

International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



No Romantic Prometheus: Marry Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Rejection of Romanticism

[PP: 50-59]

Samira Sasani

Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz University, Iran

Hamid Reza Pilevar

Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz University, Iran

ABSTRACT

The tool for Mary Shelley to criticize and satirize Romanticism is her famous character, Victor Frankenstein, or as the subtitle of the novel suggests: *The Modern Prometheus*. In Romantic beliefs, Prometheus was the symbol of limitless ability and freedom to whom many Romantic Poets pay tribute. In contrast, in Mary Shelley's opinion, this 'metaphysical revolt' cannot go unpunished. The aim of this paper is to examine, through a Foucauldian reading, the mythic character of Prometheus in Romantic era, and the differences existing between Marry Shelley's presentations of the modern version of the character and the Romantic version, and to show how Mary Shelley, belonging to other discourses rather than the dominant one, opposes the Romantic-related ideas. As Foucault believes there exist other discourses along with the dominant one all of which are in a constant struggle over power in a hierarchy. Mary Shelley follows some marginalized discourses, and her opposition to Romantic ideals stems from her relationship with other major Romantic Poets, and also from getting influence from some scientific experimentations of her day. She witnesses the harshness in her relationships with Romantic Poets, and their doomed aspirations, which agonizingly affect her life.

Keywords: Foucault, Discourse, Romanticism, Prometheus, Metaphysical Revolt, Romantic Poets, Scientific Experimentation, Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein*.

ARTICLE INFO | The paper received on: **12/07/2016** Reviewed on: **29/07/2016** Accepted after revisions on: **08/09/2016**

Suggested citation:

Sasani, S. & Pilevar, H. (2016). No Romantic Prometheus: Marry Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Rejection of Romanticism. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(3), 50-59. Retrieved from www.eltjournal.org

1. Introduction

Frankenstein is surely a canonical novel in English Literature because of a variety of methods employed to study it. The novel "is a unique blending of Gothic, fabulist, allegorical, and philosophical materials" (Oates, 2007, p.29). Not only is it an innovative novel which gives impetus to later Gothic novels, but also "it [has] the dominant and recurrent image and accounts

for much of the latent power the novel possesses" (Bloom, 2007, p.2). Byron once said of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*: "Methinks it is a wonderful work for a girl of nineteen,—not nineteen, indeed, at that time" (qtd in Badalamenti, 2006, p.425).

The idea of authoring *Frankenstein* was inspired by Romantic writers around Mary Shelley; therefore, she was romantic-loaded with their aspirations. The novel has

an ironic subtitle, *Modern Prometheus*, which is of utmost significance. But the purpose here is to show how Mary Shelley opposes the associated qualities with the character of Prometheus, and how she even doubts the propriety of these Romantic ideas stemming from a different discourse rather than the Romantic one.

Despite living among the Romantics, Mary Shelley does not show any affiliation with freedom and limitless ability of human beings, as it is vividly evident in her famous novel *Frankenstein*. In the novel, as it will be discussed later, she utilizes her character of monster to decry the romantic-related ideas of human beings' limitless capabilities. Although she is not the sole person who dislikes the notion of the utter freedom on the part of the creator as the god, she powerfully arranges an antithesis to those sets of beliefs. Additionally, a lot of women authors "responded negatively, very negatively" (Mellor, 2009, p.80) to these romantic ideologies.

2. Methodology

Although Mary Shelley was born in Romantic Era and she is anthologized in many books on history of literature as an author who has been affected by Romantic ideologies, she shows strong oppositions to these ideologies. The method used in this paper is to find some marginalized ideologies and voices which are mostly in opposition to the dominant one. The reasons brought to prove the claims in this paper are not very often anthologized in many books, considering the fact that they did exist along with the dominant ideologies. Therefore, all these reasons are brought to shed light on the fact that not only does not Mary Shelley follow the Romantic ideologies, but also she opposes to such ideas and writes a novel in which the falsity of Romantic ideas and aspirations has been delineated. Hence, we

cannot say there is a spirit of an age in every era, and put all the authors under this heading just because they were born in that era. Mary Shelley is a good example of an author who decries the normative discourse in her own time.

