



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET  
INST FÖR SPRÅK OCH LITTERATURER

ENGLISH

**Frankenstein**  
**Or,**  
**The Voice of Chaos**

A Psychoanalytical Reading of Mary Shelley's Journey  
Into the Subconscious of a Gifted Mind

**Filip V. Svensson**

BA Thesis  
Spring 2013

Supervisor:  
Fereshteh Zangenehpour  
Examiner:  
Margrét Gunnarsdóttir Champion

**Title:** *Frankenstein, Or the Voice of Chaos; A Psychoanalytical Reading of Mary Shelley's Journey Into the Subconscious of a Gifted Mind*

**Author:** Filip V. Svensson

**Supervisor:** Fereshteh Zangenehpour

**Abstract:** The aim of this essay is to trace *Frankenstein* back to its origin in an attempt to revisit the creative 'chaos' behind Shelley's gothic horror story, in order to unveil a hitherto undiscovered latent meaning that lurks behind the narrative structure. By subjecting Shelley's *Frankenstein* to a psychoanalysis that draws on Freud in focusing on the 'dream' as wish fulfillment, while showing how a formalist approach can be a part of psychoanalysis by the introduction of Maslowian theory, along with the incorporation of a proposed cognitive disposition of the implied author into the analysis – this essay, in a sense, seeks not only to offer an original reading of Mary Shelley's 'hideous progeny', but also to revive the (in the wake of New Criticism) somewhat forgotten author herself.

**Keywords:** *Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley, Sigmund Freud, Abraham Maslow, David Hume, James T. Webb, psychoanalysis, implied author, giftedness

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction	3
Chapter One: Structure, Voice and World	9
Chapter Two: Victor, the Monster and Clerval as Wish Fulfillment	14
Chapter Three: A Sea of Ice	18
Conclusion	25
Bibliography	26

## Introduction

I have always felt that there is something special with Romantic literature; that it has a certain impact or a certain authenticity to it. It feels like some semi translucent veil has been drawn away, rendering the words naked; clearer. Percy Shelley claimed that the words of the best authors of the day burns with “[...] an electric life [...]” (qtd. in Stillinger and Lynch 7), and frankly, I could not agree more. Perhaps the reason for this is to be found in the way the words themselves were conceived? As it were, the Romantics had a certain view on art, and subsequently about the very act of creation itself. As a reaction against empiricist philosophy and the scientific mentality of the age, the Romantics in “[...] attempt to reach behind the sensuous screen of ordinary knowledge [...]” (Dickie 49) looked inwards, into their very souls, putting focus “[...] on the individual consciousness” (Stillinger and Lynch 7) as they sought to imbue their art with an almost transcendent quality. This introspective view on art made Wordsworth conclude that the source of the poem does not lie in nature, but in the psychology of the individual poet; that the material of the poem thus represents the inner feelings of the author (Stillinger and Lynch 9), and furthermore that all good poetry at the moment of its conception is wrought by the “[...] spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings” (qtd. in Stillinger and Lynch 9). Although Mary Shelley was not a poet by definition, her creative process – carefully described in the Author’s Introduction to *Frankenstein* – certainly bears the mark of the Romantics as she was overwhelmed by the idea as it presented itself to her in a waking dream. In fact, Shelley almost paraphrases Wordsworth in stating that “[i]nvention [...] does not consist of creating out of void, but out of chaos [...]” (8).

With this “[...] Romantic interest in the mysteries of mental life [...]” (Stillinger and Lynch 14) in mind, it is quite clear that *Frankenstein* – what Shelley herself calls her “[...] hideous progeny [...]” (10) – is by no means just a scary story, nor is it a mere critique of the human endeavors into the field of natural philosophy. No; I claim that it is a journey into the subconscious world of a troubled mind, were the passions of a gifted soul battle for their very existence, and thus of the very soul itself; it is a journey into ‘chaos’. Therefore, the aim of this essay is to trace *Frankenstein* back to its origin in an attempt to revisit the creative forces behind this ‘hideous progeny’, and thus unveil the latent desire that lurks beneath the surface of the manifest; that is to say: to shine a new light on the vivid darkness that permeates Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*.

