیف را به عنوان تنها منبع شرارت در رمان می نگرند، این تحقیق به دنبال ایجاد یک رویکرد اجتماعی برای شناسایی ضد شخصیت های این رمان است. با بهره گیری از نظریه های هومی بابا از جمله "پیوند"، "همرنگی" و "مکان سوم"، که منبع اصلی بررسی خواهند بود، تلاش خواهیم کرد استدلالی ترتیب دهیم که ضد شخصیت ها در بلندی های بادگیر را شناسایی کنیم. بنابراین، هدف چنین تحقیقی توضیح این است که چرا و چگونه یک "دیگر" استعماری، همان هیفکلیف، در جامعه ای که افراد برجسته اش خود را درست کار می دانند تبدیل به یک ضد شخصیت می شود.

واژگان کلیدی: امیلی برانته، هومی بابا، پیوند، هم رنگی، مکان سوم، ضد شخصیت، بلندی های بادگیر

Introduction

The studies done on the role of villainy in Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* are not unanimous in their identification of a single character, especially Heathcliff, as the villain. As a result, we confront a set of views that are different in their approach to and recognition of the villain. According to Przybylowicz (2013), the identification of villain in Emily Bronte's novel is controversial although he is aware of the fact that the general point of view holds Heathcliff as the one character whose malicious acts knit the torments of the novel together and turns time into an absolute abyss for other characters (p. 6). Przybylowicz holds a drastic view that goes as far as claiming "the novel has no "good" characters" (p. 6). Moreover, Hafley (1958) asserts that "to propose, over hundred years after its publication, that a celebrated novel has been consistently and seriously misread [...] is to assume a responsibility that almost certainly can't be satisfied within the bounds of a single essay" (p. 199) as he comments on the general views' failure to recognize Ellen Dean, and not Heathcliff, as the villain. With his revolutionary assertion, Hafley unloads the role of villainy from the back of Heathcliff onto the back of Ellen Dean. Hafley recognizes Ellen Dean, or simply Nelly, not only as the ultimate villain in *Wuthering Heights*, but also as "one of the consummate villains in English Literature" (p. 199). Furthermore, Beaumont (2004) identifies barbarism, as attributed to Heathcliff's actions, not as "the diametrical opposite of civilised culture", but as "its dialectical obverse" (p. 137). Beaumont further maintains that "for the colonial culture of late-eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain, the cannibal was the ultimate image of the other" (p. 143), thus pointing to the subjective view that condemns Heathcliff as evil.

Various as they are, debates can still continue as to who exactly is the villain in the novel. To be more specific, departing from the centralized identification of villainy in a single character, and building on the point of view of Hafley (1958) and like-minded scholars publishing in this field such as Michie (1992) and Przybylowicz (2013), among others, and borrowing theoretical assumptions from Bhabha's post-colonial theories, this paper moves one more step further and attempts to identify a society of villains in Emily Bronte's novel. The purpose of this paper, consequently, is to cast doubts on the assumption that Heathcliff alone should stand trial for his nefarious actions, and to see whether the treatment he receives from other characters is any less nefarious or not. To this end, this paper will draw on Bhabha's speculations on issues such as "hybridity", "mimicry" and the "third space". Then, by identifying the English characters under the "Self" and Heathcliff under the "Other", in the course of the fiction, this paper hopes to delineate the exploitation and maltreatment of Heathcliff by his betters, or at least to find the roots for his malice in other character's biased actions. The ultimate purpose, however, is not only to give Heathcliff enough reason for his actions, as such a justification has already been made by scholars such as Lodine-Chaffey (2013) and Carlisle (2012) respectively in "Heathcliff's Abject State in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*" and "Emily Brontë's Heathcliff: His Journey of Jealousy", but also to find the element of villainy in the society that surrounds him.