This research employs Foucault's ideas to analyze Shelley's status in the period in which Romanticism is a dominant discourse. Foucault believes that all the social relations are constructed upon the struggle over power. Mills believes that Foucault's model of power is "bottom-up model of power, that is his focus on the way power relations permeate all relations within a society" (Mills, 2003, p.34). Therefore, each individual, belonging to one specific discourse, exists in the power structure, and he is able to make alterations to this hierarchy; thus as Foucault says power circulates in all directions. This type of approach toward history and society "allows an analysis which focuses on individuals as active subjects, as agents rather than passive dupes" (ibid).

Discourse in Foucault's opinion governs and controls the production of knowledge within its domain. In Foucault's view physical objects exist out of our will, independent from the discourses, but how we apprehend and interpret these phenomena is within a discursive structure.

The fact that every object is constituted as an object of discourse has nothing to do with whether there is a world external to thought . . . An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, in the sense that it occurs here and now, independently of my will. But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of 'natural phenomena' or expressions of 'the wrath of God' depends on the structuring of a discursive field. What is denied is not that such objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute



themselves as objects outside any discursive condition of emergence. (qtd in Mills, 2003, p.56)

Therefore, when Foucault talks about discourse, he is focusing on the constraints and restrictions. That is, one can utter infinite number of utterances, but they are all produced within finite and narrowly confined limitations of the discourse in which one is uttering.

Foucault's main objective as a historian is to discover the marginalized voices in the history, and "to re-do the things said by traditional records of history so that the 'interior secret' and the other history that runs beneath those records and is more fundamental would be uncovered" (Foucault, 1972, p.22). To identify the "interior secret" and the "initiating subjectivity" of a historical era, he attempts to "discover the law operating behind" (Foucault, 1972, p.50) the dominant discourse of the era that "is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence" (ibid, p.106).

The notion of power is of utmost importance in Foucault's ideas. He believes that "power circulates in all directions" (Tyson, 2006, p.284). It is just like a chain, and it does not remain in one direction and the relation with people within a given community is complex and it is not "a set of relations between the oppressed and the oppressor" (Mills, 2003, p.35). In opposition to many other theorists, "he asserts that power is not the privilege of the dominant class; rather it comes from innumerable points" (Farshid & Sokhanvar, 2010, p.7). Therefore, the individuals are not just the subjects to power, rather they may actively play a role in resisting the power which is embodied in the form of institutions.

In Foucault's opinion, power is not located in one single specific institution, instead he believes in the existence of various forms of discourses struggling over power. Not only does Foucault believe in simultaneous existence of discourses, but he also claims that power is not necessarily a constraining factor. In *History of Sexuality* he says: "if power was never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you really believe that we should manage to obey it?" (1978, p.36). Therefore, it is implied that power has a constructive feature in itself as opposed to conventional Marxist and Feminist tradition which consider power as a restrictive and oppressive force.

Thus, in Foucault's ideas, no discourse is ever able to have very long validity. He believes the way in which discourses are formed "does not play the role of a figure that arrests time and freezes it for decades or centuries" (Foucault, 1978, p.74). And his reason for this claim is:

there is no statement in general, no free, neutral, independent statement; but a statement always belongs to a series or a whole, always plays a role among other statements, deriving support from them and distinguishing itself from them; it is always a part of a network of statements. (Foucault, 1978, p.99)

How a discourse comes to the top of hierarchy of power is a complicated process. All the institutions within the discourse work together to exclude the statements which they categorize as false and which do not conform to their discourse. If one wants to remain in the domain of a specific discourse, one must comply with the rules of that discourse. In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, he states that "it is always possible one could speak the truth in a void; one would only be 'in the true' however if one obeyed the rules of

some discursive 'police' which would have to be reactivated every time one spoke" (1978, p.224).

