

## Chapter 6

# Playing God and the Aesthetics of Exclusion: Unveiling the True Monster in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* 8

Afranur Yilmaz<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

Monster figures have traditionally represented something inhuman or partially human. As a pioneer of the Gothic genre, Frankenstein both transformed this genre and provided a new perspective on the definition of a monster, a perspective that has endured for two hundred years. This chapter examines how Mary Shelley, a prominent female writer of the time, wrote this story in the context of the Enlightenment era, as well as the consequences of humanity's assuming the role of the God. Furthermore, it explores the topics science has addressed, their reflections from the nineteenth century to the present, and the concept of the successful scientist as represented by Doctor Victor Frankenstein. Also, it reveals whether scientists choose to play the role of the God or science itself, while working on a new discovery, as the character Victor does. On the other hand, the concept of the absence of divinity (atheism) and the aesthetics embraced by the creature are studied in this context, with an emphasis on both social and psychological consequences. In these circumstances, where unbelief and science come into conflict, they shed light on both Mary Shelley's critique of her time and current studies concerning the concept of creation. As a result, the contemporary reflections and ethical debates surrounding these and similar issues have been examined from both the Creature's and Victor's perspectives, as well as from a discussion of who the true monster is.

### Introduction

Monsters, created as symbolic figures rather than genuine individuals, have been used for generations as mirrors of human terror. This vantage point is occasionally associated with concepts such as ghost stories and

1 Karabuk University, Orcid: 0009-0007-7653-573X



zombies, which have continued from the past to the present. However, this perception is reversed in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*, which depicts a creature whose very existence reveals the human roots of horror. *Frankenstein* is an alienation story of the unnamed monster.

This novel is considered through the following mythical perspective: Prometheus is a titan who stole fire from the Gods and is punished for his attempt, until the end of the world. In the novel, Prometheus is a doctor named Victor Frankenstein, who is interested in galvanism and desires to create a new kind of entity from a compound of human bodies; his creation led to the birth of a monster. It is highly suggestive in that the novel was believed to be under the influence of the concept of galvanism because debates as to the boundaries between life and death were quite common in Europe at the time. In 1803, the Royal College of Surgeons invited Professor Giovanni Aldini to conduct galvanic experiments on the body of George Foster, who had been convicted of killing his wife and child by drowning them in the Paddington Canal. Aldini believed that the bodies of those who had passed away still possessed their "vital powers," so he needed access to them.

Reading the records of this scientist's work at the College in 1803, it is not difficult to see why others believed such men liked to play at being God. Always conscious of his audience, Aldini made the dead perform tricks. He boasted that in Europe he had once placed the heads of two decapitated criminals on separate tables, then connected them with an arc of electricity to make them grimace to such an extent as to frighten spectators. He had also made the hand of a headless man clutch a coin and throw it across a room (MacDonald, 2005).

Thus, Victor Frankenstein's character is inspired by this idea; he steals the idea of creation, which belongs only to gods, and believes he is able to create a new kind of human, so he collects body parts from autopsies and disposal parts from abattoirs.

Most critics would probably agree that Frankenstein and the creature cannot be separated from one another. To talk about one means to talk about the other. Muriel Spark goes a step further, saying, "There are two central figures—or rather two in one, for Frankenstein and his significantly unnamed Monster are bound together by the nature of their relationship" (Keese, 2011, p. 3).

This creation of a monster is, in fact, a basis for atheism. It is a revolt against the God since the monster consists of human body parts, and Victor takes these parts from dead people. "I collected bones from charnel-houses

and disturbed, with profane fingers, the tremendous secrets of human frame." (Shelley, 1818, p.50) The dead is sacred, inevitable, and irreversible. Victor is defying the idea of death, but he also intends to understand it to create the monster. However, Victor is not God, even though he behaves as if he were. Throughout the story, he despises the creature. One of the main reasons for this is the creature's ugliness. Victor himself creates it and rejects it. One irresponsibly takes life into his own hands and abandons it; the other takes life into his hands and extinguishes it. One creates; the other destroys (Keese, 2011, p. 3). He himself creates an ugly, large, and misshapen monster; however, when he sees what a repulsive and unmanageable creature it is, he begins to flee from it.

