



Universidad de Chile
Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades
Departamento de Lingüística

The mythical imagery under the context of English Romanticism in Mary Shelley's
Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus: About the plasticity and authenticity of
myths in the novel

Informe Final de seminario para optar a grado
De Licenciado en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa

Autor
Orlando Cisterna Oyarzun

Profesor Guía
Andrés Ferrada Aguilar

Santiago de Chile
Enero 2016

*I strongly appreciate Professor Andrés Ferrada Aguilar for his support
In the creation and development of the current work. Also, I would deeply*

Give thanks to the teachers of the BA Program of English

Linguistics and Literature of Universidad de Chile.

I am proud of the love and care of my family, especially in these very long years.

For them, I dedicate this work.

*The current work would have been impossible to finish without the
Support and help of my Seminar classmates, and those who until today*

Are my friends. To all of them, thank you

Dedicated to my father, Orlando Cisterna Bustamente.

Introduction

Under the context of the seminar “Romanticism in the English language literature”, the subject of study of the current work will establish a question that has challenged this seminar. This is how modernity affected English language literature during the romantic age, not only in terms of political, social or artistic terms, but in the building and development of lyric and narrative works that embodied “the spirit of the age” of the period.

In order to answer that question, it is pertinent to explain the selection of "Frankenstein" ¹ as the main source of this work. The present research deals with an issue in relation to the mythical imagery built in a novels which were produced during under romanticism scope.

When we read the discussed novel, everything seems to be shaped in the sense of understanding the unnamed creature presence as a monster, which is actually named through the literary stage as the main producer and articulator of Frankenstein’s tragedy

However, this research will attempt to orientate the discussion focusing in the understanding of the "creature" as a Titan. The god-like creature, who was transplanted in an alien context, and brought to a modern milieu.

The latter context suggests that the scientific revolution, that embraces Victor Frankenstein in his quest for eternal life, fails in the monster’s creation. In that sense, the failure of his purpose is the liquidation of the eternal life project that Frankenstein developed in the novel. The procedures of that attempt are the events that should be considered as key passages to formulate the current work.

Continuing these ideas it is pertinent to mention the symbolism beneath the presence of the monster (or for this research, a Titan) presence. The Promethean myth, mentioned in the subtitle of the novel, provides a character out of the epic narrative text. It functions as the transplantation

¹ Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print.

of an epic character in a romantic novel, reacting as a symbol of an Ancient mythical character's presence in a romantic novel.

The latter sets a turn to the mythical imagery. This is central, because moving the Epic towards a flexible unit, as it occurs in "Frankenstein" provides a new perspective of the subject. The element previously mentioned suggests the mixture between a modern kind of discursive tools, like journals, letters notes, with the presence of this unnamed creature which takes the role of a Titan, allowing the renewal and expansion of the epic genre to modern characteristics.

Taking into consideration these characteristics, the change is even deeper than a mere genre twist. It is during modernity where the end of the communal affair of gathering around the fire and telling stories changed. The end of oral tradition, heir by the transmission of the people's stories from mouth to mouth, ended with the rising of the modern cultural institution of the novel.

The impact of the latter in the cultural process of authorship and readership, core for the modern institution of the novel, crossed its transition between the 18th to 19th centuries. It was a trend of having narratives that were between novel and epic, as it occurred with John Milton's "Paradise Lost": It was an epic narrative or a modern novel? That is the main question that we should ask in order to understand "Frankenstein" as a plastic literary text.

The complexity of creating an artificial being, born and raised under extreme circumstances, consolidates the break between epic characters, considered for being encircled in their own discourse, with modern roles.

It is the influence of a modern dialogic structure, a discourse that liquidates the epic, making it flexible and plastic for a new artistic sensibility, which was romanticism, which permits the rising of a modern mythopoetic.

The elements previously mentioned had circulated around perspectives which were provided by several critical approximations to the subject of study. The issue developed by them had relayed on the following definition: Victor Frankenstein is the modern Prometheus. Another perspective is that the "so-called" monster acts as a mirror of Frankenstein's perverse idea of eternal life, representing himself as the counterpart of Victor's goodwill.

Taking into consideration the previous paragraph, the current work will suggest that the actual representation of Prometheus was not meant through Victor Frankenstein, but it was in the inception, creation and realization of the Titan.

The mythical entity became the embodiment of a plastic being that contradicts the epic principles of character building. This moves the epic to a new literary institution, which is the rising of a modern mythopoeia, constituted by “Frankenstein” as its first literary member.

The critical proposal will suggest a new reading of the novel, through standing a symbolic approach rather than an intertextual or historical analysis. The selection of this kind is mainly mediated by a need of leaving behind aspects that were not relevant for the current research, like a historical or cultural approach to the novel.

The influence of interpreting literary texts as organic units with sense, as Paul Ricoeur suggests in his “Interpretation Theory”² will provide a challenging position in order to analyse “Frankenstein”. In that sense, the idea of a “fragmented whole” represented by the “unnamed creature”, plays the role of a technological device that gathered corrupted body pieces in a being.

The monster, in that sense, is fetishized as the engine of science as the new modern religion, through a ritual of fire and light. These elements are going to be analysed and explained in depth in the theoretical framework section.

Returning to the critical proposal, the mythical creature suggests the practical embodiment of the revolutionary ideals of the period; is the symbol of the new world which is built among the organic rests of the puritan society of the period. The latter allows a series of questionings about the monster’s presence in the novel, as a literary device.

The element previously explained, permeates the thesis proposal, because if for most of the critics the presence of the unnamed being is a medium of Frankenstein’s tragedy, the world built in the novel is not possible without the creature.

² Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976. Print.

As a consequence of the latter, if the monster was not created by Victor Frankenstein, the novel could not exist. The creature's speech matters. The seductive capacity that the creature would not live eternally, but transcends Victor's speech and is authentic into that literary stage. That is at the core of the current research.

The latter will attempt to provide a new perspective about the novel, establishing a complex narrative embroidery rather than a typical definition of speaker. The previous idea suggests an understanding of the telling-listening act translated in a reading-interpretation process that respond to a literary representation of the mythical character of the novel.

In that sense, it is through the character's speech were the innovation that the novel delivered constitutes the plasticity inside the literary text. The concept of a novel as a plastic creation, as it is suggested by Mikhail Bakhtin in his essay "Epic and Novel"³, transforming the concept of narrator to "Speaker"; characters enrolled as discourse's makers, instead of narrators.

The latter perspective suggests a literary turn of concepts, from narrators that narrate stories, to speakers that deliver speeches. The characterization of the narrator as a speaker expands the analysis, in terms of moving literary studies to new boards, and allowing the rising of a new perspectives towards literature and literature studies. This perspective is going to be expanded in the theoretical framework.

Moving towards the critical readings about the novel had provided a contextual background to the present work. Mainly feminists interpretation of it, like the one provided by Anne. K. Mellor⁴, had suggested that Victor Frankenstein represented the mythopoetic vision that was central for the romantic poets.

In that sense, he was a scientific and member of one of the most prestigious families in Geneva, who was able to put into practice his knowledge, in order to create his artefact. The issue that her reading suggests is that, being a rational member of his community, Victor transformed his knowledge and his own life into an alienate entity, dividing his individuality from the whole.

³. Bakhtin, M. M, and Michael Holquist. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Mellor, Anne K. *The Modern Prometheus*. From Bloom, Harold. *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2007.

The latter provided a critical turn to the human nature of Victor Frankenstein, as Lawrence Lipking⁵ suggests, that the novel established a questioning to the educational system heir from Rousseau's ideas and how this system inhabits Victor. In depth, the modern institution of university as a world of imagery that, in the actual practice of the natural philosophy, failed to provide not only knowledge, but an actual creation of new beings.

This element, in a critical turn, gives credit to an idea that this research will attempt to pursue, and that is the rising of the demonic nature in the daring of creating beings through artificial devices.

Demonic in the sense that the pursuing of knowledge finally ends in the liquidation of characters, or in other terms, the consummation of the individual as an effect of his daring to cross the natural knowledge, with characters condemned to pay the price in their own living experiences of attempting the divine and transcendental world.

Continuing the subject of education, and according to Jane Goodall⁶, Victor Frankenstein was influenced by two forces that were in opposition.

As first object, the Calvinist or puritan tradition, that was his inner state as a member of the republic of Switzerland, and the scientific endeavour that was trending at the beginning of the 19th century in Europe. Certainly, this bipolarity of Victor was shared by the romantics, who were in a transitional age between the enlightenment and modernity.

Continuing this idea, the notion of death or mortality was not only controversial but central in Mary Shelley's experience and also in Frankenstein narration. Science, or natural philosophy, became the key element in order to rise an "electrical Prometheus", a being able to shackle the chains of human kind from the bondage of death, and allow the rising of the specie to a new world.

⁵ Lipking, Lawrence. *Frankenstein, the true story; or, Rousseau Judges Jean-Jacques*. Found in Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print.

Goodall, Jane. *Romantic Electricism*. Retrieved from Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print.

The latter, as suggested by Carol Dougherty⁷, represented the attitude that romantic writers had towards the figure of Prometheus. It was not by chance that, in a short period of time, translations of the Aeschylus drama, and romantic interpretations were written and published.

It is pertinent to mention a series of lyrical, theatrical, and narrative works that were published between 1773 and 1820 about Prometheus, which were mentioned in Dougherty's work "Prometheus".

First, Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe's epic poem "Prometheus" in 1773, which was considered one of the sources for his own narrative work, mainly found in his "Faustus". Second, the translation and dramatic representation of "Prometheus in chains" by T. Morrel (1773-1777), that later was supposed of being watched by the romantics.

These were sources for Lord Byron, Mary Shelley and Percy Shelley that helped them to write their own interpretations of the Promethean myth. In 1816, Lord Byron wrote "Ode to Prometheus", a political poem dedicated to the figure of Napoleon, who was actually considered "the modern Prometheus".

Then in 1818, the first publication of Mary Shelley's novel, and finally, in 1820, Percy Shelley's rendering of the Promethean myth, one of his later works "Prometheus Unbound".

The implication of the latter suggests that romantic writers manifest a sensibility towards the Promethean myth. Why romanticism had this sensibility? This might be mediated by means of the tradition that romantic writers were pursuing in their art. A symbolic approach to the divine knowledge through poetry and literature.

This is suggested by the rendering of a new communal tradition, in terms of nature and men as the true embodiment of God's creation, or maybe the consolidation of the grotesque embodiment of modernity.