Discussing *Wuthering Heights* in the Postcolonial Context

Heathcliff is the stereotype of "other", and the inhabitants of both the Moors and the Heights are the stereotype of "self". Then, following Bhabha's post-colonial theories regarding the colonized and the colonizer, the commonly accepted view that blames Heathcliff as the sole source of villainy in the novel is invalidated. "What is theoretically innovative, and politically crucial, is to think beyond narratives of [original] and initial subjectivities, and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences" (Bhabha, p. 1). In *Wuthering Heights* exists a binary of cultures: one dominant English culture observed in the

Moors and the Heights, and one uncertain, unknown and uncivilized culture of Heathcliff. Although differences exist between the life of the Moors and that of the Heights, both the Lintons and the Earnshaws are unanimous in how to treat Heathcliff as an inferior colonized object. Examples of this (mal)treatment are mentioned in the novel such as “Poor Heathcliff! Hindley calls him a vagabond, and won’t let him sit with us, nor eat with us anymore [...] and threatens to turn him out of the house if we break his orders” or “Mrs. Earnshaw was ready to fling it out of the doors [...] to bring that gipsy brat into the house” and Mr. Linton’s reference to Heathcliff as “[A] little lascar, or an American or Spanish castaway” (Emily Bronte, 2000, pp. 28, 46, 63).

In his “(Dys)Function in the Moors: Everyone’s a Villain in *Wuthering Heights*”, Przybylowicz (2013) identifies no hero in the novel, thus labelling all characters villainous based on his definition of a villain: “The villain may also be the dark side of human nature, the opposite of the hero, or what the hero could become if s/he fails” (p. 6). The case of heroic failure is obvious in Heathcliff’s formation of a type of character who causes torment to other characters such as Hindley, the old Catherine, Isabella and Edgar. However, the question here concerns the past and the present Heathcliff considered as a whole. Consequently, to be specific, this paper focuses on the making by other characters of Heathcliff, whose faulty production must, in turn, reveal enough evidence of their own imperfection. Simply put, this study aims to trace villainy in those who have created a villain. Moreover, distinction has to be made between revenge and villainy. Przybylowicz is well aware of the fact that “[m]any scholars point fingers at Heathcliff as being the ultimate ‘villain’ of the story” (p. 6).

Yet, one focal point of this study is to differentiate between malicious actions done by Heathcliff out of revenge and the malice caused by other characters towards Heathcliff out of a sense of superiority, thus gaining ground for the notion of revenge which is ignored by those who “[P]oint fingers at Heathcliff” (p. 6). An early example of revengeful Heathcliff appears when he retaliates his loss of Catherine with Edgar’s loss of his sister which results in Isabella Linton’s falling in love with Heathcliff: “Isabella sent to her brother, some six weeks from her departure, a short note, announcing her marriage with Heathcliff” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 173).

The notion of “otherness”, Przybylowicz (2013) believes, brings Heathcliff to be considered a villain early in the novel. He states “that which is not understood” makes readers look negatively for a villain in Heathcliff as a result of “misunderstandings and biased attitudes of most characters” and “social condemnation” some examples of which are given in the paragraphs above (p. 7). Therefore, one main reason for identifying Heathcliff as the villain stems from his state of “otherness”. Early in the novel, Heathcliff was subject to harsh treatment and judgment by Mrs. Earnshaw when she wondered “how he [Mr. Earnshaw] could fashion to bring that gipsy brat into the house[?]” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 46), and later by Hindley as he calls him a “beggarly interloper!” and an “imp of Satan” who has come to “wheedle my father out of all he has” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 49).

The fact that Heathcliff is a non-English person poised among the English brings in difference, ambiguity, misunderstanding and finally condemnation by the society wherein he is placed. Przybylowicz (2013) objects to the generally negative view held against Heathcliff on the basis of his non-English origin. He sees as illogical the fact that “Heathcliff’s otherness” gives Hindley enough reason to exert violence and harshness on Heathcliff on a “regular basis”. However, Przybylowicz points out, no description of malevolence or villainy is often imputed to Hindley. This gives rise to a suspicion that Heathcliff alone should stand as the villain of the piece. As a result, such “initial subjectivities”, as proposed by Bhabha (2012), are not allowed in the identification of either villainy or heroism. What remains to be investigated is the process which led to the reaction by Heathcliff towards his betters.

