

Cover Letter

Of the variety of different types of writing we have experimented with in this class, the researched argument and Pecha Kucha seem to be the most different. At their heart both are pieces intended to argue one perspective as the most reasonable perspective available. With the Pecha Kucha this was done in a relatively informal light. For example, when writing my Pecha Kucha I ensured that I used humor occasionally. My artifact included a grisly depiction of a dead bird, so later in the piece I said “and back to the dead bird” while the slide switched to an almost comical cartoon including a dead bird. For a spoken piece it is vitally important that I maintain listener’s interest and humor can help with this.

This sort of approach would have been impossible in the researched argument. This style of writing is significantly more formal so while it is still important to maintain a reader’s interest, it would be wrong to use humor. Instead I had to rely on the strength and novelty of my argument. For example, I tried to have a strong thesis statement in the introduction to my essay, this focused on how *Frankenstein* is the story of *Prometheus* “cast in a modern light”. I felt by giving a novel approach I could maintain interest without attempts at humor

Even the approach taken to these different styles of writing was different. The researched argument required a general idea followed by hours of meticulous planning as I found each quote and reference I planned on using. This can be seen in the proposal that laid out the simplest form of the argument I wanted to make. The Pecha Kucha required as much time talking to myself as writing and I could write it in only two drafts. For both the research I did was

specific as I was searching for small facts to bolster my argument. However, while the Pecha Kucha's argument had to be airtight, I did not have to go into as much detail. It was more important that I presented it well, and this is how I spent most of my preparation time.

I feel that over the course of the semester my ability to respond in writing to other's arguments has improved greatly. This can be seen through a selection of my blog posts. In my first post from September 7th, I was only capable of summarizing the argument made and found it difficult to respond. In my post I quoted facts on the number of "case 1 crimes" and details on "project Angelfire", but didn't offer my own opinion.

By September 26th this had improved somewhat. I was capable of reading a section of *Super Sad True Love Story* and finding an appropriate image that captured the "character's reactions to the military presence." However, my discussion of the image and how it related to the story was simplistic and focused on description instead of evaluation.

In my post made on October 26th I have shown a massive improvement. I can summarize the core argument made by Enikő Maior around Lenny's "multi-faceted identity" and clarify how I would use it in my own essay. I mention how I might use it to show "Lenny and Eunice's conflicted personalities."

While I might have improved in my writing, I still have work to do in class discussions. Going forward I need to make more of an effort to listen and acknowledge that I have understood other's points before I continue. Perhaps by asking a question for clarification or summarizing their argument I can do this in future classes.

The final outcome is writing as a process. This is something that the structure of the class has hammered home. For every major piece of writing we were encouraged to step-by-step work on a single piece before we came to the final draft. This is clearest with the stages I went through to make my researched argument.

In my proposal and annotated bibliography I show the very first step I took. I display my original Idea, “How *Frankenstein* reflects many of the underlying themes found in *Prometheus*”. From then I start looking at the wider discussion around this topic, researching different scholars approaches to this topic and finding sources I would like to use in my paper. This forced me to consider the points I wanted to make and the ideas I would bring in before I had even begun my outline.

From there I made an outline and wrote a rough draft. The rough draft was my first attempt at writing and editing the essay and had many small problems that I needed to fix. I consistently referred to the story as a “hubristic warning” for example, which suggested entirely the wrong thing. By writing a rough draft I was able to review and improve my paper before I had to hand it in.

Going forward this is something I would like to do for all major papers I have to write. This many staged process may take longer to write, however, it means I write a more complete paper, with an airtight argument and sufficient examples. It is a skill I would like to develop throughout my academic career.