However, it is precisely in "Frankenstein" in which the romantic sensibility is put into question, providing a crisis to the romantic sensibility, and moving towards the liquidation of the "spirit of the age" represented in the pursuit of eternal life by the main speaker.

⁷ Dougherty, Carol. *Prometheus*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print

Returning to the contextual background, Peter Brooks⁸ suggests that “the transference situation of telling and listening” provides an approach towards language as the seductive tool for the creature in order to persuade his creator to perform a new paradise on earth.

Even beyond a narrative perspective, this research proposes that the only way in which human beings could build their subjectivity was through language, mainly in the learning process of separating the different voices or personas. This element is central if we analyse the narrative structure of the novel.

In a critical perspective, the novel was built under the notion of a matryoska. This implies that the act of enunciation was mediated by layers, represented in the technological devices present in the novel (Letters and journals) and second, in the creature, an artefact that became a being by means of language.

The mechanical being, or in more literary terms, the artefact designed by Victor Frankenstein is the carrier of the dramatic force in the novel, and embodies the failed ideas of romanticism. In that sense, the structural approach is based upon Northrop Frye⁹ analysis of myths. This should be divided in three sections.

In a first approach, Mr. Walton speech corresponded to the present tense speech of the story. Also, it should be considered Mr. Walton’s sister, as the historical present. This is because she is the actual reader of the letters.

In a second analysis, Victor Frankenstein’s story and his relation with the monster. His narration and perspective is relevant, because Victor Frankenstein narrates the inception, creation, encounter and deception with the monster.

Third and finally, the delivering of the monster’s speech as the true manifestation of the plasticity in discourse. This discursive elements marks the rising of the plasticity within mythical

⁸ Brooks, Peter. *What is a monster? (according to Frankenstein)* Retrieved from Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. Frankenstein. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print.

⁹ Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.

imagery in the novel. As a consequence of the latter, the enrichment of speeches that overlaps the romantic sensibility of the period, and the beginning of a modern mythopoetic tradition.

The element previously mentioned was mediated by means of the reproducibility of artistic devices during modernity. That is the key for this research to guide the discussion towards an organic analysis of literary texts, instead of new historicism or deconstructive method.

As a principle manifestation, this research believes that when a research is dealing with art products, like photographic media, Historical events or the author biography is irrelevant. The critical view towards an art product should only be referred and inferred if we approach that unit in the sense that the product was created as an authentic art work.

The current work strongly believes that art, in its entire expression, resembles one of few instances in which human beings are connected with the universe of symbols. In that sense, the approach to a new language, poetry, is mediated by the plasticity that artists search in their art work.

Furthermore, the novel as an artistic genre embodies the plasticity of discourses that exist in language, in all its forms and perceptions. That supports the view about art as an organic and living entity that is constantly evolving towards new forms and meanings.

Finally, it might be pertinent to mention the objectives of the current research, which are going to be formulated as it follows

- A- Delivering a definition of *Plasticity* and *Aura* for the interpretation of literary texts, as current events during the 19th century literature, under Mikhail Bakhtin and Walter Benjamin ¹⁰literary perspective.
- B- Establishing the relation between *character's speech* and *voice* in "Frankenstein" as the main literary stage source, supported by Frye's and Paz's critical work.
- C- Understanding the *inception, creation* and *embodiment* of the monster as a *technological device*, which transforms the mythical entity in a plastic unit with meaning.

¹⁰ Benjamin, Walter et al. *The Work Of Art In The Age Of Its Technological Reproductability, And Other Writings On Media*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 2008. Print.

D- Guiding the analysis and interpretation of “Frankenstein” as a *Plastic literary work* allowing the renovation of the Epic narrative towards a plastic literary unit.

E- Delivering a new understanding of the novel, in the sense of comprehending the presence of the monster as the *consolidation of a mythopoetic building* in the literary stage of the novel.

Summing up, it is expected that the current work guides a new set of interpretations of Mary Shelley’s “Frankenstein”, and even beyond, a new perspective about the literary work developed by romanticism in the English language literature.

In that sense, a singular analysis of literary texts might provide, in the near future, a complete revision of the current trends in literature and in other media arts. The rising of a new sensibility towards arts, mediated by technology and singularity will open the path of contemporary tensions and breaks in 21th century art.

Theoretical Framework

Whenever a research deals with mythical imagery, the possibility of expanding the subject to an unlimited series of possible critical perspectives, theories and interpretations, is a bias that researchers should handle with precautions. The latter suggests the focus of the current theoretical framework, narrowing down concepts and critical perspectives for the research.

Continuing the previous idea, it is pertinent to establish that the current work will analyze the 1818th version of Mary Shelley’s “Frankenstein”. Moreover, it is in the 1831th ¹¹version where we can trace the inception of the novel. The core ideas, mainly in relation to science experiments and procedures at the beginning of the 19th century, were central for the author.

The current work analyses the 1818th edition of the novel but we suggest to read the 1831th edition in order to compare and contrast the changes within these two versions.

For Shelley, the creation of her “ghost story” was based upon a series of German Folk stories, named “Fantasmagoriana” or “Tales of the dead”. However, it is in the dialogues between Percy Shelley and Lord Byron where she found the materials for shaping her novel.

It was through this experimental process in which Shelley could access to a new form of understanding her narrative work. She considered “Frankenstein” as the recipient of all the dreaming influence during her young-hood, mostly mediated by science and the “spirit of the age” idealism.

Continuing the latter, the subtitle of the novel “The modern Prometheus” should call the research`s attention. What was the symbolism beneath it? We should consider this as a sign for guiding the discussion, because it allows us to move towards the genre discussion of “Frankenstein”.

In addition to it, the presence of a series of non-literary texts inside the novel is a relevant subject to take into consideration. These are Mr. Walton`s journal, the letters he wrote to his sister Margaret, Frankenstein`s letters to his family, the dramatic dialogue between the monster and Victor, Frankenstein`s notebook of the monster`s creation, and the final comments of the monster`s aftermath. What are these elements? Certainly, they represent a modern kind of textuality.

In that sense, what if these discursive tools were used by Mary Shelley in order to create her own mythopoetic literature? Maybe, as it occur with English novels during the 19th century, we have a *travesty text*, a ghost or terror novel which actually is not what seems to be. Let this research to introduce a new perspective for analyzing the novel, based on Northrop Frye`s guidelines of his “Anatomy of criticism” critical work.

Supporting the idea that “Frankenstein” correspond to the building of a mythopoetic discourse, Frye defines a myth as “the imitation of actions near or at the conceivable limits of desire” (136). This concept suggests that a myth is built as a world of action and production, which imitates reality in order to create a metaphor of it.

In that sense, human desires are at the top of the building imagery of myths. The archetypes provided are related with the current identity that grows within communities, focusing in pre-modern societies.

In relation to this element, mythical literature was designed as a communitarian totem, ending in true representations of the ethical and moral values of the people. The community lives through their myths, which also constituted their state-nation building.

The latter is a key element for understanding myths, because it is only through language in which these metaphoric imageries became true. This element is beyond history, social classes, or cultural influences.

The consequence of this in Epic narratives is the liquidation of the author figure. Myths belong to the people, in their own imagery as a nation. Folk tales are considered true, actual events that support their tribal commonalities. The communion is given by institutions; churches, meals around the tribal fire at night, the market are institutions that give a sense of belonging to these communities.

Furthermore, the mythopoetic design was delivered by means of an organization of the territory or zone that gathered those communities. The human representation of desires, the psychological passions, and the type political and economic behavior, shape those societies. In that sense, a myth constitutes a system of traditions, represented through institutions and experiences of the people. These qualities are commonalities in any territory that is based upon myths.

The previous elements are allegories of the mythical imagery. Frye provided two possibilities of mythical imagery. At one hand, the development of an apocalyptical world, which is based on pleasure and ecstatic events. On the other, a demonic imagery of the world, constituted by unpleasant experiences, mostly related to the nightmare event. The latter will be explained in further, because it is necessary for the current research.

Focusing on the demonic imagery, it is pertinent to move towards the rising of the individuality in the Epic. Demonic imagery constitutes the isolation of human beings, mainly

experiencing the *remoteness* of the individual in relation to the community. The demonic plot, based on the ego is central, because these are the support for the conflict.

In that sense, the demonic world provides nightmares and creature that take divine characteristics. The relevant feature about these creatures relies on their ability of delivering pain; they punish the community and their inhabitants. In that sense, they are offered as a human sacrifice for satisfying the sexual desire of the creature, which might take the form of a God, or a monster.

Taking into consideration the elements previously mentioned, the critical turn suggests the following. The presence of daemons in mythical imagery, mediated by its inception, conception, and consolidation of them, are actions that input the demonic plot.

The latter allow us to move towards the understanding of myths during the 19th century. English romanticism was deeply influenced by the analogical understanding of the artistic sensibility of the period. This *analogy of experience* was analogical, in terms of proposing a world connected with nature and experience, in terms of experimenting with an artistic device that was inferred as a new creation.

According to Frye, the previous element was a consequence of the presence of mythical elements in literature, but adding the interpretation of an imagery that is symbolic. The building symbolism raises from ordinary experience, daily life events that are moved to an actual meaning. In that realm, symbolic *displacement* occurred as an evolution of the mythical world imagery.

Continuing the latter, symbolic language was based in reality, and not in mythical imagery. The analogy of experience became a grounded kind literary experience. Symbols were concrete, true entities that constitute the mythopoetic symbol. Taking into account this definition, Octavio Paz put it into question, if we based our counterpoint in his critical perspective found in “Analogy and Irony”.

According to Paz`s understanding of Romanticism, the assume idea that human being`s first language was poetry canalized the literary act, meaning that the “poetic operation consists of seeing the world as a fabric of symbols and relationships of these symbols” (58)

Furthermore, symbols are the actual joint between poetry (theory) and poetics (practice) through experience. The proclamation of a new human, this is the romantic men, was brought by that element. If language was a tool of power, the products of it will allow the rise of poetry as a true language.

The effect of the latter in literature suggests that novels and poetry are magic events, in which actions are proposed not just as a contemplative or closed imagery. *Language*, in that sense, is always in movement. It ceased to be a rigid structure, and transforms symbols into *flexible units with meaning*.

The elements previously mentioned support the introduction of Mikhail Bakhtin's idea of literary texts as *symbolic experiments*. Discursive elements combined irony and comedy, displacing the epic, and transforming it to a new literary genre.

Continuing this idea, the novel establishes the turn of the mythical imagery towards the rising of a tradition that liquidates the epic. In that sense, Epic speeches were no longer the community milestone, because the absolute narration ended. The idea of a state-nation with one language and one community was over.