It is believed that the idea of the monster is inspired by the perspective of Mary Shelley's own life. However, before that, there was an incident that is believed to inspire Shelley. In 1816, 13,000-foot-tall volcano on the Indonesian island of Sumbawa erupted starting a gloomy weather condition across Europe that is known by the infamous name the year without summer. One of the largest volcanic eruptions in recorded history occurred in April of 1815 as follows:

Mt. Tambora ejected immense amounts of volcanic ash into the upper atmosphere, where it was carried around the world by the jet stream. The volcanic dust covered Earth like a great cosmic umbrella, dimming the Sun's effectiveness during the whole cold year. This resulted in a further reduction in solar irradiance, which brought record cold to much of the world during the following summer. Such an eruption would explain the appearance of the 1816 sun as "in a cloud of smoke (Steinberg, 2024)

During this time, Mary Shelley was enthused while staying with her husband, Percy Shelley, at the house of their friend, poet Lord Byron, on the shore of Lake Geneva in Switzerland. As the weather directly affected them, they were unable to see the sun, and it was cold and rainy most of the time. One evening, Lord Byron intended to organise a horror story competition. Percy Shelley wrote poems, and Lord Byron wrote a vampire story that inspired the well-known *The Vampyre*, but Shelley was unable to write for days. However, one evening, somewhere between sleep and wakefulness, I noticed a pale student kneeling beside the dead body he had created, which was slowly coming back to life. This dream sequence she had stimulated the creature's resurrection scene, and she began writing *Frankenstein*. (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.).

Prior to this, according to Mary Shelley's diaries, there were some events that influenced the novel. Shelley begins her life without a mother. Mary

Shelley's name comes from her mother, Anne Mary; her father demands that her name to be Mary. In light of this situation, it relates to Victor and the Creature's relationship because the Creature takes his name from his creator, Victor, and this could be a significant clue to Shelley's life. Victor flees from the creature after bringing it to life, so it becomes an unnamed creature. The Creature adopts Victor's name because it reflects his shadow. When Mary Shelley's relationship with her mother is examined, it can be observed that she carries the shadow of the person who gives her birth and whom she would never see again for the rest of her life. Thus, it is acknowledged that she draws inspiration from her own life experiences in creating the creature. Her journals clearly point out that she had nightmares wherein she was trying to restore a dead baby to life by "rubbing" it. It is interpreted in terms of the psychological impact of the baby she had lost and her miscarriage. Dilemma in her vision as to resuscitate her deceased infant by rubbing it, drawing a direct parallel to the creature. In her journal, she notes that when this act of resuscitation failed, she fled the room. It is said that the exact same action Victor takes when the creature comes to life. Furthermore, considering the period in which it was written, it is vital to remember that Shelley is a female author who remains, in a sense, in the shadow of her husband. In her youth, as a young woman in her 18, drawing attention to her personal experiences to produce such a work is remarkable for the 19th century. It is noticeable as both a major achievement and a scientific contribution to Gothic literature. Therefore, the monster idea is a creature brought to life through a (purportedly) scientific method. Nevertheless, it is concluded that the author is deeply influenced by her own life and traumas (Taylan, 2018).

Every form bears the God's mark, but the creature's appearance is grotesque. This is inevitable for Victor, who plays the God and becomes arrogant in his quest to create a new species of humankind. This new creature sees him as its creator and obeys him. "A new species would bless me as its creator and source; many happy and excellent natures would owe their being to me. No father could claim the gratitude of his child so completely as I should deserve theirs." (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 49). Considering this, it is claimed that Victor plays the role of the God. Before going through today's perspective of assuming a godly position over life, it ought to be agreed that the creature's aesthetic perception is different from a normal human being. No matter how attentively it's created out of a meticulous selection of the human cadavers, the creature itself is told to be ugly by Victor.

His limbs were in proportion, and I had selected his features as beautiful. Beautiful! Great God! His yellow skin scarcely covered the

work of muscles and arteries beneath; his hair was of a lustrous black, and flowing; his teeth of a pearly whiteness; but these luxuriances only formed a more horrid contrast with his watery eyes, that seemed almost of the same colour as the dun-white sockets in which they were set, his shrivelled complexion and straight black lips (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 53).