Literary Response Letter

Dear Diary, {THEONLINEDIARYSERVICEFORCHEAP} {UPGRADEFOREXTRAS}

OMG so much happened and last night was such a mess. So I went to that party. I get there and I'm just drinking and flirting with this girl, when this OAP corners me. This guy was wasted and kept staring at me all predator like, as if I were just some piece of meat (as if with his yellow, crooked teeth he could even still eat meat). So he just throws himself in front of me, kicking the cute chick I'd been chatting to away, and starts name-dropping like he is some big deal. IDK what he expected, like I was just meant to bow down and blow him or smthg. So cringe. But I'm trapped. Well, I keep drinking and making the eye at anyone, just begging to be saved, while he rambles about some sculpture he is making or some Contessa he was banging. He just goes on and on and on and on till finally another old dude basically falls into the conversation. I think he was called Lenny. Well then, get this, the OAP sculptor tries to introduce me and gets my name wrong. He calls me Eunice Kim, like any Asian name is good enough LMFAO. So the OAP sees Lenny as a rival and tries to exert his dominance or smthng IDK. I start watching Lenny and tuning out OAP. I see him and he just keeps drinking and drinking, so I decide to match him. I swear by my 5th glass Lenny was looking good (I mean not Lucca good, but wayyyy better than OAP, eww right?). Well I stop pretending to listen to OAP and the next thing I know he is fucking trying to manhandle me into kissing him. He was just shaking me like a doll. He made me spill my wine over my fucking jumper (that grey cashmere one Grillbitch got me). IDEK what happened next all I have is OAP losing his shit and Lenny and I running away.

So after that I was still pissed but Lenny was so clearly happy, NGL it was kinda infectious. He takes me to some restaurant full of drunk theatre kids and we just fuckin stuff ourselves. Like that meal was the best part of the evening. We

must've had four or five full meals. There were pig jowls in this tomato sauce; Lenny said it was Bucatini something but IDGI. Then we had the biggest portion of spicy eggplant spaghetti followed by this amazing rabbit dish. It was totally drowned in olive oil but sooo goood.

Lenny turned out to be pretty funny. Appaz he is one of those immortality salesmen and he was working out here (not very well). His flirting was soo bad though, he went from 0 to 100 super quick. He was saying how I should go with him to NY and marry him or something. TBF we were both pretty drunk, I mean, I told him about dad. I never tell people about dad. I also told him I'm probs a lesbo but he didn't even seem fazed. He just kept on flirting. Y'know despite OAP and everything else I actually had a good time during that dinner.

After we were both too full (I think I had a full-on foodbaby) we walked back to his tiny apartment. I don't think I really thought about what I was doing. Well we get to his one-room and he gets this look on his face just like OAP's earlier. So cus he had been nice and paid for dinner and all, I kiss him. (I cant even believe I did that, like he had bunions, and such old man feet!!!) but I was drunk so we both stripping naked and I see he couldn't even get it. His dick just hung there limp and sad (ew). Finally he convinces me to let him eat me out. I was so full and still drunk and tbh all I wanted was to sleep, but I figured maybe cus he was old he'd know what he was doing atleast. TBH he wasn't bad at it, I mean, he was great till he passed out still with his head between my fucking thighs. I was so done I didn't even bother moving him, I just slept like that with this old hairy guy passed out on top of me (bleak.)

This morning I woke up and Lenny was not cute anymore. He was just this OAP with ugly feet. I had to spend like half an hour helping him pack, but

that isn't even the saddest part. I legit had to teach him how to brush his teeth.

Um, WTF, who doesn't know how to brush their teeth?????? Ugh, I need to shower. I'll finish this later. Euni-tard out.

{THEONLINEDIARYSERVICEFORCHEAP} {UPGRADEFOREXTRAS}

Reflection

With this assignment I decided to structure it as a diary entry from Eunice's perspective. In the book this entire section is from Lenny's point of view and I thought it might be interesting to show how Eunice's memories might be drastically different to Lenny's. With the style, I wanted the entire thing to seem genuine and private. So I wrote as if she wasn't holding anything back, just spilling her thoughts onto the pages of a private diary. To achieve that I first went back to the book to collect information. After I had written out all the details of the evening I read through the section written by Eunice to get an idea of how she might write.

While I find writing in a very informal relaxed style very easy, I found it very difficult trying to avoid using English slang. Naturally the words I wanted to use would have made Eunice sound British. I feel a weakness of this letter is that I don't know American slang very well and so was forced to reuse certain Acronyms and phrases.

Pecha Kucha

Hi I'm Lucas. Today I'm going to be speaking a little bit about Greenpeace, about the environment and about one image in particular that will be on the next slide.