The theme of suicide is no stranger to literature; in fact, one of the most famous lines in literary history is about this very subject, immortalized in Hamlet's famous soliloquy in the words: "To be, or not to be, that is the question [...]" (Shakespeare 77). However, I do not believe that the ultimate question has been posed in such an intricate and elaborate a matter as in Shelley's *Frankenstein*; a carefully crafted narration that lures the reader in, giving the reader a sense of being completely immersed in another type of existence altogether; an existence where the voiced characters in presenting their story are at the same time representing a part of the psychic realm which they inhabit, and how they use other characters and events to understand themselves – and to impose their will on, not just others, but on the very existence itself. Or, to paraphrase Ingmar Bergman's 1957 epic "The Seventh Seal": it is a subconscious a game of chess, between the will to live, and the will to die.

With a theme that grapples with the existential anguish of the human condition along with Shelley's own testimony of 'chaos', *Frankenstein* is a narrative that gives a sense of wanting to be understood on a deeper level; it beckons the reader into the realm of the subconscious, and thus into the art of psychoanalysis.

Previous psychoanalytical readings of *Frankenstein* have put focus on the relation between *the mother* (the desire thereof), *the father* (the identification, and/or competition with said parent for the attention and love of the mother) and that of the infant's realization of the world and self identification, such as in Sherwin's Freudian article "*Frankenstein: Creation as Catastrophe*".

The psychoanalytical pioneer Sigmund Freud has been a great benefactor to the field of literary psychoanalysis. Perhaps his greatest contribution is introducing the aforementioned Oedipal complex; "[f]alling in love with one parent and hating the other [...]" (1899:159) as well as proclaiming the libido to be a major force behind the endeavors of the human soul; making it a frequently addressed source of action and general motif. However, the Austrian neurologist also introduced a structural model of the mind that has come to shape the very essence of psychoanalysis.

This theoretical representation of the mind, first presented as a whole in the publication *The Ego and the Id*, provides a model of the mind which explains the interplay between the conscious and the unconscious. What Freud calls the *ego* represents a semi-conscious part of the mind that is "[...] essentially the representative of the external world [...]" (1923-1925:36) and whose function is to act as a mediator between the unconscious – the *id*, and reality. This mysterious *id* is in turn the "[...] unknown [...]" (ibid); the deepest part of the

mind, containing our primal urges and our “[...] passions.” (25). This Freudian relationship between the passions and the world – between the unconscious urges and the rules of society – has been frequently addressed as a means of explaining the nature of the monster in *Frankenstein*, and has paved way for critics such as Reisner who claims the monster to symbolize the *id*; “[w]hether presented abstractly as the Freudian id or imagistically as Shelley’s Monster [...]” (86). There are, however, other theoretical models that seek to explain the mysteries of the mind, such as “the basic need hierarchy”, proposed by the American psychologist Abraham H. Maslow (15).

Whereas Freud sought to explain the interplay between the conscious and the unconscious, Maslow – who “[...] in spite of the revolutionary and controversial nature of [...] [his] work” was elected president of the American Psychological Association in 1967 (Maslow xl) – puts focus on the urges that, according to him, shape and determines our behavior. In his work *Motivation and Personality*, Maslow sought to explain our actions in terms of the aforementioned hierarchy of needs; a theory of human motivation that states that the most basic needs must first be met in order for us to move up the hierarchy and attempt to fulfill a need less crucial to our existence (15-26). For instance, Maslow claimed that in order to fulfill the proposed need of self-actualization, one must first be safe and have access to adequate food etc. (ibid). In terms of literary analysis and the psychoanalytical interpretation of symbolism within *Frankenstein*, Maslow appears to be a rather untapped source.