In line with Hafley’s (1958) rejection of Heathcliff as the villain, we seek to look for villainy in the other characters. Hafley’s recognition of Ellen Dean as “one of the consummate

villains in English Literature” is achieved by her narration (p. 199). However, the point we are to look for in this paper lies not in the realm of narration. Hafley himself in later pages urges the readers to look for a “social awareness” novel in *Wuthering Heights* (p. 202). What, first and foremost, catches one’s attention in the novel is the introduction of an unidentified “other” in an orderly English society. The “other” that is not in harmony with the society soon brings difference and perturbation as Bhabha (2012) notes “[A] mediator or metaphor of otherness must be found to contain the effects of difference” (p. 31). Hafley uses the word “tension” (p. 202) to refer to this difference in the new society, a mixture of Heathcliff and the English. The existence of this “tension”, Hafley says, is reasonable enough to read Emily Bronte’s novel sociologically (p. 202). Heathcliff, without fail, felt this tension when, based on his otherness, he received outrageous comments from Mr. Linton in “[o]ho! I declare he is that strange acquisition my late neighbour made, in his journey to Liverpool a little Lascar, or an American or Spanish castaway” and Mrs. Linton in “[a] wicked boy [...] quite unfit for a decent house” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 63) as they observed him in their yard.

At the outset, it is the English who first mark this tension, or difference, by their objectification of an “other” human being. A most prominent early example of this subject-object relationship is the Earnshaws’ entire unacceptance into their family of Heathcliff which leads to Nelly’s “I put it on the landing of the stairs, hoping it might be gone on the morrow” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 47). As a result of such prolonged objectification, Heathcliff seeks solace first in the vivacious Catherine, and second, after her conversion, in a long-term journey away from the Heights. Moreover, the English, as the initiators of tension, kept up with the objectification of Heathcliff to the extremes in a way that cultural difference was not only spotted by him but it also turned into his utmost suffering:

He had by that time lost the benefit of his early education: continual hard work, begun soon and concluded late, had extinguished any curiosity he once possessed in pursuit of knowledge, and any love for books or learning. His childhood’s sense of superiority, instilled into him by the favours of old Mr. Earnshaw, was faded away. He struggled long to keep up an equality with Catherine in her studies, and yielded with poignant though silent regret: but he yielded completely; and there was no prevailing on him to take a step in the way of moving upward, when he found he must, necessarily, sink beneath his former level. Then personal appearance sympathised with mental deterioration: he acquired a slouching gait and ignoble look. (*Wuthering Heights*, pp. 85-86)

Seeing themselves as culturally superior, the dominant power in the Heights would not expect a clash with Heathcliff. However, Heathcliff does not typify an object who is unable to resist subjugation. Although culturally unknown, Heathcliff exhibits strong adherence to freedom:

They both promised fair to grow up as rude as savages; the young master being entirely negligent of how they behaved, and what they did, so they kept clear of him. He would not even have seen after their going to church on Sundays, only Joseph and the curate reprimanded his carelessness when they absented themselves.; and that reminded him to order Heathcliff a flogging, and Catherine a fast from dinner or supper. But it was one of their chief amusements to run away to the moors in the morning and remain there all day, and the after punishment grew a mere thing to laugh at. (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 58)

The unity in action against restriction, as exhibited by Heathcliff and Catherine, that sets them apart from the majority of the inhabitants is the quintessence of Heathcliff’s culture. Therefore, being “[U]nited on one side of a polarity that opposes nature to culture, the inhuman to the social, and the energetic to the placid” the formerly mentioned tension sets in (Stevenson, p. 60). However, Heathcliff’s resistance alone cannot account for his later malice. Moreover, such a resistance on Heathcliff’s part should not and could not threaten anyone’s well-being in

the Heights. One very simple, yet almost totally ignored point about the young Heathcliff is that his nature-bound behavior provides literally no one with the slightest degree of threat.

Although much importance is attached to familial ties in the society of the Heights and the Moors, it analytically cannot label as villain the one who stands outside the family, although a local view can. Therefore, no credit can be given to statements accusing Heathcliff as the sole source of villainy. The difference, which in the *Wuthering Heights* consists in a nature-culture binary, could not be turned into a hot frame of enmity by Heathcliff, who did not fuel the tension before he was fueled by his betters.