Now this image is part of a campaign Greenpeace had a number of years ago. It was meant to draw attention to the effects of littering on the environment. A serious problem since every year enough plastic is thrown away to circle the earth four times.

You're probably wondering where all this trash goes. The answer is that what doesn't end up in landfills, goes to the Great Pacific Garbage Patch. Which does exist, and is off the coast of California. It is the largest oceanic garbage site in the world.

Plastic in the ocean breaks down into such small segments, that small amounts of a one-litre bottle could end up in every beach of the world. Its these tiny pieces that do so much damage to animals. Which brings us back to the dead bird

Clearly this is an important issue, and its good that Greenpeace is drawing attention to it. However, it doesn't take too much research to realise Greenpeace may not actually be doing this out of some sort of love for the natural world

Instead it seems as if Greenpeace's primary motivation is somewhat more financial. As a charity it has received a C grade from the independent charity watchdog, Charity watch.

Though it pitches itself as an underdog taking on the government and big business. It's actually a good example of big business itself. In 2012 (the year this

poster was made) it dedicated half of the 368 million dollars it raised from fundraising into advertising campaigns and campaign support.

In actual fact Greenpeace likes to talk big, but it rarely does any real work. On average only 6% of its revenue goes towards fieldwork, or solving the problems it so often talks about, while 60% goes towards salaries.

Despite this, the one thing Greenpeace is truly good at is advertising. Their advertisements are strong, they remain with us, if we're honest they are the reason we even know about Greenpeace.

Lets take a look at another example. Each advert I looked at was effective and powerful. Each advert would play with the audience's emotions and genuinely get past the apathy most people feel over matters like this.

However, more often than not they seem to be more focused on scare mongering than actually raising awareness. In 2006 they accidentally released an internal document, which legitimately said

"In the twenty years since the Chernobyl tragedy there have been nearly [FILL IN ALARMIST and ARMEGEDDONIST FACTOID HERE]" that was there exact language

The problem with all this is they could be doing so much good. As an international charity, with a recognisable name and a fantastic advertising team, they could be making a change in the world

So often they touch on real problems. In this campaign they once again touch on the affect that trash is having on the environment. But again instead of putting the money raised towards solving anything, they just return it to their own bank accounts.

All of this information comes down to two statements. The environment is messed up and Greenpeace is in a fantastic position to do something about it, but instead just line their own pockets

Which brings us back to the original advert. We now know the issue it discusses; we know the sordid history of the company that created it, now lets discuss how effective it is.

The advert clearly, like most of their other adverts, relies heavily on pathos. The dead bird is shocking enough to grab the audience's attention and twist their emotions. This it does very effectively, more than that the image is graphic enough to stay with the audience for a time.

Another reason the advert is effective is its use of colors. It matches the red of the Coca Cola logo with the red of the birds visceral. This very visually ties the blame to Coca Cola and makes the message abundantly clear.

Finally though the Greenpeace logo is small, it is on the poster. This is to some extent using Ethos, or the credibility they believe that their logo represents to give the poster the same credibility.

Overall, I'd say that though the poster might effectively communicate the message, and raise awareness of an issue. The logo and company are using this message to convince people to donate to them and then squandering their money, instead of actually doing some good in the world

Blog Posts

Posted September 7th

In the Past year there have been 10,000 part 1 crimes in Daton, Ohio. That means 10,000 murders, rapes, and assaults. Ross McNutt believes project Angelfire can change all that. The project is a plane with a high-powered camera strapped to its base, photographing and storing every moment of a day. He has proven that this system works. It has let police and law enforcement agencies remove dangerous people from the street in hours. It could also be used to track known criminals and discover more about their associates and colleagues than we would have found out through traditional policing. Though this may feel like a loss of privacy, the only people who should really fear this surveillance are criminals. For the average person, this technology just means a safer city with better, more targeted policing.

Here, many people would object that we couldn't trust a government with this level of power. They would suggest that this technology is wide open to misuse. This level of access and knowledge would leave every person with a private life open to blackmail and stalking. It would only take one person with low-level clearance and all your daily habits could be sold to the nearest tabloid. So though this type of technology might stop crimes, it would also set a dangerous precedent. With technology advancing so much, we need to decide how much privacy we as a people need and how much access to our personal life our government deserves.