He says, “I had selected his features as beautiful...”, but he underscores that he is an ugly monster. This perception displays the aesthetic concerns of the 19th century. However, the problem persists in the 21st century. He wishes him to be beautiful, but it turns out to be one of the creature’s weaknesses. The Creature is an outcast. It is despised by the people because of its appearance, it terrifies people, and it does not fit the idea of aesthetic beauty. Being labelled monstrous by its own creature alienates the monster from society. If your god/creator does not love you, who will love you unconditionally? If that notion is recognised from today’s perspective, aesthetic concerns remain a top issue for people.

According to Aristotle, in *Metaphysics* XIII.3, “The chief forms of beauty are order and symmetry and definiteness, which the mathematical sciences demonstrate in a special degree” (1078b). For instance, the objects of geometry, such as the sphere, and the cube and the pyramid, with their symmetry and order and wondrous elegance of line, specially reveal the beautiful. Thus, when something is dissimilar to human eyes, it outcasts them. This notion becomes a weakness for the creature; that’s why he wishes Victor to create a female creature for him. The Creature assumes that this woman will accept him because of their resemblance. However, Victor is afraid of creating a female creature because of women’s fertility. Considering this, Victor assumes that she becomes worse than him, and he rejects this request. The Creature’s fundamental weakness -society’s disregard- is once again exposed during the encounters with villagers. First encounter with the shepherd and seeing himself on the surface of the water represent the effects of his weakness. The Creature’s encounter with the shepherd is the first stage of rejection. While escaping the cold, the creature comes across a hut and seeks shelter there. Although the creature approaches the two people eating breakfast in the shed with good intentions, the man screams in terror and runs away.

Nevertheless, the only hospitable character towards the creature in the novel, De Lacey, is blind, therefore he can only hear the Creature’s speech, and he is not aware of his appearance. Just as he sees his reflection in the surface of water and is startled, the creature realizes how his appearance evokes fear in humans. Considering these circumstances, as Aristotle states,

it illustrates how aesthetic beauty and appearance can lead to judgments. Even today, it is almost impossible for society to accept the Creature though, it is believed to have human origins. If society were as blind as De Lacey, it would be possible then to accept this kind of creature. Evidently, a beauty standard has been imposed on people by the Western mind from ancient times to the present day. Ancient Greek and Roman sculptures, with their magnificent depiction of Gods and Goddesses, always highlight the greatness of human form- large, powerful, and aesthetically attractive- and dictate it upon people. Additionally, they would classify this creature as a mythological if it were a statue, but a mythological creature still fits the description of a creature. As a result, even if the monster is composed of human body parts, people who see the statue would classify the monster as a mythological creature, like Medusa, whose characteristics are defined as human but do not conform to the ideal of human form. Concluding, Frankenstein's creation is made of human parts. Moreover, the creature does not fit within a boundary or border (life and death), which evokes Victor's fear of death as well, but in quite a subtle manner.

### The Creation: Playing the God

“O mankind! Be conscious of your Lord, who created you from a single soul and created from it its mate.”

*(Qur'an, 4:1)*

“So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him.”

*(Genesis 1:27)*

The Enlightenment, the period in which Frankenstein was written, is considered a time when men played the God in their positions and claimed nature for themselves. As Francis Bacon states, “Ipsa scientia potestas est” which means knowledge itself is power (Bacon, 1597). This philosophy is not about knowledge being power, yet it is dominating knowledge. Just as mentioned in the galvanism experiments conducted during this period, it implies playing with a force of nature, which may ultimately be comparable to imitating the role of the God. Additionally, the era is characterised by the rise of logic and science over faith and the soul, and by the discovery of everything through experimentation, yet it is the beginning of the collapse of the system of faith. Nevertheless, the Enlightenment has a humanist face; it adopts a way of thinking that separates and classifies people, marginalises them, and destroys the faith order.

No one can conceive the variety of feelings which bore me onwards, like a hurricane, in the first enthusiasm of success. 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. (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 55).