3. Renunciation of Prometheus: A Romantic Hero

Romantic period started in England when some radical changes in the overall structure of the society were taking place. One of the most significant of these changes was the equality of the individuals within a given society. Some books are really influential to trigger the changes in England, one of which is Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Men*, which vindicates the French Revolution and defends it against Edmund Burke's attack on the Revolution; the other one is Tom Paine's *Rights of Man* in which the support for changes in England can be witnessed, and William Godwin's *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* which bespeaks an evitable change in English Society (Abrams, 2006, p.2).

One of the recurrent motifs of Romantic Literature is the theme of nature, and resorting to nature as a source of solace; as William Wordsworth says: "In nature and the language of the sense, the anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse, the guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul of all my moral being" (Wordsworth, 2006, p.260). This preoccupation and closeness with nature is vivid when Rousseau says: "Everything is well when it comes fresh from the hands of the Maker, everything degenerates in the hands of Man" (qtd. in Cudden, 2013, p.474); thus he emphasizes the superiority of what is natural.

"Turning against cold philosophy and abstract reason, the Romantic poets insisted instead on the ultimate value of passionate love, that love which is embodied in Percy Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*" (Mellor, 2009, p.79). For Romantic Poets, the individual is much

more important than the whole community, and therefore, the value of individual growth is of epic value, as it is stated and supported by Wordsworth in *The Prelude; or, Growth of a Poet's Mind*. The question of how an individual can interact with the external nature is also of much importance to later Romantic Poets who were inspired by the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. They believe that human mind transforms the data gathered from nature into the language of senses (Mellor, 2009, p.78).

The Romantics believe in the capacity of mind to re-create, thus, the individual's mind acts as the Almighty God. P.B. Shelley in his seminal work, *A Defense of Poetry*, says: "The mind in creation is as a fading coal which some invisible influence, like an inconstant wind, awakens to transitory brightness" (1840, p.56). Hence, from this sentence an understanding can be raised which is the promise of revolution and change from the old and worn-out ideas by the creativity of the mind. And again in aforementioned work, not only does he define poets as "the unacknowledged legislators of the world" (ibid, p.46), but he, most evidently in his *Ode to the West Wind*, celebrates the god-like power of the poet:

Drive my dead thoughts over the universe
Like wither'd leaves to quicken a new birth!
And, by the incantation of this verse,
Scatter, as from an unextinguish'd hearth
Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!
Be through my lips to unawaken'd earth
The trumpet of a prophecy! O Wind,
If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?
(P.B. Shelley, 2005, p.874)

The idea of having supreme power is also encouraged and articulated by Jean-Jacque Rousseau especially in his *Second Discourse on the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Men*. He believes that society is an invention, and it is opposed to his pure state of nature. "Rousseau



espoused a return to nature and equated the increasing growth and refinement of civilization with corruption, artificiality, and mechanization” (Habib, 2005, p.423). He, in *Social Contract*, says: “Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains” (qtd in Habib, 2005, p.423). Although, in Rousseau’s ideas, man’s primitive state of nature corresponds to biblical Garden of Eden, unlike Milton, he does not “envisage a third stage of human history” (Gilroy, 2010, p.283) when Christ washes all the sins away. This belief in the potentialities of human beings inspires Romantic thinkers to be able to progress and believe in their internal talents.

Prometheus’ quality of rebellion and liberty is appreciated and welcomed by a lot of Romantic authors. This attribute is embedded everywhere in 18th century Romantic literature owing to a great change happening in Europe and America, which leads to the breaking down of the dominant rules and tyrannies. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe sees Prometheus “as a symbol of humanity’s creative striving and rebellion against the restraints of society” (qtd. in Kathleen, 2009, p.121). Romantic authors have attempted to depict this quality to redeem and consider themselves as creators who are equal to the Almighty. Percy Bysshe Shelley, in *Prometheus Unbound*, “glorified the Titan who dared to revolt against the gods and triumph over tyranny” (Kathleen, 2009, p.121).

A Promethean re-reading of *Paradise Lost* can mingle the qualities of Satan with those of Prometheus based upon the fact that both “supplant passive or repressive orthodoxies with their imaginative energies.” (Gilroy, 2010, p.285). In this of kind of reading, Satan moves from the anti-hero to the object of admiration. What is important to mention is that in *Paradise Lost*, Milton narrates the

story according to the *Genesis*; for this reason, he cannot “suggest any alternative to Christ as man’s only hope of redemption” (Gilroy, 2010, p.282).