Posted September 26th

The scene I have chosen is on page 42 and 43. In this scene Lenny disembarks the plane at the urging of military officers. After leaving the plane he is directed to the 'security shed', where he is told to wait with the other passengers. While waiting a tank rolls up and a soldier places a sign near the tank effectively barring anyone from actively recognising the existence of the tank.

The character's reactions to the military presence at the airport struck me as particularly dystopian. Instead of surprise or anger, each American seems to feel genuine fear. The jock sat next to Lenny even raises his fingers to his lips, as if to suggest that Lenny would be fine as long as he doesn't grab their attention.



I chose this image, as I feel it shows how even today airport security has the same militarised aspect to it. A genuine photo of people heading through security at an airport would have been too recognisable, and so we wouldn't have noticed how totalitarian the scene seems to be. By showing this through Lego, we get a clear sense of how, like the jock, we just attempt to go through security quietly with our eyes averted so as to avoid falling under TSA's scrutiny.

October 15th

Jessica Hale makes the argument that the nuclear family portrayed in Shelley's *Frankenstein* is a comment on both the strict gender binary of 18th century English society and of the dangers in separating the public sphere and private sphere. She discusses how the nuclear family is based on a power inequality between the elder Frankenstein's that leaves Caroline (and eventually Elizabeth) trapped in a domestic role. Then by showing how the domestic life and public life are displayed as incompatible Jessica comes to the conclusion that Shelley was commenting on the set roles women were forced into.

In Her section discussing Freud and Frankenstein Jessica does a close reading of pg 122 of *Frankenstein*. In this passage The Monster is examining a small portrait of Caroline Beaufort around William's neck

In the same section she uses a secondary source to support her argument. The source is a book written by Leo Bersani called *The Freudian Beauty*. In this book Bersani discusses a specific idea, that Hale then brings into her argument to strengthen her claims.

There were a few terms that, though I could understand within context, I had trouble pinning a direct definition. One term was "chattel". It is defined as "a moveable possession: any possession or piece of property other than real estate or a freehold." To go about finding this definition I first went to the Oxford English Dictionary's online website and searched it. There were a variety of definitions available and even the etymology, however, after reading through them this seemed to be the definition that made the most sense in context.

October 26th

The author of this piece goes into great detail discussing the multi-faceted identity that Lenny Abramov exhibits. The author discusses to what extent Lenny identifies with his American-Jewish heritage and they examine the roles that jewish characters have within the novel. After this they look into Lenny's Russian heritage and his inner confusion surrounding his own cultural background. The

author concludes that at the end of the novel, Lenny has returned to his Jewish roots, in doing so made a pact with god, and left his Russian heritage behind.

The author uses an argument made by Michiko Kakutani to bolster their own essay. The argument is a brief description of Super Sad True Love Story, that describes it as a novel with a dark future yet deeply sweet love story. The author then shows this throughout their writing. They display how the book relays this dismal future. Where America is "on the brink of fiscal collapse" and the government is falling apart around the main characters. Yet they also discuss the sweetness of Lenny and Eunice's relationship, and even if the two characters are undeniably flawed the love story portrayed is seen to be all the more real for it.

I think that I am going to look into the nature of modern dating as portrayed by Super Sad True Love Story. To do that i'm going to have to discuss the mixed backgrounds and identities of all the books characters. So i might use this essay to help discuss both Lenny and Eunice's conflicted personalities.

[link](#)

November 17th

I have yet to decide which blog posts I shall choose to use for my Final Portfolio. However I feel like it would be important to show how my blog posts have progressed and improved over time. With this in mind, I will definitely be choosing my first blog post "eye in the sky". From there I will choose four other posts that I feel truly reflect how I have improved over the course of the term.

From there I feel I will display everything but my literary analysis letter as I feel this work best shows my skills in writing. Of course, as I haven't handed in my final paper or received commentary on my first draft this isn't certain. However, I feel that even if my first draft doesn't receive great feedback I may include it to contrast against the final paper, which will hopefully be much improved.