The novel, under Bakhtin's perspective, became an artistic creation that was flexible. In common terms, the novel was a plastic unit that embodies a diverse range of symbols, discourses, and languages. The representation of new voices and characters expanded the literary stage, comprising it to a new form, which is the novel.

The latter implies that a literary unit expands its imagery to unexpected qualities, even transforming reality in a renovated manner. This manner suggests that not only literary imagery is affected by this plasticity, but the *verité*, the actual world, affects its condition by means of symbolic language.

In that sense, it is relevant to understand that a novel trespasses the epic, but not leaving behind myths and their imagery. The artistic device became an even more diverse unit. A complex entity that might take several forms, with speeches that were mediated by the individual, in representation of the community.

Continuing the idea of the individual, it is pertinent to mention certain aspects in relation to a work of art as an authentic piece of art. It is the novel, in its technological context, one of the first modern embodiments of the cultural implications of reproducibility or industrial production.

In that sense, *reproducibility prompted the artistic experience in multiple ways*. One of these is the access to artistic devices, which were now concrete, tangible by the users. As suggested by Walter Benjamin, tradition is *detached* from the communal experience, and the individual perception of the work of art takes relevance.

Continuing the latter, the individual experience is named as an “Aura”, defined by the critic as “a strange tissue of space and time: the unique apparition lowered near it may be” (14). A novel, in that sense, became the recipient of an extraordinary experience, it becomes authentic for the individual.

The implication of the latter in the plasticity of Epic speeches in the modern novel suggests the unique value of the artistic device. The magic of poetry, communal, was for the English romantic writers an individual affair.

Mentioning the latter implies the consolidation of a new secularized ritual. *Artistic devices were individual entities, incepted, created and performed in the community, but being authentic as independent, individual bodies*.

In order to support the last sentence, it is necessary to question the quality of this body or technological device, under the light of “Frankenstein” reading. The current trend during modernity was the pursuit of beauty as a scope for the fine arts and literature, even for romanticism. However, it is precisely in this novel where it is possible to find a mobilization of that subject.

The effect of the cult toward grotesque bodies, as it occur in the creation of the monster, constitutes a central element for the current research. If artistic devices were meant for being perceived by individuals, why the massive reaction of dejection and hate towards the monster? It seems, under the light of 19th century people, that the grotesque was monstrous.

The perception of the monster, in that manner, was deeply connected with a political questioning of the reproducibility of artistic devices. This question is related to the idea of a “*mass*” that functions in art as religious belief.

For the modern user, an artistic device is not actually authentic, is just the reproduction *en masse* of the original entity. In that sense, what if the monster was an authentic original being? Taking this into consideration, are human beings just replicates of the original? Why the reaction towards the monster was of an outrageous hate?

In order to answering these questions, it is pertinent to establish that a technological device became a ritualized subject. Sciences became a new religion during the 18th and 19th centuries. The Enlightenment, through educational institutions, replaced the mythical and ancestral tradition with new mantras and new wisdoms.

The latter implies the cult towards technological and singular devices, as the novel actually is. The en-masse community observes the monster as a horrible creature, because all technological devices hide a magic in their creation. Taking into consideration this, the monster is the symbolic representation of the idea that men is over nature, which fails in “Frankenstein”.

Nature, in that sense, will always be in an upper position than men. Artifacts were meant as grotesque, unnatural entities. By extension, modernity became a monster, a horrible embodiment of the failed ideas of progression and industrial production. The attempt of a new human species is actually destroyed in Mary Shelley’s “Frankenstein”, because *the monster in itself is emotional, logical, and a too human entity.*

Following the concepts previously discussed, an artistic device became an individual affair, by means of an auratic experience, an orgasmic connection with the universe and its symbols. However, it is in the community where the artistic device loses its meaning, because it manipulated by audiences with superfluous or superficial meanings.

In that sense, literature became a singular experience, overlapping its content in symbolic language (poetry), with an individual *actualite* (experience), interpreted in many forms by a community of users of plastic artistic devices. The community will collect, receipt, and transmit

those devices in a multiverse of poetics and novels that constitute the infinite set of literary creation.

As a consequence of the latter, literary speeches that gathered mythical imagery should not be analyzed under the scope of the ancient literary tradition. *The plasticity of textual units embodies the symbolism of a new sense in which literary devices should be analyzed, mainly mediated by means or reproduction and singularity of the novel.*

In that sense, Mary Shelley's "Frankenstein" embodies the consolidation of a mythopoetic tradition, by transforming the figure of a Titan in a monster, displaced from its original background. This element opens the rising of a new literary set of modern myths.

Continuing the latter, the epic narratives is transformed in a new plastic unit. God-like creatures and Titans are now monstrous symbolic units. They became strange beings in a world that establish that human beings are all equal to each other.

The implications of the elements previously exposed guide the theoretical framework of the current work towards a comprehension of organic literary works as symbolic units with meaning. This singular units, the art work, is what the monster actually became.

In that sense, *the monster is the embodiment, as a work of art, of the tensions and ideals of the period, embracing the complex speeches and discursive elements carried by this new unit.* "Frankenstein", as a novel, allows the emergency of a renovation of the mythical imagery in English Romanticism.

In a summary, the definition of the monster as a titan reacts as an answer of the mythopoetic imagery built in "Frankenstein". *This mythopoeia developed in the novel is true because the monster was created by means of authenticity.* Also, the monster remains as the true example of an auratic entity all over the novel.

In that sense, the monster is a new myth. It represents the rising of a modern mythical imagery, built as an individual affair that founds meaning by the individual perception and interpretation of the art work.

“Frankenstein”, the novel, has the capacity to transcend its literary stage, and take multiple forms. *The latter implies the symbolic multiplicity that collects the novel, not only by means of an artistic unit, but because it expands the art work to new forms of meaning.*

In other words, “Frankenstein” became one of the first literary works that expands its scope towards Theatre, Cinema, Illustrated novels, Comics and an entire set of artistic expressions that expand the mythical story of the monster to a renovated instantiations.

Analysis and Interpretation

Mary Shelley’s “Frankenstein” should be considered as a novel in which it is possible to find three main narrators. Mr. Walton, Victor Frankenstein, and the monster. Narrators in the sense of telling a story with a series of characters inside the literary text that participates in the actions and events of the story.

The issue that the latter idea represents is that the narrator does not satisfy the principle of plasticity that was suggested in the previous part of this work. This is mainly because the sense of plasticity relies in the idea of plurivocality.

Defining the latter implies that the voice of a character could take a series of manifestations, moving from its own storytelling to a series of other narrative structures. These are referential to the character and constitute its own ability to build an imagery world inside the novel.

The function of the speaker, which from now on will be the definition for narrator, allow this research to move towards a more large understanding of the character’s voice. It will be suggested that characters have a voice, and in that voice it is possible to trace a series of incarnations of the character not only in his voice, but in others voices, represented by means of textual formalities, like journals, letters, or inside tales within the main story that constitutes an innovation of the textuality of the novel.

The analysis of the series of voices inside the novel constitute the main source of this research. In a first approach, it will be analyzed the speech of the first character, Mr. Walton, who is the voice that introduce and provide context to the novel.

His voice is in charge of establishing the current milieu of the novel, establishing the present tense, or what should be called a contextual speech.

In terms of delivering the literary stage of the novel. The latter defines the sense of a scenario and motion of the events that is provided by this speaker.

The meaning of contextual speech implies not only the understanding of the novel's stage, but also the representation of certain values and principles that are part of the character's speech. This is important, because it allows to generate a contrast between this particular character and Victor Frankenstein.

In that realm, we are able to look both sides of the coin, establishing a thorough description of the embodiment of the trending tensions of Romanticism. In that sense, the world vision behind Mr. Walton's desire of endeavor and discovering a new path for transport and commercial matters, manifests the need for introducing a character that functions as the historical device of the issues of the period.

Furthermore, the belief of an eternal human progression was incarnated by Mr. Walton. His ideology relied in a series of flexible uses of tense and voice that are going to be explained in the following paragraph, and that constitute the first element of plasticity inside the novel.

The use of tense in "Frankenstein", focus on Mr. Walton speech contemplates the embodiment of a delimited time. This element embodies the mere period of the speech act. The enunciation, in this case, is given through the letters sent to his sister, Mrs. Margaret Saltville.

One of the relevant factors that should be taken into account is the cut in Mr. Walton's speech. This event occurs when Victor Frankenstein's speech permeates the first voice, and takes the turn in the act.

Taking in consideration the latter, we could suggest that the tense of the novel in which the events are performed, correspond to the period between *Dec, 11th, 1817, that corresponds to Letter 1, and September 19th, 1817*, which corresponds to the final date added in the journal that he was carrying, and that embodies the textual entity in which the novel is realized as a literary device.

Continuing this idea, the literary function of Mr. Walton corresponds to the figure of the speech initiator and ender of the narrative text, and this element should start the analysis of this current section. Mr. Walton's speech allows the creation of the imagery that shapes the novel, mainly because he was able to mutate from one original state of emotions to a different one at the end of the novel.

The plasticity of Walton's speech was performed by means of using a modern technique which is the epistolary speech, which rises as a monologue to a receiver that it is outside the novel stage, in this case Mrs. Saville.

Continuing this idea, if we are discussing about epistolary speeches, what should be understood is that a modern subjectivity permeates monologues as dialogic entities, ending the physical presence of the speaker.

By extension, the physical letter is the symbolic representation of the character's speech. A speaker that is absent, in concrete terms, but that lives through its speech.

The key aspect that established the latter is that it is through Mr. Walton speech were we can access to the novel, and not through Victor Frankenstein's speech.

The latter aspect shapes the condition of a matryoska narrative structure; multiple speeches that gathered a series of voices inside the literary text that built the literary imagery in the novel.

Continuing that idea, it is in the volume one were these four letters constitute the introduction of the novel. It is between the period of time that contemplates letter I and letter IV were the context is delivered by Mr. Walton. For the purpose of this research, it is explained the symbolism of each letter for the novel building.

Mr. Walton letters to her sister Margaret Saville

The current section will analyze the letters written by Mr. Walton to his sister Margaret Saville, which corresponded to the embodiment of a contextual speech in the novel. As it follows, the mentioned letter constitute a milestone, because it allows the rising of a plastic unit in the literary stage of the novel.

As it follows, in letter I it is possible to find traces of Mr. Walton ideology, mainly focused in the contemplation of nature that the character provide on it.