The second phase of Heathcliff's presence in the Height exhibits an impeccable personality who seeks revenge. This sense of revenge which is finally clinched by Catherine's renunciation of free nature in her answer to Nelly's question regarding the reason to marry Edgar: "And he will be rich, and I shall like to be the greatest woman of the neighbourhood, and I shall be proud of having such a husband" (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 99), sends Heathcliff away only to come back as a colonial subject who can avenge his loss as long as he is in a position of power. John Hagan (1967), in his "control of Sympathy in *Wuthering Heights*", draws our attention to a "double view" towards Heathcliff. "We must condemn the sin, but pity the sinner" (p. 305), asserts Hagan in his attempt to reveal Emily's Bronte's mastery that brings the reader to this double view. Hagan holds that if we are to see the sinner, Heathcliff, as the sole source of villainy, we will end up labelling Emily Bronte an immoral writer because she focused at length on the life of an immoral character (p. 305).

Far from that supposition, Bronte's purpose, Hagan (1967) says, is to show the condition of a man whose enemies have "entrapped him in their own values" (p. 306). Thus, the new Heathcliff is now like the English: he owns land and property, and he looks pretty much like a gentleman. However, he was not originally one of the English. As a result, his transformation into a standard English man is not possible since he is bearing a certain sense of revenge and humiliation that is absent in English characters. According to Bhabha (2012) in his *The Location of Culture*, this state of double identity that exhibits features of both the colonized and the colonizer is referred to as "hybridity": "[A] space of translation: a place of hybridity, figuratively speaking, where the construction of a political object that is new, *neither the one nor the other*, properly alienates our political expectations" (p. 25). In this regard, the new Heathcliff is neither a quintessentially English man, nor a totally natural and carefree creation as he used to be in his childhood. This new mode of being "alienates our political expectations" (p. 25), as it duly did in the novel. Instead of a neatly polished English man who believes in order and observes social rules, we observe an English man in appearance and a "vengeful beast" deep in heart when Heathcliff returns to the Heights. His "translation" into English has incorporated all the humiliation and belittlement to which he had been exposed earlier into his new self. Confirming Heathcliff's momentous hybridity is Hagan's assertion that Heathcliff's cruelty "is the consequence of their [Catherine and Heathcliff's] extreme suffering" (p. 312). Therefore, little or nothing could account for Heathcliff's malice than the pain and humiliation inflicted on him as a former servant in the Heights.

As a result of cultural hybridity, Heathcliff's actions oscillate between the local culture and his free nature. This hybrid, however, includes an unforgettable past history full of dehumanization and abuse. Therefore, incorporated into this hybrid is a strong sense of revenge that enables Heathcliff, a man in a position of power now, to act towards the English the way he was treated by the English. Furthermore, his actions towards the English are exacerbated by the same sense of revenge resulting from his abused childhood and servanthood. For instance, Heathcliff, as the "other", did not even have the right to be happy under Hindley's mastery, and would be identified as a threat for no good reason:

They met, and the master, irritated at seeing him [Heathcliff] clean and cheerful, or, perhaps, eager to keep his promise to Mrs. Linton, shoved him back with a sudden thrust, and angrily bade Joseph ‘keep the fellow out of the room send him into the garret till dinner is over. He’ll be cramming his fingers in the tarts and stealing the fruit, if left alone with them a minute.’ (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 72)

Therefore, Heathcliff’s currently mixed culture, what Bhabha (2012) calls “a difference ‘within’, a subject that inhabits the rim of an ‘in-between’ reality” (p. 13), runs its course and “alienates our political expectations” (p. 25). In simple terms, Heathcliff’s version of English mannerism and lordship is far from that of locally English landowners, and his free nature and exotic culture now forego friendly passion, affection and light-heartedness. Taught by the English and driven by revenge, the new lord of the Heights never ceases to torment his previously dominant betters.

The view that looks for villainy in the actions of English characters holds responsible the people both of the Heights and the Moors for their abuse of Heathcliff. Fraser (1965) in his “Nelly Dean and *Wuthering Heights*” urges readers to view the inhabitants of the Heights and the Moors as agents of suffering rather than victims. Thus, Heathcliff’s betters are held responsible for their own final torment in that they maltreated him to the point of excess, making him seek power and revenge by their own standards i.e. possession of property, land, power and superiority. Even Catherine, with whom Heathcliff was madly in love, would not think of him as a suitable husband due to his “other” status, and discourages Isabella who claimed “I love him more than ever you loved Edgar, and he might love me, if you would let him” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 130). The once love-driven Catherine now has this to say to Isabella, “I would not be you for a kingdom, then!”, and continues “Nelly, help me to convince her of her madness. Tell her what Heathcliff is: an unreclaimed creature, without refinement, without cultivation; an arid wilderness of furze and whinstone” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 130). Important in Catherine’s description of Heathcliff is her reference to “civilization”. Heathcliff has by now assumed a position of power desirable in the tradition of the Moors and the Heights, which would be of utmost importance in the hierarchy of the English society of the time, that makes even Edgar Linton address him as “Mr. Heathcliff” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 123). The treatment Heathcliff receives as a gentleman in the English society no longer resembles the treatment of a man “without civilization”.