Frankenstein's religious beliefs are unknown, but considering this period, the Enlightenment, Shelley actually criticises people for imitating the God's position in defining life through a humanistic perspective that would be denoted as the Enlightenment Humanism. They are overconfident and believe that knowledge is power, just like Victor ensured in the novel. Influenced by the galvanism that flourished during this period, humanity's attempt to create a superior species and its frustration with the result when it is unsuccessful, leading to its rejection and avoidance, demonstrates that humans are not like God but rather helpless. The topic of creating a superior human being was also addressed by Hitler in a time very close to the present times. He argued that with the idea of the *Übermensch*, a superior race could exist. Hitler's adoption of the *Übermensch* concept, according to Justus H. Ulbricht, "the ideal of the non-conforming "Übermensch" (superman) was reinterpreted and heroicised as the "Herrenmensch" (member of the master race) and "Aryan". (Ulbricht, 2025). Thus, *Übermensch* constructs his life according to the physical reality conditions of material life while after life promises are ignored. Hitler's efforts to create a master race truly indicate how Shelley's novel is criticised by her in light of the conditions of the day. Since Western minds apparently believe in annihilation after death. In the novel, the creature is brought back to life as a whole body, invoking the idea of immortality.

Herman Joseph Muller (1890-1967), who won the Nobel Prize for discovering that X-rays could induce mutations in living organisms, altered 20th-century genetics and laid the groundwork for both molecular biology and bioethics. However, for instance, he is not an upholder of the ideas in question; he rather sees it as a threat to humankind. Shelley's opinion of a modern Prometheus is similar to Victor's in the 19th century, and Muller presented his viewpoint to the public and conducted studies on the subject.

...indeed, at once so powerful, so virtuous and magnifi-cent, yet so vicious and base? He appeared at one time a mere scion of the evil principle and at another as all that can be conceived of noble and godlike. To be a great and virtuous man appeared the highest honour

that can befall a sensitive being; to be base and vicious, as many on record have been, appeared the lowest degradation, a condition more abject than that of the blind mole or harmless worm. (Shelley, 1818/2019, p.120-121)

The creature is beginning to comprehend and question humans thanks to De Lacey and his family. It is the indication that if a new species starts to doubt humans, other species might follow as well; therefore, this assumption increases doubts about the future of humanity. Substantially, Muller mentions, "Frankenstein's monster was a fantasy; ours will be living, thinking men." (Muller, 1959). In response to this idea, Shelley's 19<sup>th</sup>-century concept of playing the God still exists in the 20<sup>th</sup> century; these studies are still being conducted and are experimenting with this topic. Manipulating humanity's genetics is legal in some places, which illustrates that the idea of playing God, and the idea at the foundation of the novel, are not only from the 19<sup>th</sup> century; even 200 years later, people still keep the same mentality. Hence arises the questions: What is the purpose of this? What is the main element of fear? The contradiction in aesthetic perception is one of the creature's main weaknesses, due to its ugliness and appearance, which are alien to human perceptions of beauty, leading to the creature's social exile. No matter how hard Victor tries to make him beautiful, he creates a monster; he is afraid of him because of his hideous appearance. Indeed, it demonstrates that people may be afraid of things they are unable to comprehend or control.

Therefore, Muller converses moral ethics of genetics, and the capacity to redesign life, because it seems inconceivable that the secrets of human creation and moral ethics are being thrust in front of the uncontrollable and incomprehensible thing he does, just as Shelley states, just because mankind is able to do everything does not mean they should do it. The fact that creation, which is God's possession, is handed over to a defenceless human being is a question of faith, even though the outcome is unknown. Even under the mask of science, as Muller also pointed out, "to play with the human germ line is to take the place of God" (Muller, 1959). That is another way of honouring the Enlightenment mentality. The only thing that humankind has not encountered is a story with a creative core and conflict about life after death. Death is the only thing that human beings have not experienced. Consequently, developments and research on post-humanism, death, and the afterlife, which are among the most important issues of the present day, are also reflections of Frankenstein and are being investigated through vital scientific studies.