Thus, it is clear that Adam’s consolation cannot be achieved from within, but by an outside savior. However, the Romantics interpret this in the other way around. They say that the redemption can be reached inside Adam’s mind, which is itself a revolt against the will of God (Gilroy, 2010, p.282). Wordsworth in *The Recluse* says, if mind “once wedded to this outward frame of things” (1949, p.338), then it is enabled to create its own paradise without an outside savior.

Mary Shelley is brought up in an ambience which is loaded with Romantic preoccupations of which she has thorough knowledge, but toward which she has a critical approach. She states her “profound disillusion with the central philosophical, poetic, and political tenets of romanticism in her famous, well-read novel, *Frankenstein*” (Mellor, 2009, p.83). This fact is totally explicable and justifiable if one follows Foucault’s ideas concerning simultaneous existence of discourses, or what he calls “interior secret”. The ideas related to French Revolution, though sacred to Romantic authors are mistakes in Mary Shelley’s system of thoughts, hence “[i]n her novel, she represented the havoc wrought by the French Revolution in the gigantic and misshapen body of Frankenstein’s creature” (Mellor, 2009, p.85). Mary Shelley is following another discourse which is in struggle with the dominant discourse of the time being Romanticism. All this struggle has one end: reaching power. Foucault believes that power “is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. It is simply the over-all effect that emerges from all these

mobilities” (qtd in Habib, 2005, p.771). In Mary Shelley’s opinion, French Revolution failed to find a systematic rule. In *History of a Six Weeks Tour*, she describes the disastrous effects of French Revolution on the village of Echemine:

It had been once large and populous, but now the houses were roofless, and the ruins that lay scattered about, the gardens covered with the white dust of the torn cottages, the black burnt beams, and squalid looks of the inhabitants, present in every direction the melancholy aspect of devastation (1817, p.23).

In addition, Mary Shelley herself witnesses the failure of those Romantics around herself, which may have had a great influence on her dislike of Romantic idealization as the dominant discourse of her time. Her father had been immersed into debts, and he had been borrowing money from every acquaintance; Coleridge had been leading a parasite-like life; Byron was living a life of debauchery and he had compromising position with numerous women, including his own stepsister Claire Clairmont, and Mary Shelley’s own lover, P.B. Shelley, who heartlessly abandoned his wife and daughter to search for the beauty which he found in Mary (Mellor, 2009, p.85).

Besides, Percy’s constant disregard of Mary makes her create a villain of him. P.B. Shelley is considered as the embodiment of Romanticism and Romantic Ideals as discussed above; therefore, denouncing him equates denouncing Romantic idealism. In this novel, Mary Shelley finds the room to show her repressed desires and “seize[s] the opportunity to express in story form the things within herself she could not deal with consciously, and at the prompting of her antagonist, Percy” (Badalamenti, 2006, p.436). Mary Shelley depicts some monstrous features of her husband through

the monster figure. “The monster of her nightmare begins as an encoding of some parts of Percy... [t]he monster’s misery and dejection express her persecutory feelings in reaction to Percy’s frame breaks of their relationship” (Badalamenti, 2006, p.436).

Mary Shelley scolds the romantic-connected ideas regarding French Revolution and limitless imagination by creating an ironic subtitle, *Modern Prometheus*. Mary Shelley’s depiction of Victor Frankenstein is really important, since it is through this character and his actions that she expresses her disillusionment of Romanticism. Mary Shelley starts predicting the damnation of Victor Frankenstein from the very beginning of the novel. This damnation is portrayed by the technique of foreshadowing: “It was a strong effort of the spirit of good, but it was ineffectual. Destiny was too potent, and her immutable laws had decreed my utter and terrible destruction” (Shelley, 2005, p.32).