Fraser (1965) further explains that “the novel is consequently a remarkably subtle and valuable exploration among other things, of the relationship between actions and “character”, the problem of self-responsibility and responsibility for others” in addition to “the role that one’s knowledge of another’s past can, and should, play in one’s present conduct towards him” (p. 225). In this regard, Heathcliff is not seen as the sole source of his malice. Instead, his malice is seen in the ignorance of other characters who were so wildly exhibiting their superiority by means of dehumanizing him. Hindley’s exploitation of Heathcliff, the Linton’s disgraceful view of him, and finally Catherine’s marriage to Edgar, therefore, indicate the status of Heathcliff’s betters as agents of suffering rather than victims (Fraser, 1965). With such sufferings imposed on Heathcliff, he, as a cultural hybrid, reaches a position where he can declare “My old enemies have not beaten me; now would be the precise time to revenge myself on their representatives: I could do it; and none could hinder me” (*Wuthering Heights*, p. 409). What then is expected of an abused “other” for whom no sense of humanity is observed by his betters than revenge and rage is a question that plays a telling role in explaining Heathcliff’s actions when he is in power.

In order to take revenge on his betters, Heathcliff has to reach a position of power. Knowing well the universal fact that servanthood does not suffice at all if one is to eliminate their master, Heathcliff embarks on achieving mastery. For him, therefore, the only way to exhibit his

rage at subjugation and suppression is through gaining power. The reason for which he seeks mastery and property is that power is defined by mastery and property in the society where he resides. As a result, following his resistance to the dominant power, Heathcliff is magnetized by what Bhabha (2012) calls “mimicry”;

The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus, the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the Other as it visualizes power. (p. 86)

The difference, therefore, between Heathcliff’s position as a subjugated “other” and that of his racist betters provokes him to imitate them so that he would be able to wield enough power to stop being dehumanized. Such an imitation, however, Bhabha says, involves “disavowal” (p. 50).

In Heathcliff’s case, the disavowal involves his attachment to lordship, property and land at the cost of his free nature and wild passion. Although his wild passions for Catherine are everlasting, they bring destruction to her and her family, thus being in contradiction with his previously natural affections for the unmarried Catherine. Therefore, Heathcliff disavows all sorts of previously nature-bound, impulsive and affectionate kindness, humanity and joviality he had exhibited in the Heights before his transformation. Noticeable in his transformation is the source of imitation; if we are to see Heathcliff malicious and his acts nefarious, we should first trace malice in those who affected him and expedited his formation of an impeccably revengeful, angered personality. Consequently, it would seem vividly superficial, simplistic and racially subjective to seek for a villain in Heathcliff.

Regarding the hostility between the English and the Irish, and the Victorian attitude of the Irish as “simians”, in her “From Simianized Irish to Oriental Despots: Heathcliff, Rochester and Racial Difference”, Michie (1992) refers to the potato famine of Ireland in the late 1840s, as a result of which lots of Irish children thronged into England, and attributes Heathcliff’s origin to the Irish. However, the obscurity of Heathcliff’s identity and the absence of any reference to Ireland, Michie implies, is a result of Emily Brontë’s own Irish origins that would be troubling for her in England, and Michie describes it as “a troubling instance of local colonialism” (p. 125). In her attribution of Heathcliff and Rochester to the Irish, Michie explains:

Because of their family background, the Brontës were particularly interested in the situation in Ireland, and *Wuthering Heights* and *Jane Eyre* bear traces of that interest. In those novels, however, direct references to the Irish are difficult to identify because they are screened by references to China, India, Turkey and the West Indies. (p. 125)

Moreover, the harsh treatment Heathcliff receives in the Heights is a result of his characteristics that were dehumanized and disapproved of by the English of the time; “Heathcliff’s and Rochester’s violently personal attachments and their emotional vitality are the characteristic of the Victorian conception of the Irish national or racial personality” (p. 130). Such descriptions typify Heathcliff’s free nature in the novel and are obviously opposed to the English perspective that gave priority to culture over nature, society over individual and regulation over feeling.