## The Mad Scientist

Many scientists, particularly those working in bioethics and AI, have chosen Frankenstein as an ethical role model because Victor is a prime example of a mad scientist. Moreover, if one sets aside the pretence of God, this character can be an example of scientific ethics, empathy, and a sense of duty. Victor Frankenstein exemplifies the dark side of science and scientists for the participants, the dangers that science poses to society (Nagy, et al., 2019, p. 13-14). Just as Muller also argues, Frankenstein posits much credibility to be a modern ethical instance of science. With its anthropomorphic appearance and lack of resemblance to humans, it evokes fear, but if approached through Victor, it also serves as an example of what science may achieve today and the consequences for humanity. Thus, it becomes a source of fear. Based on this impression, a scientist must be ethical and moral, have developed empathy and sympathy, and understand the limits of human nature. On the contrary, Victor is perceived as having abandoned his creation and failed to take responsibility for this scientific (!) work of his own. This also implies that science bears a responsibility to humanity. Victor, as a brilliant scientist, lacks these qualities. He is a character who attempts to resolve all of humanity's questions about death and immortality, but he is unable to bear the consequences. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that the Frankenstein novel does not tie in with a single scientific issue, instead contributes to many.

Scholars note that the story is a cautionary tale. The theme of scientific hubris in Frankenstein is not just a fictional element; it also reflects ethical failures in the real world. One of the most remarkable examples of this is the case of Henrietta Lacks. Just as Victor Frankenstein ignores the suffering of the creature he created and becomes 'myopic' by his own obsession with his creation, doctors took Lacks' cells without her consent. It is about arrogance. Through this arrogance, scientists can create a lot of suffering. They often think that their work is so great. As Rebecca Skloot (2010) also points out, the scientific community was so focused on the benefits of 'HeLa' cells that they forgot the human behind them. Scientists begin to forget about the suffering that their work can cause to other people. They can easily become myopic.

The narrative is fairly straightforward about how much Victor suffers and regrets what he created after witnessing it. In fact, in chapter 17, when the creature expresses his desire for a partner who resembles him, Victor begins to see this as his responsibility, but then he decides it is improper and refuses to create a partner for the creature.

"How can you, who long for the love and sympathy of man, persevere in this exile? You will return and again seek their kindness, and you will meet with their detestation; your evil passions will be renewed, and you will then have a companion to aid you in the task of destruction. This may not be; cease to argue the point, for I cannot consent."

(Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 150)

Although many aspects of it are scientifically applicable to the present, it can be considered a complete post-human work. However, when approached from a scientific standpoint, those fields that are still ongoing today and on which research is being conducted, a variety of subjects are highly susceptible to instilling anxiety in human beings. Frightened by a monster in the past, but today's fears stem from the unknown and negligence. In today's world, the rise of genetic disorders, scientists who refuse to accept responsibility for their actions, and unsolved mysteries are creating new concerns (Badii, et al., 2021, p. 2). It raises the question of whether the problem is finding the monster or discovering what caused the monster.

Reactions to unusual situations are interpreted as indicators. This particular topic of discussion clearly demonstrates who the true monster is. When a person sees someone soaked in blood, is it the victim they fear, or the unseen hand that caused the blood to flow? Thus, Victor's personality is at the heart of the debate. Putting human parts back together and creating a new species may appear scientific, but it actually reveals who the true monster is. The idea of creating a new species using the body parts of people who have died long ago, and rejecting it, is not something a person with a conscience would do. It is now clear that Victor, who is attempting to play the God, can never be the God himself. Any human being who believes in the God or a creator understands that their creator will not abandon them. However, Victor, the Creature's creator, is a scientist and a man who claims to be doing this for science. Assuming that a person returns from death, but the creator does not want that person in life, who would be the true monster in that case? The answer is obvious: Victor, a scientist who does not take responsibility for his actions. The creature's disillusionment and self-loathing lead him to deem himself inferior to Satan, whereas Satan has followers; he is completely alone. Victor is the sole cause of all of this. Hence, the expression: *Why did you create me if you did not intend to love me?*

There are serial killers mentioned in the world who instil terror in people. For instance, Jack the Ripper is a famous serial killer known for brutally murdering women in the Whitechapel district of London in 1888 and never being caught. Noticeably, this is just one example, but what needs to be highlighted here are some horrific things this serial killer did to women's

bodies, such as chopping off their genitals. If this instance is taken into account, who should be held accountable: the women or the serial killer who victimised them?

In 1803, the College invited Professor Giovanni Aldini to carry out galvanic experiments on the body of George Foster, who had been found guilty of murdering his wife and child by drowning them in the Paddington Canal. Aldini required access to the bodies of people who had died very recently, in the belief that these still held their 'vital powers'. In contrast, those who had died of disease might have 'humours' which would resist his experiments. Later, writing up his London work, Aldini admired England's 'enlightened' laws, which provided murderers with an opportunity to atone for their crimes by such uses of their bodies after death (MacDonald, 2025).