Frankenstein’s damnation is like that of Dr. Faustus, as Faustus has the “willingness to barter his soul for knowledge” (Oates, 2007, p.31). One can draw an analogy between Faustus’ regret at the end of the play due to the treaty he signed with Mephistopheles and Frankenstein’s remorse after Justine is hung on the accusation of murdering William, indicating the catastrophic outcome of their greed. “A thousand times rather would I have confessed myself guilty of the crime ascribed to Justine; but I was absent when it was committed, and such a declaration would have been considered as the ravings of a madman, and would not have exculpated her who suffered through me” (Shelley, 2005, p.75).

Mary Shelley’s period is simultaneous with some scientific advancements and, through variety of



means, she is introduced to some of them. She does not take a passive stand toward these scientific advancements, but she tries to have a critical view towards them. Some of these scientific experiments, being associated with Romantic ideals and limitless ability of human beings encouraged by the spirit of the Romanticism, are exactly the ones which are used by Frankenstein for creating the monster. “She used this knowledge both to analyze and to criticize the more dangerous implications of the scientific method and its practical results” (Mellor, 1988, p.89).

Marry Shelley's scientific enterprise is inspired by Humphrey Davy, Erasmus Darwin, and Luigi Galvani. Out of the three scientists, Darwin is the most influential one in creating the mentality of Shelley toward science and its life-related issues. She is introduced to Darwin's ideas by her father and later by her husband who is heavily influenced by Darwin's ideas; this is quite clear if we read P.B. Shelley's poems such as *Queen Mab*, "The Cloud", 'The Sensitive Plant', and *Prometheus Unbound* closely (Mellor, 1988, p.99).

In Mary Shelley's opinion, there is both good and bad science. Good science describes what the phenomena are and does not alter and disturb their mechanisms. Therefore, this kind of attitude is not in line with the scientific discourse of the time, showing that even there is no single discourse explaining the science of the time, and all in all, one can say that “there is no monolithic (single, unified, universal) spirit of an age, and there is no adequate totalizing explanation of history (an explanation that provides a single key to all aspects of a given culture)” (Tyson, 2006, p.285). Throughout the course of the novel one can witness that Frankenstein's intention, in making a new species, is based on Davy's thoughts. There is an unbridgeable gap

between what Mary Shelley and Darwin believe to be the good science and what Frankenstein does. The opposition to these overreaching scientific experimentations is mentioned by the monster in the novel: “If our impulses were confined to hunger, thirst, and desire, we might be nearly free; but now we are moved by every wind that blows, and a chance word or scene that that word may convey to us” (Shelley, 2005, pp.92-93).

Davy argues that chemistry is the mother of all sciences, but “the result of such an activity, Davy confidently predicts, will be a more harmonious, cooperative, and healthy society” (Mellor, 1988, p.93). Davy's ideas find their representation in the character of Waldman, in the novel, who says:

The ancient teachers of this science,' said he, 'promised impossibilities, and performed nothing. The modern masters promise very little; they know that metals cannot be transmuted, and that the elixir of life is a chimera. But these philosophers, whose hands seem only made to dabble in dirt, and their eyes to pore over the microscope or crucible, have indeed performed miracles. They penetrate into the recesses of nature, and show how she works in her hiding places. They ascend into the heavens: they have discovered how the blood circulates, and the nature of the air we breathe. They have acquired new and almost unlimited powers; they can command the thunders of heaven, mimic the earthquake, and even mock the invisible world with its own shadows (Shelley, 2005, p.38).

One can witness the sharp difference between Marry Shelley's conception of chemistry and that of Davy. In Mary Shelley's view, this kind of science which tries to alter the structure of the environment is totally a negative influence; as a result, these “Purely objective thought and scientific experimentations can and do

produce monsters” (Mellor, 1988, p.94). The result of the experiment is the monster who compares himself to Satan in *Paradise Lost*, and concludes that he is much more miserable than Satan:

He had come forth from the hands of God a perfect creature, happy and prosperous, guarded by the especial care of his Creator; he was allowed to converse with, and acquire knowledge from, beings of a superior nature: but I was wretched, helpless, and alone. Many times I considered Satan as the fitter emblem of my condition; for often, like him, when I viewed the bliss of my protectors, the bitter gall of envy rose within me (Shelley, 2005, p.127).