The English perspective on the “other”, especially the Irish, offers a fair reflection of the totally inhumane condition of the colonized. “From the point of view of a member of gentry, Mr. Linton”, Michie (1992) points out, “Heathcliff’s blackness makes him a threat; he is a potential thief come to rob the landlord” (p. 133). The racial difference plus a narrow-mindedly negative suspicion of the “other”, therefore, incites Heathcliff, who is an equally living human, first to mimic the colonizer in an attempt to prove himself standard and second to have himself revenged. Furthermore, the members of a cultural class who judge people based on their color

should never expect to be treated humanely by the one previously under their subjugation. Consequently, Heathcliff reaches a position of power similar to that of his betters when he was determined to treat them as unfairly as possible as a result of their own incorrect, inhumane perspective on the “other”.

Suffice it to say that the inhabitants of the Heights and the Moors act as the “other” when Heathcliff gains mastery and lordship. We may not call Heathcliff a colonizer in the first place. Nevertheless, the complexity of power relations through Bhabha’s hybridity, mimicry, and the occurrence of the “Third Space” creates a new atmosphere in which fixed culture sees itself collapse at the hands of its practitioners. As Bhabha (2012) puts it, “It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or post-colonial provenance” (p. 38). In this regard, the newly created third space which is neither totally based on Heathcliff’s nature nor English culture has its roots in the colonial discourse through which Heathcliff was maltreated and dehumanized by the English. Simply put, among the “productive capacities” (p. 38) of the third space are Heathcliff’s ascending mobility and ruthless malice towards his formerly dominant masters, both of which originate from the colonial harshness to which he was once exposed.

The rules and regulations of the cultural class in the Heights and the Moors are no longer observable in the “Third Space”. In Bhabha’s (2012) words:

It is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appreciated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew. (p. 37)

Therefore, the creation of the “Third Space” introduced great anomalies into the culture observed in the Heights and the Moors. One of the most noticeable of such anomalies is the introduction of a non-English master who not only owns land, but also rules over English inhabitants such as Hindley and Isabella and teaches an English child such as Hareton how to live. Thus, the Third Space in the *Wuthering Heights* bears witness to a non-English personality who dresses like the English middle-class and enjoys ownership over their lands, but who contradictorily exhibits interminable hostility and exerts impeccable harshness against the English.

If the occurrence of the “Third Space” involves the coincidence of the colonized and the colonizer, and if the resulting “Third Space” bears harshness and discrimination towards the colonizer, it will be necessary we feel suspicious about the humaneness of the colonizer. Since it is the colonizer that is mimicked in the case of *Wuthering Heights*, not the colonized, the resulting cruelty of the colonized has to be traced back in the culture of the colonizer. Following Beaumont’s (2004) assertion that *Wuthering Heights* “uses images of cannibalism in order to strip this culture [middle-class culture] of its respectable clothing and expose it in its naked form” (p. 139), we are persuaded that the cultural class inhabiting the Heights and the Moors is not as righteous, fair and civilized as it pretends to be. “For the colonial culture of the late-eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain, the cannibal”, Beaumont points out, “was the ultimate image of the other” (p. 142), as a result of which, not only Heathcliff but also any other outsider would be labelled “cannibal”, with *Jane Eyre*’s Bertha Mason being the familiar example. Moreover, such a superficially cannibal character as Heathcliff, even if we are too conservative to call him as such, has suffered extreme racial discrimination and been prone to objectification which provoked him to seek revenge in beastly manners. Therefore, an analytical attempt to identify the villain(s) in the novel needs to be centered around preliminary actions that provoke villainous acts in a colonizer-colonized relationship.