In today's moral framework, according to this experiment, people hold the murderer accountable first, so why is Victor exempt from the same moral gaze? When human body parts are reassembled to create something dreadful, what else is it but the work of a murderer or a monster?! Thus, when this fact is taken into consideration, the line between them and Victor blurs, for the true monster is, in fact, Victor himself. Nevertheless, the monster's experiences are so vivid throughout the novel that the reader begins to sympathize with Victor, especially when the creature murdered William. "The child still struggled and loaded me with epithets which carried despair to my heart; I grasped his throat to silence him, and in a moment he lay dead at my feet." (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 145) Indeed, this is the creator's responsibility because the creature expresses its rage toward Victor here, but murdering a child is unethical and morally wrong. Simultaneously, the fact that Justine Mortiz is wearing William's necklace is morally shocking because the two characters die at the hands of a monster Victor created. Mortiz, in her trial, states the following:

"God knows," she said, "how entirely I am innocent. But I do not pretend that my protestations should acquit me; I rest my innocence on a plain and simple explanation of the facts which have been adduced against me, and I hope the character I have always borne will incline my judges to a favourable interpretation where any circumstance appears doubtful or suspicious." (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 80-81)

It is evident that both William and Justine are victims of Victor. In chapter 8, it can be relatable both Victor's suffering and the condemnation of an innocent woman to death. Even though Victor tries to get away and ignore the creature, it is obvious from these two events that the creature is following him and that he is desperate for his creator's love. The immense

suffering, he endured, culminating in his death and the abandonment of his creation, illustrates that monstrosity can exist not only in form but also in moral failure.

### **The Idea of Beauty**

Kant claims that, because natural beings are considered beautiful, the human race will undoubtedly be regarded as beautiful (Kant, 1790/2000). However, there is one significant difference that distinguishes the Creature of Dr. Frankenstein from this: it is not a natural structure. Even if Victor selects the most beautiful parts to form the creature, it is not beautiful as a whole because it is not a natural pattern. This is one of the main reasons for the creature's exclusion: it's terrifying appearance. This particular aspect of appearance and aesthetic perception is still prevalent today. The increasing number of plastic surgeries and the beauty standards created and imposed by social media are ultimately disrupting a natural process because, even today, just like Victor, there is a perception of being perfect. Since in aesthetic operations the idea is to disrupt what is natural and replace it with something better, Victor's desire to create a perfect living being is associated with today's esthetical operations. Victor states that in order to understand life, understanding of death is essential (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 46). As a result, he is both embracing death and opposing it at the same time.

If this situation is addressed today, monsters may become associated with people's aesthetic concerns and efforts to appear much younger. The Creature is initially rejected by its own creator, society eventually joins in, and the doctor triumphs over death. However, the consequences are inevitable. The monster Victor created is not accepted by society. Indeed, the subtext of racism and excluding those who are different may be derived from this idea. The exclusion and marginalization of people with different skin tones or those who do not conform to the same beauty standards in society reflect the monster's experiences. However, based on Derrida's argument of binary oppositions, it is occasionally argued that concepts are defined by their opposites; for instance, one cannot define white without black; one view must have a contrast (Derrida, 1972/1981). "But the monster cannot enter society because he is inhumanly hideous and gigantic. Yet he must enter society if he is to become part of society. Thus, the monster forms a rational solution to his aesthetic problem" (Abrams, 2018, p. 14). In other words, the Creature's appearance and exclusion pose much credibility to stand for today's fear: the fear of aging and aesthetics. Moreover, aging is

also associated with death, which is illustrated as a fear of death. Although the creature believes it can persuade the villagers through kindness, it took that approach and was utterly unsuccessful.

I looked upon them as superior beings, who would be the arbiters of my future destiny. I formed in my imagination a thousand pictures of presenting myself to them, and their reception of me. I imagined that they would be disgusted, until, by my gentle demeanour and conciliating words, I should first win their favour, and afterwards their love. (Shelley, 1818/2019, p. 111)

Thus, it can be deduced that there is a universal-scale ongoing concern for aesthetic disposition. It has been imposed on society as a magnificent, perfectly shaped form, and if humans cannot adhere to these forms and standards, they may be considered outside of society. The fact that certain aesthetic concerns about submitting to society and skin colour are addressed in Europe, where humanism was born, is no different from Victor, who collects perfect body parts but still creates an ugly monster.