The aspect of admiring nature is part of his speech, and claimed the romantic admiration to it. As an example of the latter, it is pertinent to introduce a brief monologue provided by Mr. Walton

“What may not be expected in a country of eternal light? ... I shall satiate my ardent curiosity with the sight of a part of the world never before visited, and may tread a land never before imprinted by the foot of man” (7)

The reference to the eternal light corresponds to the fact that during winter, in the northern regions of Russia and near the Artic Pole, the climatic event of the “northern lights”. This decision was not by mere chance.

The reference to the light are constant in the novel, and it determines characteristic that determines the northern light is that it is a light without heat.

His quest is to find a path to connect Asia to America via a hidden channel constitute his childish attitude towards his own life experience. In a way, it is through this innocence act were he can dare his own uneducated performance that constitute his condition of a discoverer, not only of new lands, but of knowledge yet hidden for mankind.

The latter is introduce by the following element, which describes Mr. Walton knowledge desire. He embodied the idealism of the romantic man, and in that sense, the fact that he belongs to the higher class is central for its speech

“My education was neglected; yet I was passionately fond of reading” (8)

In his speech, the innocence of ignorance allows a path for the establishment of a sensibility towards the future events narrated as a child, as someone who will not be critical or put into question the story told by Victor Frankenstein. In that sense, we can find his own definition of his decision of docking himself in this journey of exploration

“My life might have been passed in ease and luxury; but I preferred glory to every enticement that wealth placed in my path...I am required not only to raise the spirits of others, but sometimes to sustain my own, when theirs are falling” (9)

He delivers the sense of comradeship acting as the crew, he is in fact the crew, one member who represents the community of his mates. In that sense, Mr. Walton's attitude towards his endeavor is not only to promote a new discovery, but to dare his actual human nature and capacities as a modern man.

However, Mr. Walton is conscience about the fact that he is human, and that he could peril in any moment. Moving towards letter II, we can trace the spirit that moves the character sensibility, defined by himself as a "dauntless courage" (10).

As a counterpart, in the following lines rises the emotion of a lonely man. The following dialogue should be taken into consideration, because it is at the core discussion about the medium through the novel could exist as a novel itself

"I shall commit my thoughts to paper, it is true; but that is a poor medium for the communication of feeling. I desire the company of a man who could sympathize with me, whose eyes would reply to me. (10)

In that sense, the emotion that he is looking for is, again, related to the idea of "comradeship", of finding a friend who accompanied his adventures for the world.

Continuing this idea, his own perception as an "illiterate" and "Self-educated" man are only the remainder of his pursuit of a "friend who would have sense enough to not despise me as romantic".

His despair could not be fulfilled, even if he found his companionship for his adventure. It is this pursuit which allows him to move his spirit to a new. At this point appears the first out-stage story, which constitute one of the elements to analyze in this research. The plasticity of the novel allows the entering of third person stories, which work as the entering of other voices in the novel.

These are voices that were not in the position of power offered by Mr. Walton or Victor Frankenstein. At this point, the exploration journey begins, and the unexpected events are introduce "I am going to unexplored regions, to the land of mist and snow" (12)

Jumping to letter IV, that section suggests one of the central points for the current research, and this is mediated by the apparition of a "low carriage, fixed on a sledge and drawn with dogs,

pass on towards the north, at the distance of half a mile: a being which had the shape of a man, but apparently of gigantic stature, sat in the sledge, and guided by dogs” (14).

This is the time in which the monster first appear in the novel. The presence of this being called the attention of Mr. Walton and the crew, who were amazed by this figure.

The plasticity, in terms of voice, takes control of this section, by means of delivering the dialogue between Victor Frankenstein and Mr. Walton. This is the main element in order to explain the impact of the dialogic structure within these characters.

The symbiotic relation between these discoverers suggests the tension that connect their stories to a milestone event, which is pursuing of a new knowledge. The latter is suggested by means of a brief dialogue between Frankenstein and Walton, during the rescuing moment of the first:

"On perceiving me, the stranger addressed me in English, although with a foreign accent. Before I come on board your vessel", said he, "will you have the kindness to inform me wither you are bound?"...I replied, however, that we were on a voyage of discovery towards the northern pole. Upon hearing this he appeared satisfied, and consented to come on board (14)

The latter paragraph suggest the presence of an otherness in the figure or Mr. Walton, as someone that Victor could trust in order to shape his secret mission. Which was uncovered in the following lines by means of explaining his pursuit “to seek someone who fled from me”(15).

At this moment, the first clear reference to the monster as a *daemon* appears in the novel, but Victor remains confident and keep his secret safe from the storytelling. However, and after days pass by, Mr. Walton offers, in the writing of his journal, the key to exploit Frankenstein`s quest as an event to find companionship.

"Such is my journal of what relates to this strange occurrence up to the present day...he must have been a noble creature in his better days, being even now in wreck so attractive and amiable....I have found a man who, before his spirit had been broken by misery, I should have been happy to have possessed as the brother of my heart. (16)"

In order to enrich the discussion, we should connect the current discussion with the ideas exposed in the theoretical framework. It is through Mr. Walton's speech in which this plasticity became real. However, it also resembles the conditions of an authentic event.

In that sense, beyond plasticity, the human connection between Mr. Walton and Frankenstein allows the establishment of an Auratic event between them. Mr. Walton is a witness of the decay of humanity, represented by Victor Frankenstein's tragedy. The consequence of this emotion is to find the secret hidden in Frankenstein's quest, and that event was mediated by means of earning his trust.

The logic of a dialogue is based upon the amount of trust that exists between one being and the other, and in that sense, the communicative performance delivered in the novel actually relies in the confidence that Victor Frankenstein offered to Mr. Walton in order to provide his story.

It is at this moment where the confidence between hearer and speaker starts as a manifestation of honesty by Mr. Walton, and by Frankenstein's own decision to tell his speech, as an answer of a trustworthy fellow being, a human who could believe in his word:

"I had determined once, that the memory of these evils should die with me; but you have won me to alter my determination...if you are inclined, listen to my tale. I believe that the strange incidents connected with it will afford a view of nature, which may enlarge your faculties and understanding...hear of powers and occurrences...but I do not doubt that my tale conveys in its series internal evidence of the truth of the events of which it is composed" (17)

The implications of this section suggest that, in order to build the literary imagery of the novel, the dependence of the members of the literary unit is relevant for the stage. In that sense, the tension of the communicative act allows the rising of the story, and mainly, the performance of both speakers allows the establishment of a "macro-speech" that has built the novel stage.

What it is relevant to mention is the transitional paragraph at the end of letter IV, which allows the entrance of the poetic discourse brought by Victor Frankenstein's storytelling.

It is this moment when the novel turns its focus to the past tense, then the stage changes to Frankenstein's life experience. Mr. Walton, aware of the movement, decided to take notes of

Victor's speech, writing a "manuscript" which he will read with "interest and sympathy" in the future. It is here where we can trace the dialogical implication of a third person that it is actually reading this story.

It has been neglected that there is someone out of the stage of the novel that it is actually reading the story, and she is Mr. Walton's sister, Mrs. Margaret Saville, and as a matter of fact, the readers of the novel embodied her role.

This element is a remarkable innovation that characterizes this literary text to others. The innovation of writing a story with multiple layers and speakers synthesizes the ability in the building of the novel to create a literary system that permeates the plasticity of the speakers to an extended reality framed by this plastic textual speech.

In that sense, a literary speech extends the perception of reality to a more complex entity. A novel, as a literary genre, constitutes a unit that expands the character's speech with a new meaning. Literary units are not fixed or closed. They are flexible and propose the rising of a new method in delivering literary texts.

Following this idea, the character's speech synthesizes the implications of plasticity in literary texts. Mr. Walton's speech is mediated by the extended

In order to deliver an accurate analysis of Mr. Walton's section in the novel, this research will overpass Victor Frankenstein's part. However, the next chapter of the research will analyze Frankenstein's speech in further. Continuing then with the current section, the novel moves in the time of August 19th to August 26th of 1817, when the speaker one, Mr. Walton, returns to telling the main story.

Walton, in continuation

The delivering of the continuation of letter IV allows the intromission of the comments about the story exposed by Frankenstein. In a way, the characteristic of stage returning allows the showing of the change in Mr. Walton's emotion, prompted by Frankenstein's adventure.

Even if the considerations of it are, first, as story of "horror", the perception of Victor's wildest rage of face expressions convince Mr. Walton of the true events told.

"His tale is connected...such a monster has then really existence" (151)

The importance of this sentence is that, under the context of the current research, the acceptance of a story as a true reality constitute the realization of the mythical entity in the literary imagery built all over the novel. In that sense, the logic hidden by this event relies in the acceptance of the Titan as a true presence in the novel.

In that sense, Frankenstein is quite conscience about the damage suffered by the monster's creation. His advice to Mr. Walton not to give the secrets about the creature formation. The monster is a demonical enemy, and demands from his listener peace of his curiosity.

This curiosity supports the idea that Mr. Walton was changing his discourse, understanding the complexity of Frankenstein's drama. The mentioned curiosity, by extension, constitutes the possible damage that knowledge generates in researchers and explorers, in the case of misleading the purpose of science for egocentric reasons.

Moreover, curiosity condition the transition from innocence to experience, as it was mentioned in the theoretical framework. Experience became central for the romantic writers, because it allows the rising of a new language, in connection with nature and the universe. However, knowledge also became a tool for destruction, as Frankenstein's life experience embodies.

Adding a new element for the current analysis, it is pertinent to mention one of the most symbolic parts of the novel. It is a brief paragraph, in which it is explained Frankenstein's revision of his speech, in Mr. Walton's written notes. The focus of this dialogue is to solve the veracity of the story told, an element mentioned as it follows

"Himself corrected and augmented them in many places; but principally in giving the life and spirit to the conversations he held with his enemy. Since you have preserved my narration," said he, "I would not that a mutilated one should go down to posterity" (151)

In literary terms, the latter paragraph symbolizes Victor Frankenstein's awareness of becoming eternal inside the narrative reality built in the novel. Frankenstein, the storyteller, now became writer and editor of his own discourse.

The understanding of the latter comprises the effect regardless the narrative imagery built in it. Furthermore, within literary discourse, Frankenstein's ability of creation innovates in the analysis of his own speech production. He is not anymore a narrator, he is now the true embodiment of a speaker-receiver building within a literary text.