This description of the monster is totally negative and contains the expected dire consequences due to the ambitious desires of Frankenstein. “Shelley presents Victor Frankenstein as the embodiment of hubris, of that Satanic or Faustian presumption which blasphemously attempts to tear asunder the sacred mysteries of nature” (Mellor, 1988, p.94). Victor Frankenstein’s attempts to uncover the secrets of nature not only do not bring him any good, but also they bring him dire consequences. The disastrous upshot of the scientific experimentation is due to the Romantic nature of it.

In contrast to the ideas of Davy, Mary Shelley is inspired by the ideas of Erasmus Darwin concerning a scientific project which attempts to discover the secret of the world, but not to alter its procedure. This marginalized discourse of science is the one which exists along with the dominant discourse. Mary Shelley, as stated by Mellor in her essay “Why Women Didn’t Like Romanticism”, has the monster voice her concern about morality of the actions and science, when the monster says that the pursuit of knowledge is beneficial as long as it does not do any harm to the human and does not disturb the natural

equilibrium. In this case, Victor’s motivation and nature of his experiments are considered as a direct opposite to Darwin’s notion of appropriate science.

A human being in perfection ought always to preserve a calm and peaceful mind, and never to allow passion or a transitory desire to disturb his tranquility. I do not think that the pursuit of knowledge is an exception to this rule. If the study to which you apply yourself has a tendency to weaken your affections, and to destroy your taste for those simple pleasures in which no alloy can possibly mix, then that study is certainly unlawful, that is to say, not befitting the human mind. (Shelley, 2005, p.46).

Frankenstein is so overwhelmed by the ‘bad science’ that hubris does not let him see the other side; he just wants to enliven his own creature. “Life and death appeared to me ideal bounds, which I should first break through, and pour a torrent of light into our dark world. A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me” (Shelley, 2005, p.45).

In this way Frankenstein disrupts the organic mechanism of nature; he attempts to accelerate the process of organic formation by artificial methods, which is itself a disturbance in the order of the Great Chain of Being. Abrams in his *Glossary of Literary Terms* defines the notion:

The existing species exhibit a hierarchy of status, and so compose a great chain, or ladder, of being, extending from the lowliest condition of the merest existence up to God Himself. In this chain human beings occupy the middle position between the animal kinds and the angels, or purely spiritual beings (2012, p.154).

Frankenstein gets himself up to the highest point of the hierarchy of the Great Chain of Being and replaces himself with God, but he fails to provide his own



creature with what he needs. As Mellor says, Frankenstein “parodied [god] by creating only a monster” and he “blasphemed against the natural order of things” (Mellor, 1988, p.101). He moves to the top of the ladder, constructing “not only out of dead human organs collected from charnel houses and dissecting rooms, but also out of animal organs and issue removed from ‘the slaughter-house’” (Mellor, 1988, p.101). The monster complains that God creates man “after his own image”; but “[his] form is a filthy type” (Shelley, 2005, p.128), which is the product of harum-scarum creation. The monster wants to establish “the company of man [but] is rejected with horror, fear and abuse. He concludes that human nature has both noble and treacherous sides” (Badalamenti, 2006, p.430).

Remember, that I am thy creature; I ought to be thy Adam; but I am rather the fallen angel, whom thou drivest from joy for no misdeed. Everywhere I see bliss, from which I alone am irrevocably excluded. I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend. Make me happy, and I shall again be virtuous (Shelley, 2005, p.95).

In his compulsive desire for creating a new being, Victor forgets the beauty of nature around him and becomes indifferent towards it, so he is more immersed in sorrow, which is clear when he says: “I seemed to have lost all soul or sensation but for this one pursuit” (Shelley, 2005, p.45). This regret intensifies when he is spending some time with Clerval who does not show any compulsive desire for altering the natural order and creating something new at any expense. In this regard, Clerval is the one who is acting in another discursive formulation rather than the dominant discourse, and as one can witness, his discourse is challenging the typical Romantic discourse of science. The

existence of Clerval is triggered by Mary Shelley’s friendship with Isabel and Christy Baxte who lived satisfying lives. “Mary used the Frankenstein and Clerval families in her novel to hearken back to the Baxters” (Guerin, 2005, p.73).