## Conclusion

This body of analysis demonstrates that Frankenstein is the source of numerous issues that are still debated today. Although it is one of the pioneers of Gothic literature, it is also considered a foundation of science fiction, making it a strong example both scientifically and literarily. It is noticeable that Doctor Frankenstein's creation of the monster, which he thought was an outstanding example of science, was a failure. Playing the God and stealing creative power from him causes a drastic problem in the eyes of a scientist, as well as the accompanying monstrous consequences. However, in the novel, the true monster turns out to be the doctor himself. Victor, who abandoned the Creature he created, condemning it to loneliness, inciting anger, and driving it to commit crimes. The numerous themes that this creature has encountered throughout the story, exclusion, being perceived as ugly, and not being considered human, serve as a good example of both life and what society imposes today. To sum up, the real monster in this case is the pseudo-creator, Dr. Frankenstein, not the creature he has revived. Because everything the monster has gone through is the fault of its creator; it didn't ask for resurrection, and its creator did not endow it with a soul. The Creature has to rediscover what it means to be human, just like a newborn baby. Thus, the real monster becomes the unmerited creator himself who ventures beyond his limits in an oblivious arrogance.

## References

Abrams, J. J. (2018). Aesthetics in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. *Journal of Science Fiction and Philosophy*, 1, 1–19.

Alhashmi, R. (2020). The Grotesque in Frankenstein in Baghdad: Between Humanity and Monstrosity. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2(1), 90–106. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i1.120>

Aristotle. (1998). *The metaphysics* (H. C. Lawson-Tancred, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.)

Bacon, F. (1597). *Meditationes sacrae*.

Cambra-Badii, I., Guardiola, E., & Baños, J. (2021). Frankenstein; or, the modern Prometheus: a classic novel to stimulate the analysis of complex contemporary issues in biomedical sciences. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 22(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-021-00586-7>

Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions* (A. Bass, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1972)

Journal of South Texas English Studies | Journals | University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. (n.d.). <https://scholarworks.utrgv.edu/jostes>

Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the power of judgment* (P. Guyer & E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1790)

MacDonald, H. (2007). Galvanising George Foster, 1803. In *Dark imaginings: Gothic tales of wonder*. University of Melbourne Library. <https://library.unimelb.edu.au/asc/whats-on/exhibitions/dark-imaginings/gothicresearch/galvanising-george-foster,-1803>

Muller, H. J. (1959). *Science and ethics*. Indiana University Press.

Nagy, P., Wylie, R., Eschrich, J., & Finn, E. (2019). Facing the Pariah of Science: The Frankenstein myth as a social and ethical reference for scientists. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 26(2), 737–759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-019-00121-3>

Obrazović, A. (2019). Monstrous appearance and the element of unknown: A parallel reading of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and contemporary media narratives on migrant crisis in Europe. *X. A. Proceedings*, 2, 146–157.

Rédei, A. C. (2022). The human being as a creator of (in) human life: the example of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein; or, the modern Prometheus. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhmd.2022.718435>

Shelley, M. W. (2018). *Frankenstein*. (A. M. Taylan, Preface). Dex Book.

Shelley, M. W. (2019). *Frankenstein; or, The modern Prometheus*. Karbon Books. (Original work published 1818)

Skloot, R. (2010). *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*. Crown.

Steinberg, M. (2024, February 16). *The Year without a Summer: Mount Tambora volcanic eruption*. Almanac.com. <https://www.almanac.com/year-without-summer-mount-tambora-volcanic-eruption>

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.). *Haunted summer of 1816*. Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Haunted-Summer-of-1816>

Ulbricht, J. H. (2025). Nietzsche in National Socialism. A small exhibition on a major topic: A cabinet presentation at the Nietzsche-Archiv: 21 March – 1 November 2024. *Klassik Stiftung Weimar*. [https://doi.org/10.26013/ksw.pub\\_00000877](https://doi.org/10.26013/ksw.pub_00000877)