Heathcliff's actions at the time of his dominance are defined by a strong sense of revenge, a lack of regulation, and an impeccable selfish desire. However, such a desire-driven state and selfishness observable in Heathcliff happen as the result of his dehumanized self in the Heights and are necessary to the realization of Hybridity. Bhabha (2012) considers a cultural hybrid to "shift forces and fixities", display "the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination" and base the position of power "on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory" (p. 112). Simply put, the hybridity taking place in the novel has as its prominent component the interminably shocking, desire-based authority of Heathcliff as a person formerly subjugated and currently authorized. Therefore, his former subjugation, which itself was a result of selfishness on the part of his masters, is not content to lordship alone, thus turning Heathcliff into a revengeful power whose relaxation lies in the torment of his former masters.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a superficial identification of Heathcliff as the villain of Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* does not pay due regard to the complexity of the text. To see the villain in the novel as that who is generally called "bad", would be too myopic. Furthermore, if malice is observed in Heathcliff, it needs to be regarded as a result of the emphatic colonization to which he was exposed. Taking Bhabha's postcolonial assumptions as the framework of analysis in our rereading of *Wuthering Heights*, this paper delineated the existence of "mimicry", "hybridity" and the "third space" in the context of the world in which the story takes place. As such a postcolonial analysis of *Wuthering Heights* had no predecessors in English Literature, the identification of the literary element of villain offered by this study stands in contrast with that considering the villain as a single character whose malice impedes the way of the protagonist. This paper's contribution, therefore, is significant in two ways. First, it applied Bhabha's postcolonial theory to demonstrate the process in which Heathcliff was turned into a villain by his former masters: his adoption of the dominant culture through the act of mimicry paves the way for the formation of a cultural hybrid in him, who, consequently, in the newly created ethos of the third space, comes to fruition, thus tracking the element of villainy all the way back to its originators, not their product. Second, by proving the members of the dominant culture parochial both in their attitude and actions towards the colonized "other", that is Heathcliff, this paper found villainy not in a single character, as is the case in the theoretical realm of literature, but in a society of villains, who factually directed Heathcliff towards villainy. To be specific, under the postcolonial context applied to analyzed *Wuthering Heights*, Heathcliff's transformation from an objectified servant to a revengeful master is caused in his masters' peevish, selfish treatment. The colonization exemplified by the actions of Hindley, Mr. Linton and his son Edgar, as agents of the local tradition, together with the feminine prototype of the local tradition, Catherine Earnshaw's dehumanizing renunciation of Heathcliff and her class-based marriage, is responsible for Heathcliff's development into a revengeful and inexorable hybrid. No matter how much the cultural class in the novel pretends to be civilized, their acts in the face of a racial "other" gives Heathcliff both enough reason and incentive to become a colonial hybrid. Accordingly, the cultural class that forms negative judgments about and objectifies their "other" finally meets with the same harshness when power relationships change hands. Finally, this paper disapproved of the existence of any single character as the villain and endeavored to prove the existence of a society of villains in the novel, including Hindley Earnshaw, Mr. Linton and Edgar, and Catherine Earnshaw. In simple words, Heathcliff's malice is no more to blame than that of the English people maltreating him and making the racial discrimination too tangible to him.

References

- Beaumont, M. (2004). Heathcliff's great hunger: The cannibal other in Wuthering Heights. *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 9(2), 137-163.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2012). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Brontë, E. (2000) *Wuthering Heights*. Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Carlisle, K. (2012). Emily Brontë's Heathcliff: His Journey of Jealousy. *The Explicator*, 70(1), 46-48.
- Fraser, J. (1965). The name of action: Nelly Dean and Wuthering Heights. *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 20(3), 223-236.
- Hagan, J. (1967). Control of sympathy in Wuthering Heights. *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 21(4), 305-323.
- Hafley, J. (1958). The villain in Wuthering Heights. *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 13(3), 199-215.
- Michie, E. (1992). From Simianized Irish to Oriental Despots: Heathcliff, Rochester and Racial Difference. In *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* (Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 125-140). Duke University Press.
- Lodine-Chaffey, J. (2013). Heathcliff's Abject State in Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights. *Brontë Studies*, 38(3), 206-218.
- Przybylowicz, S. (2013). (Dys)Function in the Moors: Everyone's a villain in Wuthering Heights. *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14(1), 6-20.
- Stevenson, J. A. (1988). "Heathcliff is Me!": Wuthering Heights and the question of likeness. *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 43(1), 60-81.