The section I would respond to is section 3: writing as a process. In the preparation of my rough draft I went through a long series of steps. I already had the outline of the essay and the broad idea, however, I decided it would be important to reread Frankenstein in its entirety with my chosen topic in mind. After that I reread all the suggested sources I had planned on including on my essay. During all this I kept a series of small notes on my phone with page references and ideas that I felt would be helpful for my rough draft. Before I started actually writing I spent an hour or so fully planning the essay and deciding upon its final structure. I then left it for a day before I began writing. The reason I left is I feel that I write better essays when I have had plenty of time to consider them and think through any potential ideas I need to include. When I started writing I wrote the entire paper in one go, before almost totally rewriting it as I went back over every section to ensure they made sense. I then edited it twice more before handing it in for submission.

Proposal and annotated bibliography

For my essay I will be looking at how Frankenstein reflects many of the same underlying fears seen in the myth of Prometheus. Specifically, I will focus on how both stories deal with humanity using newfound understanding of the

universe to raise itself to the level of the gods and suffering harshly as a result. These similarities show a fear shared between two vastly different civilizations that may be common to humanity at large. For my essay I will be using scholarly articles about both *Prometheus Unbound* (Aeschylus) and *Frankenstein* to bring in new ideas and bolster my own conclusions. I may also reference recent literature or television to show how this phenomenon continues into the present.

Annotated bibliography

Forrest, Jennifer. *Science Fiction before 1900: Imagination Discovers Technology*. South Central Review, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring, 1996), pp. 58-60

In this Jennifer Forrest discusses how it was the industrial revolution that brought around science fiction such as Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. She also considers how Science Fiction as a genre often considers moral dilemmas and can be used to reflect on the morals of a society.

I would use parts of her argument to strengthen my own, specifically bringing in her discussion of the industrial revolution, however, I would also disagree that this is the direct result of modern technology. Instead suggesting that it is an increase in scientific understanding generally that leads to works such as *Frankenstein* or *Prometheus Unbound*.

M. A. Goldberg. Moral and Myth in Mrs. Shelley's "Frankenstein" *Keats-Shelley Journal*, Vol. 8, Part 1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 27-38

In this the author discusses the moral aspect to Frankenstein. They go into detail around how the crime committed by Victor Frankenstein is not one of hubris but instead a societal crime, a sin committed against society more than the gods.

I would like to use this source to expand my discussion of the moral aspect of Frankenstein's crime. By bringing in how his actions are a crime against society, I can compare it to the crime committed by Prometheus and contrast the differing morals of both societies.

Olga Raggio. The Myth of Prometheus: Its Survival and Metamorphoses up to the Eighteenth Century. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 21, No. 1/2 (Jan. - Jun., 1958), pp. 44-62

In this Olga Raggio goes into great detail noting how the Myth of Prometheus evolved over time from Aeschylus to the late 18th Century. This document is full of useful information regarding the Prometheus myth and how it has

interacted with each era. In my paper I would like to focus on Raggio's section on Prometheus during the early 1800's as a way of noting similarities between the myth and the novel.

Haste Helen. Myths, monsters, and morality Understanding 'antiscience' and the media message. *Interdisciplinary science reviews* Volume 22, Issue 2 (01 June 1997) pp. 114-120

In this the author discusses how the monsters of myths and stories help us make sense of our cultures changing sense of morality. Helen Haste goes into more detail around how the "antiscience" portrayed in science fiction is often just the crossover between scientific development and cultural understanding. I chose to use this essay as the author looks at pieces of fiction spanning from Ancient Greek Mythology to Jurassic Park, while focusing on the science of science fiction. I disagree with some of her conclusions around science and antiscience and would like to use her ideas as a contradictory opinion (or a they say I say structure) in my essay.

Rough draft

Knowledge as Fire in *Frankenstein: The Modern Prometheus*

Stories of forbidden knowledge are often deeply religious ones. From Adam and Eve eating the apple to Prometheus stealing fire from the Olympians it

has remained at the core of many major faiths. In America today we hear discussions around whether the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is moral, with huge debates around stem cell research and controversy on animal testing. In the novel *Frankenstein* we see a similar story cast in a modern light. Victor Frankenstein represents man trying through taboo knowledge to steal power from the gods and his tale is one of Hubris. In trying to make himself as great as a god by discovering information that only gods should have, he damns himself.