The reason for this might be that other, more frequently appearing psychoanalytical approaches, explicitly deals with the interpretation of symbolism<sup>1</sup>. Such approaches include the teachings of the psychologist Carl Gustav Jung, who in turn elaborates on Freud’s work on the interpretation of dreams. According to the latter, the use of symbolism within the dream-work is a part of a ‘distortion’; a censure of “[...] unconscious wishes [...] on their way to consciousness [...]” (Cain et al. 15); i.e. the creation of an image or event that substitutes the – for some reason – forbidden nature of the unconscious wish in order to let the mind act out on whims and wishes that under normal circumstances would be considered taboo or inappropriate. This is also the basic Freudian argument for the dream as wish fulfillment (Freud 1899:33). Jung, however, being a believer in a collective unconscious,

---

<sup>1</sup> Another reason might be the fact that the Maslowian contribution to psychology was presented in the mid-nineteen fifties; a time when literary analysis had already taken a turn towards New Criticism (Cain et al. 17), which is an approach to literature that almost by definition rules out psychoanalysis as a futile attempt of searching for a none-existing intention in an author that does not matter.

argued that the symbols within the dream-work are of different nature and origin; constructed universal archetypes: “[...] primordial and universal images [...]” that hold a general meaning drawn from the collective unconscious of the human race (Carter 79). However beneficial to the society of literary criticism in terms of the illumination of illusive imagery in poetry and literature, the claim of a collective unconscious is daring, and that we are able to draw meaning from this collective is an even bolder one.

Whereas Jungian psychoanalysis is looking to incorporate a symbolic framework of general meaning, a strict Freudian approach presupposes that there is in fact no fixed meaning to symbolism within the dream-work, and furthermore that meaning is to be deciphered in collaboration with the dreamer, or as Freud himself puts it: “Generally speaking, we are not in a position to interpret another person’s dream if he is unwilling to furnish us with the unconscious thoughts that lie behind the dream content [...]” (Freud 1899:140). Thus, according to Freud, the dreamer’s ability to mirror and reflect upon the content of the dream-work is an essential component in the process of deciphering the dream-work. But if this is so, how come Freudian theory came to be such an inspiration to literary critics, and what has dreams got to do with literature?

In Freud’s ground breaking *The Interpretation of Dreams* – the work that instigated the entire movement of literary psychoanalysis – Freud exudes an outspoken fascination for the creative process, a process, that Freud argues, is not unlike the process of dreaming. In dreaming, or rather in deciphering the symbolism of the dream, the dreamer has to be open to “[...]’freely rising’ ideas [...]” (Freud 1899:14); this is a mindset where anything and everything is allowed as an attempt to bypass the intellectual censorship of forbidden ideas. This does not only let the dreamer access the true meaning of the dream, but also in a way, to heed to a message from the subconscious. This, argues Freud, is also “[...] the essential condition of poetical creation [...]” (ibid) and furthermore concurs with the philosopher-poet Friedrich Schiller who attests that “[i]n the case of a creative mind, [...] the intellect has withdrawn its watchers from the gates, and the ideas rush in pell-mell, and only then does it review and inspect the multitude.” (Freud 15); an account of creativity that is not at all unlike the creative process that Shelley, 80 years earlier, described as creating not “[...] out of void, but out of chaos [...]” (8).

Therefore, I aim to decipher Shelley’s self-proclaimed creation out of ‘chaos’ through the eyes of Freudian psychoanalysis, focusing on the latent meaning of repressed emotions, wishes and forbidden desires in disguise, i.e. of the manifest expression; and thus on the

‘dream’ as wish fulfillment, but also in arguing how the narrative structure of *Frankenstein* is a part of the manifest expression, show how a formalist approach can be a part of psychoanalysis; that is to say: I will relate the narrative structure to the notion of psychological depth. However, rather than utilizing the Freudian model of the mind, that is to say the relationship between the ego and the id, I aim to provide a different take on the matter altogether in basing the analysis on the Maslowian theory of the basic need hierarchy. Furthermore, I will attempt to relate the narrative levels of *Frankenstein* to the cognitive characteristics of the author; thus providing an alternate view of the novel as well as putting focus on the latent meaning behind the collapse of the narrative structure itself.

However, in order to interpret *Frankenstein* as a communiqué of the subconscious, the reasonable approach according to Freud would be to invite the author into the process. Otherwise; the entire analysis would rest upon the arguably false assumption that all artistic expressions are to be interpreted in a straightforward psychoanalytical fashion – with no real regard to the individual whose psyche, or ‘chaos’, lies behind the ‘dream-content’. Or as Carter comments: “[...] a whole range of literary analysis and theory has now come to be termed psychoanalytic by virtue of its practitioners proclaiming it so.” (70). However, there is a way around this seemingly insurmountable obstacle: the reanimation of the debated concept of the implied author.