Mary Shelley uses this character to accentuate the erroneous assumption of Romantic ideals associated to Frankenstein. It is with Clerval that Frankenstein momentarily regains his strength back as they go to nature. “We passed a fortnight in these perambulations: my health and spirits had long been restored, and they gained additional strength from the salubrious air I breathed, the natural incidents of our progress, and the conversation of my friend” (Shelley, 2005, p.63).

The consolation and relief with which Clerval could provide Frankenstein is owing to his area of interest which is in sharp contrast to that of Frankenstein. Clerval’s association with oriental studies shows the calmness and satisfying nature of these studies which is in sharp contrast to Frankenstein’s scientific experiments:

The Persian, Arabic, and Sanscrit languages engaged his attention, and I was easily induced to enter on the same studies. Idleness had ever been irksome to me, and now that I wished to fly from reflection, and hated my former studies, I felt great relief in being the fellow-pupil with my friend, and found not only instruction but consolation in the works of the orientalist (Shelley, 2005, p.62).

4. Conclusion

In this paper, it has been argued how Mary Shelley satirizes and criticizes the romantic ideas about limitless ability and liberty, using her male Character, Victor Frankenstein, or Modern Prometheus. Mary was born and raised in an atmosphere loaded with Romantic discourses, however, she did not follow the dominant discourse in the power structure, but she went after

other opposing discourses. These discourses are in stark contrast with Romantic discourse in that they refute the idea of limitless abilities of human beings to alter the world. A short glance at her biography will indicate how much she dislikes Romanticism; Mary illustrates Frankenstein's actions and damnation so as to cast doubt on the ideas related to Romanticism. She also has a strong opposition to scientific experimentations which are fueled with limitless imagination in a way that the natural hierarchy would be disrupted, and consequences would follow.

References

- Abrams, M.H. & Harpham G. G. (2012). *Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Abrams, M.H. et al. (2006). *Norton Anthology of English Literature. Vol. 2*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Bloom, H. (2007). *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Frankenstein, Updated Edition*. New York: InfoBase Publishing.
- Badalamenti, F. A. (2006). Why did Mary Shelley Write Frankenstein?. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 45 (3), 419-439.
- Cudden, J. A. (2013). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Farshid, S. & Sokhanvar, J. (2010). A Foucauldian Reading of Morrison's Novels. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*. 3(10), 295-311.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Tavistock Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (1987). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Hurley, R. (Trans.), Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gilroy, J. (2010). *Romantic Literature*. Edinburgh: York Press.
- Guerin, L. W. et al. (2005). *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habib, M. A. R. (2005). *A History of Literary Criticism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kathleen N. D. (2009). *Greek and Roman Mythology A to Z*. New York: InfoBase Publishing.
- Mellor, K. A. (1988). *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters*. New York: Routledge.
- Mellor, K. A. (2009). Why Women Didn't Like Romanticism: The Views of Jane Austen and Mary Shelley IN: Bloom, H. (Ed.) *Bloom's Modern Critical Views: Jane Austen*. New York: InfoBase Publishing.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. New York: Routledge.
- Oates, C. J. (2007). Frankenstein's Fallen Angel IN: Bloom, H. (Ed.) *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Frankenstein, Updated Edition*. New York: InfoBase Publishing.
- Shelley, M. (2005). *Frankenstein, Modern Prometheus*. San Diego: Icon Classics.
- Shelley, M. (1817). *History of a Six Weeks' Tour*. London: Thomas Hookham, Jr. and Charles and James Ollier.
- Shelley, P.B. (1840). *A Defense of Poetry*. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard.
- Shelley, P. B. (2005). Ode to the West Wind. *Norton Anthology of Poetry*. Ferguson, M. et al. (Eds.) New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical Theory Today*. New York: Routledge.
- Wordsworth, W. (1949). *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*. Selincourt E. and Darbishire H. (Eds.), 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wordsworth, W. (2006). *Lines*. IN: Abrams, M. H. et al. (Eds.) *Norton Anthology of English Literature Vol. 2*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.