Continuing this idea, Frankenstein himself described his imagination as *vivid*, and his intelligence was height in relation to other mates "my powers of analysis and application were intense". However, he has become just a figure "in degradation". Knowledge, in that sense, became the powerful machinery of men's fall. And that fall is represented by the love of Frankenstein's loved ones (Clerval and Elizabeth)

Mr. Walton's speech now has changed to more depressive emotions, mediated by Frankenstein's rage against his creation. The treatment towards Victor as a "Seneca" (153) permeates the sensibility of his host incarnated in Mr. Walton's speech.

"Oh! My beloved sister, the sickening failings of your heart-felt expectations are, in prospect, more terrible to me than my own death" (153)

In the remaining days of the story, the attempt of mutiny experienced by Mr. Walton in his navy affected Frankenstein's will and spirit, finishing in his death event. This is one of his final innuendos about the failed project of the Titan's destruction.

"The task of destruction was mine, but I have failed" (157)

In that particular sense, what it is experienced by Victor Frankenstein is the consolidation of his sad destiny. He continues his reflections about the afterlife of the monster instead of his own life. Those feeling "disturb me" (157). Finally, he realizes that his attempt has not been fulfilled, so he starts to lose his breath, and said his final words

"I have myself been blasted in these hopes, yet another may succeed" (157)

At this moment of the story occurs one of the symmetries in the plot building that constitute the complex imagery built in the novel. Occurs some moments after Frankenstein's death, and is the consummation of the mythical experience in the story.

The complexity of the latter event relies in the consolidation of the myth inside the literary stage. The monster's apparition in front of Mr. Walton eyes constitutes the incarnation of the mythopoetic world inside that literary text.

Moreover, the stage in which these events happened is the midnight, the time in which the monster was created (It is going to be mention in the second part of the analysis section).

“What do these sounds portend? There is a sound of a human voice, but hoarser. It comes from the cabin where the remains of Frankenstein still lie. I must arise”

This is the moment in which Mr. Walton's speech became a mixed discourse between letter and dialogue. As a consequence of the latter, the last moments of the story-telling are mostly based in the continuous intervention of Mr. Walton and the Titan. In another reading of this encounter, is what might occur if we face an alien that speaks our tongue.

The first impression might be of a shock, and then the courage to face the beast might came. But, in another artistic strategy, he starts a dialogue, a conversation with the created being. This is shown in the section following mentioned.

“Never did I behold a vision so horrible as his face...I shut my eyes involuntarily, and endeavor to recollect what were my duties with regard to this destroyer. I called him to stay” (158)

Taking into consideration the latter, the Titan's passion takes a dramatic turn, mainly mediated by the emotion of his creator's death. The monster's speech constitutes the intervention of Mr. Walton comments about his “scaring and unearthly ugliness”.

The critics towards the monster's “repentance” suggests the manipulated opinion that Mr. Walton experienced by his communion with Victor Frankenstein. The comments about the “diabolical vengeance” are answered as events pulsed by “agony and remorse”, and that Frankenstein suffered “the ten-thousandth portion of the anguish that was mine during the lingering details of its execution”.

In that sense, it is a matter of fact that the monster's behavior reacted because of his emotions, by the overflow of the revenge feeling. It is part of an energy that affected his condition.

“But I was the slave, not the master of an impulse...and now it is ended; there is my last victim” (159)

Coming back to his reasoning, Mr. Walton is moved by the monster's experience, but he recalls his friend's miseries and warnings concerning the “persuasion” abilities, and demand that the monster behave in a “hypocritical” manner. What it is impressive is the monster answer, because he decided to become a “loner”, to enjoy his happiness by himself.

“The fallen angel becomes a malignant evil. Yet even that enemy of God and man had friends and associates in his desolation: I am quite alone” (160)

The subtle reference John Milton's “Paradise Lost” supports the pursuit of a sense of justice which act in his speech as a demand. The monster demands from mankind a treatment as human and not a machine or horrible device. The Titan's raising, as it is analyzed in the current work, suggests the sensibility that was trending during the production period of the novel.

Continuing the latter, the loss of humanity experienced by the monster is also the consequence of the mischievous act performed by his creator, and by extension, is the consummation of the inner desire of raising a new men.

Supporting the latter idea, the monster describes himself as it follows. “I am an abortion”, said the monster to Mr. Walton, and by this he is implying the end of Frankenstein's ideal device, which is supported in the monster's speech.

“There he lies, white and cold in death. You hate me, but your abhorrence cannot equal that with which I regard myself, I think on the heart in which the imagination of it was conceived, and long for the moment when they will meet my eyes, when it will haunt my thoughts, no more”

At this moment, what it comes are his reflections about the crimes committed by his own hand. This act show us the plasticity that the Titan's character has, in terms of evidencing the individuality in the use of referential language, by the repetition of “I”, implying the recurrence as a discursive marker of confidence in his speech. It is pertinent to mention the importance of the

innocence/experience act in the following paragraph, which constitute one of his last reflections before he left the literary stage, and that allow the flexibility in his language

“Some years ago, when the images which this world affords first opened upon me, when I felt the cheering warmth of summer, and heard the rustling of the leaves and the chirping of the birds, and these were all to me, I should have wept to die; now it is my only consolation. Polluted by crimes, and torn by the bitterest remorse, where can I find rest but in death...my agony was superior to thine, for the bitter sting of remorse may not cease to rankle in my wounds until death shall close them forever...My spirit will sleep in peace; or if it thinks, it will not surely think thus. Farewell.” (161)

This complex imagery set reflects the very emotional thoughts and feelings that the Titan kept in his heart. By extension, it terminates the idea of an abhorred monster. Instead of that, we have found a romantic sensibility in the inner state of the monster.

The reference to a past-time beautiful nature, now forbidden by the sins he had committed, are the symptoms which connect his speech to a philosophical thinking about life and death, innocence and experience, myth and reality.

There are grey colors in his speech, and language allows the purification of the speaker in the enunciation act, by means of a pathetic hope, of his own end of life. Going in depth with these reflections, even the most horrible beasts might have feelings, emotions that surpass the expected, and dismantle the hegemonic discourse about the other not equal to me.

In that sense, the monster's final words shade the light towards a human aspect of Frankenstein's creation. He was human, shaped by a genius mind. His creator, unable see the extension of his act, creates a being that Frankenstein himself considered a “daemon”, but actually he was more human than the true humans.

Going in depth with the term “daemon”, the representation of himself as a damned son resemblances the figure of Paradise Lost's Satan character. The monster, created by the mastermind of his creator, was abandoned by his father. Mankind hate him, he was expelled from the love and care humans. He became an outcast of his unique species.

The result of the latter constitutes the raging hate towards his master, and by extension mankind. The problem of this event, as it was mentioned in the theoretical framework, was that the monster was conceived as an artistic device.

In that sense, he was an authentic being, pure from the rest of humanity. That idea liquidates the reasoning of a monster, but allows the rising of a new sensibility. The incarnation of a new body and soul became mythical, setting a new tradition in the novel's literary stage.

These considerations correspond to a critical perspective that has raised the reading of the novel. Mr. Walton, the first speaker of the novel, have a specific role, he prepared the stage and brought the events that occur in the speech act. But the meat of the story relies directly in the ability of shaping the voices of Victor Frankenstein and the Titan.

In that sense, the second part of the analysis will focus its scope in two chapters of the novel which corresponds to volume I, chapters III and IV. The chosen chapters allow the establishment of a series of events that shaped Frankenstein's inception and conception of the monster, and the consequences of such performance in the literary stage of the novel.

In a critical perspective, these chapters allow the establishment of a new set of support to the current research, going in depth with the issues established in the theoretical framework.

Chapter III

According to Victor Frankenstein, M. Waldman speech allow him to reach a more "comprehensive sense of the term", and also a "true friend". His ardor for applying the acquired knowledge take Frankenstein's life the gap of two years, and it is in these years in which he fashioned the learning of physiology, or human anatomy studies, with electricity. In that sense, he reacted as a rational man, following the principles of life in dead bodies.

The latter is supported by Frankenstein's speech, in which he mentioned a brief passage of his childhood, in which he recalls the influence of his father in order to prevent him from the stories of "supernatural horrors" (31).

It was that innocence, in terms of not being prompted for any previous influence, that he was able to collect human dead pieces of body without any sort of worried or despair. In that sense, the suggestion of living “days and nights in vaults and charnel houses” allow him to face the corrupted bodies after death has possessed them.

What it continues is the key that embodies the entire development of the novel. It was in these depths of dead bodies in which Frankenstein experienced the brilliant idea of the light as the main source of his experiment.

As he explains, the “astonishing that I alone should be reserved to discover such secret” (42), and that he was “capable of bestowing animation upon lifeless matter” reacted in him as marvelous events, totally unexpected to occur.

He continues the description of the event as the “study and desire of the wisest men since the creation of the world, was now within my grasp”. It is pertinent to considered that Frankenstein is speaking to a third person, in this case Mr. Walton, and that he advices his listener in order to not commit the same mistakes as he did in his blind pursuit of knowledge.

“How dangerous is the acquirement of knowledge, and how much happier that man is who believes his native town to be the world, than he who aspires to become greater than his nature will allow...I was encouraged to hope my present attempts would at least lead the foundations of future success. Nor could I consider the magnitude and complexity of my plan as any argument of its impracticability” (33)

The latter paragraph is the true expression of Frankenstein’s dichotomise view about life. He was caught by his later miseries, but also imprisoned by his childhood dreams. In that sense, the symbolic development of collecting dead bodies is the collection of pieces of truth, realities that were extinct and that his hidden knowledge could reanimate. He thought that he could “renew life where death had apparently devoted the body to corruption (33).

Continuing this idea, the perception of time generates a tension inside the novel. This is mostly supported by means of the body degeneration that Frankenstein’s experienced. By

extension, time is the silent actor of the novel, because it traps characters to a limited life experience.

In those terms, the liquidated body is the representation of a time as a clockwork murderer. The latter comprises times as a bodily experience, which finally ends in the culmination of spirit and soul of the speaker.

Even more than that, the life extinction suffered by Victor resembles the pathetic hope that human beings have in front of an illness. That reasoning justifies Frankenstein's pursuit for an answer to stop death, and to open a new path to eternal life.

In critical terms, the scientific method became a ritual, a cannibal collection of lost bodies that the wizard should collect in order to rendering tribute to the science-god. This is represented by means of "lost my soul", at the moment when he was chasing the pieces of dead flesh and joints of the already dead.

"I collected bones from charnel houses...in a solitary chamber, or rather cell at the top of the house" (34).