This essay will explore how *Frankenstein* is the modern Prometheus in that it too is a hubristic warning on the dangers of scientific inquiry into the realm of the gods.

1. Prometheus

Mary Shelley gave the chosen novel two titles. The first is *Frankenstein* and in doing so she centered the novel on Victor Frankenstein's follies instead, as others might suggest, on Elizabeth's love or the Monster's rage. However, she also gave it a subtitle, *The Modern Prometheus*. In doing so she forced the reader to consider this novel in comparison to the myth and its associated message.

Though there are many differing interpretations of the myth, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Unbound* reflects a version of this myth that fits best with the novel. In this Prometheus receives and gives "not only the physical fire in the fennel stalk, but also the subtler fire of reason and wisdom" (Raggio, 45). While in other myths he only gives fire, in this the added layer of forbidden knowledge is included. The fire was too much for man and with wisdom and knowledge came war.

Prometheus was a titan and not a god himself, so his theft from the Olympians required a punishment. Prometheus' story is similar to that of Frankenstein. He intends to find knowledge only the deities should know and to give it to humanity, however his actions have unintended consequences and he is punished severely. Frankenstein acknowledges that it is his scientific discoveries to blame when he describes his misfortune as the result of the "intoxicating draught" (12) that forbidden knowledge represented.

2. Becoming God

Shelley clearly shows Victor's desire to become godlike throughout the novel; an example of this is on page 32. In this passage Frankenstein has just discovered the key to reanimating dead flesh and decided upon his course. His intentions are originally pure but soon his ego becomes involved. He begins to imagine himself as great as a god himself as we see when he says a "new species would bless [him] as its creator and source". Shelley uses language of obsession to show the turn in his intentions. She describes him as a "hurricane, in the first enthusiasm of its success". This line is telling as it shows him to be destructive even as he imagines himself as a "creator". It's only later in the novel on page 35 that Frankenstein realizes his folly. He had "selected [the monster's] features as beautiful" but instead upon seeing the monster for the first time "breathless horror and disgust filled [his] heart". At this point the reader is made aware of why some information is better left unknown, as it is suggested that though he had dreamed of a new better species his creation was truly a monster. When Prometheus gave men fire, he also gave them war. Much in the same way, though

Frankenstein's intentions had once been pure, he soon longed for glory and power and the result was truly horrific. Frankenstein and Prometheus both attempted to raise humanity to the level of the gods but their actions led to chaos.

3. Hubris

M. A. Goldberg suggests that Frankenstein's crime is societal instead of Hubristic. She suggests that by neglecting his loved ones and obligations he sins "against the moral and social order" (33). Though I agree that he has failed to fulfill his obligations (to Elizabeth or his father) in the pursuit of knowledge, I don't believe that this precludes him from committing a hubristic crime. The concept of hubris is from ancient Greece and was deeply intertwined with their concept of piety.

Piety (Eusebia) in ancient Greece was a term that had twofold meaning. It meant both respect due to the gods and respect due to society. This is a concept that had a very similar place in the regency era of British society. The idea that to praise God one had to maintain a strict social order was ingrained in British society. So when Frankenstein fails to live up to his obligations, or comes to believe that the search for hidden knowledge supersedes societal obligations, he is placing himself above God. In this way as well it is clear that it is more fitting to describe his crime as hubristic than societal .

4. The Mariner

Throughout the novel Shelley also makes reference to other works in which the primary character commits an act of Hubris, most notably the Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner. We see this when Walton in his writing to his sister assures her that though he is heading to the “land of ice and snow” (10) he will kill no albatross. We also see it when Frankenstein is chasing the monster he is described “Like one who, on a lonely road, / Doth walk in fear and dread”. These small references help bolster my argument that this novel is a warning on hubris. Shelley placed them in the novel sure that this influential work would have been recognised by her readers.