The symbolism of the recollection, as the sum of parts for creating a whole, suggests a new idealism that Frankenstein was pursuing, and this was the embodiment of a being that was "plural", not a singular entity, but a collection of parts in order to shape an entire unit.

In that sense, the monster embodies the critical perspective of the current work. The collection of artistic devices, as part of our unconscious memories, reflected the symbolism beneath Frankenstein's search.

The latter is not only the sum of plural voices for creating one individual, but it is the consummation of the auratic event that was experienced by means of his genius. That moment was the creation of the monster, which by extension became the trace of an individual affair in science knowledge.

It was a work under pressure of anxiety which determines the nervous breakdown in the aftermath of the creation process. Even though, it is pertinent to mention another contradiction in

Frankenstein's discourse, mediated by the definition of an "unlawful knowledge" the one that is produced "not befitting the human mind".

Again, he contradicts himself by establishing that the monster's creation was a "hold of my imagination" and was against his father's will. At this moment, it is crystal clear that Frankenstein's speech was not only representing the "spirit of the age", but that he was symmetrically designing the monster with events that both experienced at different stages of their lives.

One of these symmetries occur at the moment of shaping the monster during the lapse of one year. Frankenstein's sight was in darkness, blind by the pursuit of knowledge, up to the point in which his "eyes were insensible to the charms of nature...and those feelings made me forget those friends who were so many miles absent".

The isolation from the community, in terms of apart himself from his beloved people, was the final key for entering into the demonic forces of creation. The implication of the latter motivates the idea that the monster, instead of being a science apparatus, was meant as an artistic device.

Going on with this subject, only by means of individuality an artistic work could reach its entire perception. This element implies the end of the communal affair of knowledge creation, allowing the rising of authorship in artistic works.

Extending this idea, the creation of artistic devices became an individual affair that satisfies the genius of the creator. The work of art, in this case the monster, is the true consummation of the ritual forces that the daemon moves.

Let us imagine the conditions in which Victor Frankenstein was living during the creation process of the monster. Alone in his room, with wormed body parts as friends, and in a state of anxiety out of what should be considered as reasonable, he spend every night in order to shape his creation.

The effect of this in his health was horrible, because he felt “oppressed” and a “slave” to his creation in which he devoted most of his time. He was amused by the monster’s creation, but at the same time, he was destroying his own life.

Frankenstein also might have felt the thrill of emancipating himself from socially accepted conventions. It is the moment of critical transformation in which creative work is induced by a daemon, an inner force that propitiates the flow of human capabilities.

In that sense, Frankenstein’s illness was the consequence of a disease that accompanied his life until his last breath. He was conscious of the effect that his creation could articulate against first, his own life, and after the entire world.

But a young mind, unprepared to tackle the reveries of knowledge, and mentally incapable of discerning whether his acts were good or evil, delivered the creation just because he was blind by the thirst of knowledge.

In that sense, the unveiling of his eyes was his damnation. The pursuit of knowledge, as the traditional canon of western literature suggests, became his original sin. It is inevitable to collect the bodies of those blind and dead speakers and transformed their discourse into Frankenstein’s one.

The consequence of the latter, in the literary stage of the novel, confirms that Frankenstein’s idea of creating a “perfect being” was indeed demoniacal, and the impact of the latter is clearly manifested in the expressions of “daemon”, “diabolic wretched” and “monster”. But these are just surfaces structures, names for a more terrible truth.

Frankenstein’s genius device was the embodiment of the tensions of the period, and by consequence, the realization of a being that was not the equal of Victor Frankenstein but someone else. A being that was not European, protestant, rational, and white, in the understanding of these characteristics as the receptacle of a tradition.

The monster was “the other”, the immigrant, the lower class butler, the catholic, the Muslim, and the discriminated human beings. In times were political correctness was not a trend, the novel presents itself a device that was the sum of these voices in one.

As a consequence of the latter, the monster's creation was damned by the terrible circumstances that surrounded its creation. The effect in Frankenstein's discourse, influenced by the anxiety of his damnation, consumes the spirit of the character.

A master who was out of a reasonable answer, who could only answer in the way he reacted, because he was unprepared for being a mother or to establish a filial bondage with the creature. The monster's creation was a rational device, not shape with love and tenderness of couple, but in a frozen room at Ingolstadt University.

The latter is supported by means of Frankenstein's illness, which himself experiences as a devastating experience

"I pursued nature to her hiding places...it was indeed but a passing trance, that only made feel renewed acuteness so soon as my unnatural spirit ceasing to operate. The dissecting room and the slaughter house furnished many of my materials: and often did my human nature turn with loathing from my occupation." (34)

As an extension of the latter paragraph, the embodiment of an ideal into reality was affected by the mere fact that the practice of an ideal is always plastic; there is not one possible behavior of a thought or idea. The multiverse of options in a literary stage conflicts the realizations of ideas just how they were thought. It was only in isolation where Frankenstein could breed and create his device, but this isolation was also the end of his scientific work.

Chapter IV

The previously mentioned "anxiety" shaped Frankenstein's attitude towards his creation. This is manifested in the definition of the monster's raising as a "catastrophe". Again in this section it is possible to find the white ideology beneath Frankenstein's discourse, mainly mediated by means of selecting his creation's parts as "beautiful", but after that he described those elements as "horrid".

The cruelest thoughts of his “accident of birth” affected Frankenstein’s health, wasting two years of his youth in order to create this “devil” device. In a sense, he took his life and health in order to give life to the “titan”.

At this moment, he unveils his eyes, and discovers that his creation was the “dream vanished” (36). The dejection act was consumed, he rushed out of the literary stage in order to find peace of mind, but it is at this moment in which the unconscious subtles the consequence of his terrible act.

The consolidation of his demonical decision was mediated not by logical thoughts, but through dreams, or in this case, a nightmare.

The referential act moved Frankenstein’s fears in order to incept the idea of hating the wretch, describing it as a “demoniacal corpse to which I had so miserably given life...I had gazed on him while unfinished; he was ugly then; but when those muscles and joints were rendered capable of motion, it became a thing such as even Dante could not have conceived” (36). The consolidation of a “hell on earth”, as it was described by Victor, twisted his perception of reality, and moves his faith in science towards the church of Ingolstadt.

The futile mentioning of this institution is a milestone, in symbolic terms, because it constitutes the movement from the isolated room of his laboratory to the site in which religion rises as the embodiment of repentance and atonement. His inner emotional state of “horror and misfortune” did persuade him in order to return to his office, in order to find his creation “alive” (38).

He was expecting a specter to appear, and like children, he “stepped fearfully” the room in which the monster was left. Here it comes the symmetric point that unites Frankenstein’s speech with the monster’s speech. At the moment Frankenstein rushed out of the room, and abandoned his creation, the monster fled from his master’s apartment, and began his winding road as a feral child. Frankenstein described this moment as it follows:

“I could hardly believe that so great a good-fortune could have befallen me; but when I became assured that my enemy had indeed fled, I clapped my hands for joy, and ran down to Clerval.”

Again, it is pertinent to mention that the emotional response that affected Frankenstein was of an extreme anxiety. That explains his “unusual spirits” in order to shape his reaction with the monster. As a consequence of the latter, his reaction of covering his sight clearly manifest the symbolic means of unveiling the bitter truth. It is suggested that Frankenstein will never forget the horrid creature that he developed, and this is clearly explained in the following utterance

“The form of the monster on whom I had bestowed existence was forever before my eyes, and I raved incessantly concerning him” (39)

It might be pertinent to consider that his “fatal passion” rises a question about the pursuing of knowledge and its consequences in a human beings. Is knowledge a demonic entity? Certainly not, but there is a flavor of astonishment and amusement towards sciences that clearly has sicken Victor Frankenstein’s speech.

This sickening is mostly mediated by means of the demonic imagery that Frankenstein gathers in his speech. The ghost of the machine that inhabits the novel is precisely the daemon, the magic being.

Furthermore, the demon embodies the mythical entity that transforms reality in the novel. The literary stage condemns knowledge to a demonic status because knowledge punishes its discoverers. In depth, sciences destroyed the progressive dream inside modernity, by means of the rising of nature against men.

The relevance of the latter suggests that the demonic forces of creation are mediated by dividing sciences from the community, liquidating the filial relation by means of corrupting the producer of knowledge.

In that sense, it is in the isolated room of loneliness where the individual collect the dead pieces of someone else knowledge, and build his own perspective, in terms of research and ideology, in order to deliver and produce knowledge, and by extension, the embodiment of such theories incarnated in one device (the monster).

Taking into consideration the latter, we should now move towards the last section of the analysis, which is the monster’s speech. The overlapping event that unites both speeches occur in

Volume II, chapter II to IX. It is in these chapters where it is possible to find the meat of the titan's discourse, allowing the rising of his speech as a movement from the rigid mythical structure to a more plastic unit that is present in the novel.

Part III

The monster's speech, or the mythical symbolism of plasticity.

The current research has focused its attention in solving, first, the conflict that presents us Mr. Walton's speech in the novel, mainly prompting the discussion towards a understanding of his speech as the literary stage that provides us context, in order to give a chronological order to the events narrated in the novel.

Second, the discussion focuses its attention towards Victor Frankenstein's speech, which works as the representation of the demonic forces of creation, delivering the monster's speech as the last element of the current analysis.

Before going to the cards, it is necessary to mention the decision of focusing in several parts of the monster's speech. First, there are symmetries between the monster's speech and Frankenstein's speech that provide a connection, not only in literary terms, but in symbolic terms, representing the union between creation and creator.

Second, the process of innocence/experience that is part of the "spirit of the age" is highlighted in the current section, because it provides a philosophical discussion about the origin of the monster, and its following understanding of his damned destiny.

Finally, the transition path from being a creature to a monster is of relevance, in order to signalize the turn of the mythical imagery to a plastic development of mythical beings in modern poetics.

The presence of the monster's speech, from now on "Titan", is prompted by Victor Frankenstein's discourse during his holidays at the mountains of Montanvert, in the French-Swiss border.

It is in this stage in which the encounter between Master and creation comes to life in the novel. Amazingly, this is one of the most exquisite pieces of symbolic language that appear in text. The demand of “wandering spirits”, in order to take him away from the realm of life, is suddenly moved by the presence of the so-called “enemy”.

“Devil! Do you dare approach me...Begone, vile insect...oh, that I could, with the extinction of your miserable existence, restore those victims whom you have so diabolically murdered...abhorred monster! Wretched devil!” (67)

The uses of this mean words towards the monster are the surface element for a deeper interpretation of the latter. The embodiment of evil, as it is shown in the monster’s existence, and not in Frankenstein’s devil act.

This is relevant, because there is a prompted emotion in the speech act of Victor Frankenstein that is calling our attention towards a hateful sensibility against the monster. But we should be very conscious that Frankenstein is even guiltier of the demonic creature existence, and the monster is conscious of that act.

“All men hate the wretched; how then I must be hated, who am miserable beyond all living things! Yet you, my creator, detest and spurn me, thy creature to whom thou art bound by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of us.” (68)

It will not be pertinent to confused or mislead the reading of the novel basing our analysis in the hero/nemesis dichotomy, because it does not embodied the complexity of the current elements developed in the novel.

That complexity is related to the idea that both, Frankenstein and the monster embodied similar roles with similar characteristics.

In that sense, the dialogic structure of their discussion is a dramatic play, in which both, knowing their dependence of creator and creation, will not attempt to destroy each other. They are mutually dependent in the literary stage of the novel.

Without the monster, the performance between listener and speaker could be seriously broken. It is this factor that helps to build the complexity of these characters, in their speeches exists the chance of moving the subject discussed to a new interpretation of it.

The monster, aware of his powers, demand from his creator a simple but complex act. To listen to his story, and put attention to his words. The seductive forces of language are present in his discourse, persuading Frankenstein to answer his demand, insisting several times.

He demand that his speech is truth, evidencing his wandering spirit. He demand from his creator the explanation why people abhor him. Frankenstein, conscious that he was the creator and the “author” of the creature, was obliged to go to the monster’s hut, moved by curiosity and by the “duties as a creator towards his creature”. Frankenstein consented to listen to the monster’s tale, by accepting the Titan’s proposal

“I demand this from you. Hear my tales; it is long and strange... on you it rests, whether I quit forever the neighborhood of man, and lead a harmless life, or become the scourge of your fellow creatures, and the author of your own speedy ruin” (69)

The latter suggests the dichotomy choices that Frankenstein had, in relation to the beast’s declamation. The elements present in the current section suggests the establishment of dialogic event, which is mostly based upon dramatic elements of speaker and listener performance. In the following section of analysis, the idea of a monologue by the Titan is of relevance, mostly because that understanding gathered.

The symmetry of light and darkness

In the understanding of the novel, we should take into consideration the meaningful presence of certain symmetries with a human life that configures the birth event of the Titan. A Titan that experienced a “multiplicity of sensations” during his original era. The light was for the Titan was “oppressing his eyes”, and leave beside his dormant state, he started to feel hungry. It is at this point where we can find the first trace of a sensibility that was not part of a mythical entity.

“I was poor, helpless, miserable wretch; I knew, and could distinguish, nothing; but, feeling pain invade me on all sides, I sat down and wept” (70)

The implication of the latter suggests the wounded sensation after the operation that his birth brought, that he felt miserable even at his very first moments of life. Light, the first object of admiration for the Titan, became not only in the representation of the sunlight, but in the condition of fire.

The selection of these two elements, sunlight or natural light, and the light produced by fire, set a constant presence in the Titan speech. The latter is mostly mediated by his perception of fire as the demonic imagery that his own creation shaped.

Born by a “spark of life”, his own existence is suggested by the presence of that element. It is important to recall that it is through fire where the demonic ritual is shaped, and that fire also cleans people's souls in the Christian tradition.

The fire produced in the Titan a “cry of pain” (71), because he could not understand how something that generates pain also produces warmth. He compares his experience with fire like the ones experienced by shepherds in “Paradise Lost”, in the Pandemonium, or the lake of fire in which they were buried. It produces dichotomized sensations at the same time.

The contemplation of the filial bonding that the Titan observed during his roaming at the De Lacey family is one of the tales that the monster narrates to Frankenstein, and that moved his sensibility in more depths emotions.

The reflections about “my human neighbors” are central for the Titan's language development. The interpretation of affection and kindness was contradicted by means of their poverty, which allowed him to understand the in and out of human experience.

The learning process was by degrees, learning from the translation of the earth and its relation with the moon, the language they speak (French), and it was through these filial conditions that the Titan approached his condition as a being.

The latter is quite relevant, because, and as it was mentioned before, the perception of the monster as a “feral child” might be mistaken. The monster, having the ability of understanding

and producing the human language, tested the principle of acquiring language as a natural element.

This is supported by the following utterance produced by the monster

“I ought not to make the attempt [of meeting De Lacey family] until I had first become master of their language” (78)

After this event, which supports the idea that he was willing to meet his neighbors, comes the thrilling reflection of accepting his monstrous condition.

The acceptance of this element corresponded to a turn from the mythical philosophy, mainly mediated by a sense of “superiority” that Titans and Human-Gods remained in the ancient tradition. For the modern sensibility, Titans had emotions, and the monster was able to reach those sensations by means of self-reflection.

The Titan, in one of the most beautiful set of reflections, realizes about his monstrosity, reflects in his condition, comparing his body and form with the body of the immigrants.

This event suggests the artistic mastery of establishing low rank individuals, who were not part of the canon, as subjects of admiration by a third entity. However, this entity is an alien being, not even considered as an equal in the after events of the novel.

“I had admired the perfect form of my cottagers...I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely knew the fatal effects of this miserable deformity...I looked upon them as superior beings, who would be the arbiters of my future destiny...I should first win their favour, and afterwards, their love” (79)

Learning language was the monster’s self-recognition that shall be considered as a process in which the Titan became the “ghost of the machine”, hiding in the reveries of the house, moving the conditions of his neighbors by bringing them wood and food for their daily income.

His hope of being considered as an equal by De Lacey household allow him to feel pleasure and joy of living, and element that was put into question when he learned the ideology and events of human history, again mediated by a third person, Felix’s Arabian Lover.

It might be significant, by means of symbolism, that the Titan took an emotional perspective about human history, mainly mediated by Safie readings of *Les Ruines, ou meditations sur les revolutions des Empires* (1791), a historical document that implied the full understanding of the rising and destruction of the human species. This element is relevant, taking into consideration the following description of the Titan's reaction towards that lectures.

“Through this work, I obtained a cursory knowledge of history, and a view of the several empires at present existing in the world; it gave me an insight into the manners, governments, and religions of the different nations of the earth...I heard of the discovery of the American hemisphere and wept with Safie over the hapless fate of its original inhabitants...for a long time I could not conceive how one man could go forth to murder his fellow, or even why there were laws and governments; but when I heard details of vice and bloodshed, my wonder ceased, and I turned away with disgust and loathing” (83)

In that sense, the implications of the latter paragraphs affected the Titan's mind, mostly because he started to wonder about his belonging, his own history and past. “Was I then a monster”, he recognizes his alien condition in front the rest of men.

He was the ultimate outcast, and his ideology was affected by this event. His sorrow and sadness increased as his reasoning of being an exiled from the human realms growth. The pain was increasing, and his desire of of death was anguish to his spirit. “I am a miserable, unhappy wretch”

The importance of the paragraph previously mentioned is the understanding of the monster about the good and evil of the human condition, and by extension, the wonderings about his own condition as being. His thoughts about the natural bonding of human relations is the key for wondering about who he was. Was he human? Was he a wretched creature?

“What was I? The question again recurred, to be answered only with groan (84)

The main source for continuing those questions was mediated by knowledge, as the Titan itself establish as his main source of comprehending his reality. The main lecture was the readings

of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Johann Wolfgang van Goethe's *The sorrows of young Werther*. These were its sources for questioning his existence that he was unable to answer.

"I read of men concerned in public affairs governing or massacring their species...the patriarchal lives of my protectors...made me a soldier, burning for glory and slaughter, I should have been imbued with different sensations" (90)

The reading of these books, as Frankenstein also experienced in his readings about natural philosophy, was the source of his damnation.

Knowledge, in terms of allowing the necessary questions of his existence, were capable of building in his mind the evil seed that marked his final destiny. The theories found in the readings of these texts were shaping his understanding about the evil that men do, is mainly mediated by the father - son bonding relation.

The latter justifies his anger towards Victor Frankenstein's figure. Its "accursed origin" might be influenced by his own father, the master and creator of his life.

The titan demanded the answering for its questions to his "cursed creator". The miseries of the son were now acknowledge by his father, but the Titan was powerful, and he believed in his "filthy" shape as part of his creator's resemblance.

"I was alone, and my heart cursed him" (92)

The symbolic cursing of his creator functions, in the literary stage, as the force that moved the Titan's will in the future slaughter of Frankenstein's domestic circle. However, it is the dejection that he experiences with De Lacey immigrant family that infused the rage against mankind.

"Cursed, cursed creator. Why did I live? Why, in that instant, did I not extinguish the spark of existence which you had so wantonly bestowed? (95)

The consummation of his anger was induced, in another masterly strategy, by a child that was crossing the forest in which the Titan was living. And this child was of the bonding of Victor

Frankenstein. Then, the reaction of the creature was of the most horrid events narrated in English Literature

“Frankenstein! You belong then to my enemy- to him towards whom I have sworn eternal revenge; you shall be my first victim...I grasped his throat to silence him, and in a moment, he lay dead at my feet. I gazed on my victim, and my heart swelled with exultation and hellish triumph...I too can create desolation; my enemy is not impregnable...can you wonder that such thoughts transported me with rage”. (100)

The literary stage of the novel provide us the inner emotion of a Titan in rivalry with his master, father, and guilty of the most terrible destiny that a human being shall challenge. Being an outcast because of his body features and by his condition as the hateful other.

This final literary stage is mediated by means of consolidating the monster's sins. The created being finally became human, committing the murdering act towards a child. His enemy's loved one, and that started the slaughter experienced by Victor Frankenstein till the end of that specific literary stage.

In that sense, the mythical creature is now an equal being, equal to mortals in their morality and ethics, but different in his embodiment and world vision. An outcast from the community, who will live condemned as a wanderer, paying a higher prize for its acts.

In that sense, the monster itself became the carrier of the human condition of destruction, ending Frankenstein's idea of helping mankind in order to heal their illnesses by means of scientific knowledge.

In depth, the project that the monster's creation embodied finally result, as it was explained in previous lines, in an “abortion”, a being horrible by sight and damned by spirit. His creator, who also destroys his dreams and his domestic loved ones, is also the responsible of the acts developed in the literary stage. As two sides of the coin behave, master and creator were both the delivered and the sufferer from a pain that was unnatural.