5. Punishment

For his crime to be a hubristic one though, he must face a punishment by the gods. For Prometheus this was being chained to a rock, having his liver pecked out every day by an eagle only to regrow at night. The punishment delivered is intense and unending. Goldberg would suggest that the death of his loved ones is the price he pays, however, it would seem that that is just an aspect of his punishment. After Elizabeth’s murder, Frankenstein dedicates his life to hunting down and destroying his creation describing his urge to revenge as “the devouring and only passion of [his] soul” (148). This would seem to be a major part of the punishment he faces. Much like how Prometheus is both ostracised and brought low by his crime, Frankenstein is changed from a man focused on life and creation to a man outside of society fixated on destruction. This would be the true punishment he faces for discovering forbidden knowledge and challenging god. This in many ways is typical of the punishments facing those

who commit hubristic crimes. Much like Prometheus the punishment seems purposeless and unending, with only death as a salvation from the curse.

6. The science of Frankenstein

An interesting aspect of the novel is the science that Frankenstein uses to bring the monster to life. If I were to continue the comparison with Prometheus, the science fulfills the same role that the fire does in the myth. However, unlike the fire it is a matter for discussion itself. The novel *Frankenstein* is often described as the first science fiction novel. While this is clearly true, I feel it also fits within the same genre that Prometheus and countless other stories have before it. Helen Haste discusses how science and our perception of science “mesh with public consciousness and tap into deep anxieties” (Haste, 116). She continues by describing how science is often viewed in such a light that many believe “that if you are too curious, you will unleash demons that you cannot control” (Haste 116). With this she is communicating how there is a stark difference between the actual capabilities of scientific discoveries and the perceived capabilities. More than that, she shows how these fears “surface in stereotypes, in fantasy and in rational critiques” (Haste, 116). This idea that cultural misunderstanding of science leads to a deep rooted fear of its capabilities seems apparent in the novel *Frankenstein*. At the time that *Frankenstein* was being written, England was in the early stages of the industrial revolution. Every day new discoveries were being made about the world around us. However, these discoveries translated poorly to the general public in the same way they do today. Any tabloid newspaper sold today will have lurid

stories describing the dangers of some new scientific discovery. It is this miscommunication that leads to the anxiety that is present in any hubristic story. When Aeschylus was writing *Prometheus Unbound* ancient Greek society was in a state of discovery similar to the industrial revolution. The ancient Greeks had just entirely changed their view of the world from Classical cosmology to Ptolemaic cosmology. His play was reflecting the same anxiety, that these discoveries would threaten the gods and society would pay for scientist's curiosity.

7. Conclusion

It is through a variety of means that Shelley makes *Frankenstein* a novel focused on Hubris. By titling it *The Modern Prometheus* she forces readers to view the story through the lens of the myth of Prometheus and its associated hubristic message. The story itself follows traditional paths when she lets Victor Frankenstein set himself up as a god, only to damn himself through his arrogance. Throughout the novel she makes references to the mariner, a famous tale of hubris and the punishment Frankenstein faces is not so dissimilar to those faced in ancient myths with the same message.

While some might suggest Frankenstein's crime was societal, it is clear that this is simply an aspect of his Hubris. More than that, as Helen Haste suggests the science fiction aspect of this novel is simply a new twist on a very old theme. Overall, the story represented in *Frankenstein* was clearly intended to be a warning from Mary Shelley on the potential ramifications that she believed scientific discoveries would lead to.

Bibliography

Forrest, Jennifer. *Science Fiction before 1900: Imagination Discovers Technology*.

South Central Review, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring, 1996), pp. 58-60

M. A. Goldberg. Moral and Myth in Mrs. Shelley's "Frankenstein" Keats-Shelley

Journal, Vol. 8, Part 1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 27-38

Olga Raggio. The Myth of Prometheus: Its Survival and Metamorphoses up to the

Eighteenth Century. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 21, No.

1/2 (Jan. - Jun., 1958), pp. 44-62

Haste Helen. Myths, monsters, and morality Understanding 'antiscience' and the

media message. *Interdisciplinary science reviews* Volume 22, Issue 2 (01 June

1997) pp. 114-120

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein: The Modern Prometheus*. Dover Thrift Edition

(1994)

H. Martin, Luther. *Hellenistic Religions An Introduction*. Oxford University Press

(1987)