Even if they loved by passion the natural science, they were incapable to enjoy the beauties of life, because they were doom by their acts. In that sense, the literary stage provided by the novel

contemplates, with horror, the end of dream. The end of the rationalized building of the western society, and by extension, the understanding that progress did not only implied knowledge or testing theories by essay-error methodology.

The urgent demand provided by the novel is the consolidation of a new humanity, in terms building human relations through love bonding, affection and togetherness. Assuming that the beginning of the 19th century was not a time of political correctness, it is precisely that element that frames the raw events masterly told in the novel.

Going even further, in the current discussion about plasticity and the mythical imagery built in the novel, the absolute world is put into end. The daemon and the creator embodied a hateful relationship. The latter is supported by daring nature and its procedures, developing the rising of an artificial being.

However, this artificial being is authentic, a true artistic device that embodies the tensions of the period. In depth, the monster is the unique product of science endeavor, incarnating the liquidation of modernity towards reproducibility.

In that sense, Mr. Walton's speech moves the plasticity towards a new form of discourse, inside the literary stage of the novel. The latter suggests a renovation of the mythical imagery, by means of a modern sensibility exposed by means of technology.

Technological devices were meant to incorporate new discursive tools, like letters and journals. These were evidence of a new plastic unit in the novel. Technology, in that sense, allows the movement of literary expressions that gathered poetry, prose, and technological advances in the novel to a new form.

The latter constitutes an interpretation of a reality that was plastic; a complex embroidery of textualities and discourses that opened the path to a new mythopoetic tradition. Titans were now monsters, vampires and super humans. All these characters enrolled in a new tradition that mixes symbolic language with technological reproducibility.

However, "Frankenstein" also establishes a critic towards the end of filial bonding, by means of technological alienation. The monster and Victor Frankenstein were transformed in isolated

beings, apart from community. The latter was meant as their destruction, alone in darkness. Even if they were raised under the light of science and life, their destiny was doomed because of their acts.

In that sense, knowledge is a poisoned seed that pollutes human beings, transforming their purity in a corrupted meat of blood and soul. Sciences and religion, as ritualized institutions of power, liquidates human innocence, leading the path to rage, anger, and hate.

The current research believes that “Frankenstein” embodies a true plastic literary discourse, not only by means of technological advances inside the textual entity. It is plastic because expands the mythical imagery towards a new set of interpretations about alienation and reproducibility of art works. By extension, the systematization of knowledge, like a grinder machine, corrupts the true and natural bonding with nature.

In that sense, the monster’s questioning about his own creation is also an individual affair. Since the very moment we are raised in communitarian institutions, we are losing our own authenticity. In that sense, the reproduction of knowledge and its pursuit guide us to a final set of comments.

First, through the reading and analysis of the novel, the current research seriously question the implications of art as an individual affair. In that sense, symbolic language takes the turn of delivering a possibility of reception in the community, but a true, singular perception of the art work.

Continuing this idea, the mythical imagery that belongs to ancient cultures and communities is transformed in a new materiality. This materiality is the novel, by means of its plasticity of textual discourses that expanded the world vision.

The latter also implies the opening for new voices and enrollments in the novels, by means of overlapping different discursive tools in characters. These characters are no longer flat, but they are plastic units of meaning.

Finally, the novel’s discourse of a horror or ghost story should be put into question. The current work believes that “Frankenstein” is a novel in which a series of genres are found. These are the Epistolary novel, Biographical prose, a Journal, a Life-Book, a play, and so on.

The plasticity of the textual discourse found in the novel moves the subject of study to a new set of possible analysis, which were developed in the current work. It should be pertinent to consider the present research as the beginning of an in depth analysis of Mary Shelley's work, and by extension, English Romanticism literary texts.

Conclusion

Under the context of the seminar "Romanticism in the English language literature", this research focus its efforts in order to provide a discussion that solves the aspect of Plasticity in the mythical imagery built in Mary Shelley's "Frankenstein".

In this case, the work was a challenging event, mainly because its attempt was to establish a new understanding of the elements found in the novel. The critical proposal, based upon the understanding of the monster as an interpretation of the mythical imagery, was supported by means of translating the Promethean Myth in a new textual entity, which was the conception, creation and performance of the monster, and its effect in Victor Frankenstein's life.

Going in depth, the creation act was establish as an individual affair. In that sense, the critical proposal considers the monster as a technological device, a work of art that embodied the tensions of the literary stage.

Furthermore, the influence of a dialogic structure, by means of a plural voice within the literary unit, expands the sense that a textual unit produce. Shading a light towards a discussion of the subject, the rising of the monster as a fragment with a whole meaning is central. This is mediated by means of theoretical support for the current research.

The monster, by means of a demonic ritual, doomed its creator and his own life experience. In that sense, the mythopoetic embodiment of the literary stage became a true event. The latter justify the presence of a series of discursive units that support the plasticity inside the literary text.

Plasticity, in that sense, transforms the close units of the Epic tradition, and renovates it in the novel, adding the presence of technological tools like letters, journals and biographic discourses that entail the novel towards a new textuality.

This textuality embodies the experiences of an analogical reality in a complex embroidery of symbolic language. This language reacts as the consolidation of the tensions of the period, liquidating the idea of progression in sciences, hinting the discussion towards the value and perception of art works.

In that sense, the current discussion of the novel moves the subject of study towards a new realm of discussion. This is the questioning about the creation of art works under the productivity of modern times. The reception of the monster, as an alien of the literary stage, was central for the current work.

The latter supports the core of the objectives proposed by Victor Frankenstein in the reasoning about the inception and creation of the monster. The initial goodwill became the damnation of his destiny, destroying his filial bonding by means of abandoning his creation.

The latter was also the articulation of a new sensibility towards art works, or technological devices. These were situated as individual affairs that obtain a singular perception within the experience of one particular speaker.

Furthermore, the rising of an individual's speech inside the novel constitutes a double face event. At one hand, it is possible to find the plasticity in the character's speech, as the main source of discourse expansion. On the other, the rising of an individual perception of art work as an auratic event, establishing the uniqueness of the character's perception of their encounter with the monster.

The previous element suggests the establishment of an authentic original being, who was pure from the human heir, by means of knowledge. It was in his learning process in which the monster finally transforms his life into a doomed act. That element corresponds to a symmetry with Victor Frankenstein's life.

Continuing the previous idea, both character's, the monster and Victor Frankenstein, were encircled by the speech of Mr. Walton. It was this particular character who provided the contextual background of the novel, and the main source for the literary stage built in the novel.

As it was explained in the theoretical framework, the current research based its analysis detaching the analysis from any historical or biographical source of the author. The latter implies

the approximation to the subject of study in an organic mood, consciously analyzing the novel without any kind of external bias.

It was the latter element which permits the analysis of the novel in a free manner, supporting this decision in believing that the novel is a plastic unit, with multiple symbolic meaning. That constitute the first element that supports the current research.

In a second event, the need for establishing the rising of an individual perception of art works allow the understanding of the monster's existence as an auratic act. This element consummates the communal perception and creation of literary texts, allowing the move towards a new sensibility inside the novel.

This sensibility reacts as a consequence of the liquidation performance of the monster towards his demonic creator, moving the monster to his final destiny of isolation and loneliness. This is the final act that permeates the plasticity of the novel, consummating the mythical imagery described in the literary stage of the novel.

A new mythopoetic tradition rises at the end of "Frankenstein". His unknown destiny opens the mythical field with a symbolic unit. This is the beginning of a modern myth, a genre that expands the notion of the Epic, adapting it to trending topics, and moving the subject of study towards a new perception of it.

Taking into consideration the latter, Mary Shelley's "Frankenstein" embraces one of the heights of English Romanticism, not only because it has expanded those studies. This particular novel constitute a milestone, as a literary renovation of the Epic, and allowing a series of interpretations not only as an art work but as a modern archetype of science as a religion.

In that sense, the current research believes that this work is just a beginning of future investigations about this particular subject. The plasticity of mythical imagery in the novel could transform literary studies, shading a light towards the becoming process of singularity in our species.

This is supported by the current discussion about the perception and reception of technological devices, which actually confirms the rising of authenticity in the perception of art works.

As a final comment of this current work, this research strongly believes that Mary Shelley's "Frankenstein" is a plastic novel, which should be reinterpreted under the trends of technological advances. Wildest dreams are encircled in the use and abuse of technological devices. In that sense, shall we listen to the prophet's word, in this case Victor Frankenstein's advice of pacing our curiosity? Are we actually prepared, as human beings, for accepting an alien species?

The latter question is actually a current trend in Europe and in our world, nowadays. It is necessary to orientate the discussion of the novel under the light of actual events of our milieu. In order to understand and accept the other, this other being a human being just like us, should us listen to this tale and comprehend its value as an authentic spotlight against the hate and horror between civilizations?

Unfortunately, it seems that there is not much time to worry about the latter. We would better say that the actual discussion of the current work opens a field for a seed in English Literature studies. The analysis of the Epic as a plastic speech act in the novel transforms "Frankenstein" in a complex literary unit, feeding the symbolic language of poetry in a new embodiment, which is the translation of reality in poetics.

References

Bakhtin, M. M, and Michael Holquist. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print. From the essay *Epic and Novel*, PP 3 to 40.

Brooks, Peter. *What is a monster? (according to Frankenstein)* Retrieved from Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print. PP 373 to 382.

Benjamin, Walter et al. *The Work Of Art In The Age Of Its Technological Reproducibility, And Other Writings On Media*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 2008. Print. From essay one, *The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility*. PP 19 to 56.

Dougherty, Carol. *Prometheus*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print. From *The Romantic Prometheus*, PP 91 to 115.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print. From the third essay *Archetypal Criticism: Theory of Myths*, PP 131 to 239

Lipking, Lawrence. *Frankenstein, the true story; or, Rousseau Judges Jean-Jacques*. Retrieved from Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print. PP 406 to 415

Goodall, Jane. *Romantic Electricism*. Retrieved from Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print. PP 490 to 505.

Mellor, Anne K. *The Modern Prometheus*. From Bloom, Harold. *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein*. New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2007. Print. PP 78 to 85.

Paz, Octavio. *Children of the Mire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974. Print. Quotations from the essay *Analogy and Irony*. PP 58 to 75

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976. Print. From the essays *Language as discourse, Speaking and Writing, Metaphor and Symbol and Explanation and Understanding*. PP 1 to 85

Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2012. Print. PP 7, 8, 9, 10,12,14,15,16,17,31,33,34,36,39,67,68,69,70,71,78,79,85,84,90,92. 100,151,157,158, and 159 from *The text of Frankenstein*.