The idea of an implied author was first introduced by Wayne C. Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, and has since been the subject of much debate and controversy, seemingly due to an ambiguous definition of the concept; leaving the fundamental question of just who the creator of the implied author actually is somewhat unanswered; the author, or the reader? According to Professor of English at the Peking University and consultant editor of *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory* PhD. Dan Shen, what Booth aimed to propose was that “[...] the ‘writer’ may enter into a state of mind [...] when writing.” or that it is “[...] a matter of the writing process's leading one into a certain state of mind.” and furthermore that the implied author thus is “[...] the textual image of this writer for the reader to infer [...]” (*What is the Implied Author?*); ergo, the concept of an implied author invites the reader to create an image of the author based on the textual decisions of said author through a reader-response-type interpretation, where the reader’s accumulated knowledge of the world (which the author is an inevitable part of) plays a key part in inferring the image of the perceived creator.

Since Shelley, the creator of *Frankenstein*; a considerably complex piece of art, managed to conceive it at the mere age of 18, the inferred image of the author in this reading is thus one



of the author being highly intelligent, or rather, what psychologists would consider 'gifted'. However, studies show that being gifted – with all the benefits attached – is a gift that comes with a price; that the ability to see the world for what it truly is often proves to be a harrowing experience that sends the sensitive soul into doubt, despair and sometimes into the very brink of existence (Webb et al). The image of the implied author also holds the information about Shelley's life that the Penguin Popular Classics edition of *Frankenstein* kindly related, such as Shelley "[f]inding herself bereft of emotional attention [...]" as the death of her mother left her in the emotionally cold care of a philosopher father. Thus, these are topics of this essay, and will be explored in the following fashion:

In the first chapter I will analyze how the implied author orchestrates a sense of immersion into the realm itself, and also – as the narrative structure descends the Maslowian depths – creates an immersion into the subconscious world of the implied author. I will also argue that the characters are connected to each other via the realm itself, and furthermore that the realm also commands them; making the characters the embodiment of the latent wills and wishes of the realm. In the second chapter, I aim to show that Victor, Clerval and the monster are all infused with different key characteristics of a gifted mind; i.e. the characters as wish fulfillment. In chapter three, I will show how the implied author illustrates the collapse of the realm itself; how the raging battle of the psyche forces the Maslowian levels to merge in a clash of passions; how the will to live is fighting a losing battle against the will to die; sending the realm of the implied author on a one way path to a latent suicide.

## Chapter One: Structure, Voice and World

In this first chapter, I will give a brief analysis of the narrative structure of the novel in order to show how the implied author manufactures the transition from the outer world into the subconscious, providing a sense of immersion into a world that appears to be the same, but at the same time is not. I will also argue that the narrative technique serves the function of a “character” in its own right; that as such, it is the narrator of the realm itself; the unified voice of the subconscious world of the implied author – or; the voice of ‘chaos’. Furthermore, I will argue that the narrative structure serves yet another critical function to this psychoanalytical reading; that the layering of the frames not only corresponds with the depth of the psyche in terms of an increasing level of distortion of the *manifest* expression in correlation to the increasing complexity of the *latent* content, but also that to the Maslowian needs of the human soul. This last concept, however, will be more thoroughly dealt with in the forthcoming chapters as it, in its nature, touches upon the core of the thesis and therefore only the basic premises for this reading will be revealed at this early stage of the journey. The final topic of this chapter concerns the realm itself, and specifically how the subconscious of the implied author is not only given a voice through the characters, but also commands them; forces them to act on its whims by the infusion of “passions”; proving that the characters themselves are in fact the *manifestation* of *latent* desires.

The narrative structure of *Frankenstein* differs from most novels in terms of its diegetic complexity (the term diegesis in literature is used to indicate that a storyline is being narrated by the author or a character, as opposed to enacted by the characters, which in that case is termed mimesis (Quinn 87)). As stories generally unfold in the storyline of the main characters, i.e. on the intradiegetic level, the narrative of *Frankenstein* on the other hand orchestrates a journey into the very narrative itself, as the onset of the story is told by Walton on the extradiegetic level, that is to say the level in which Walton retells the events of the intradiegetic level – events that in turn are relayed to him by Frankenstein. Already the sense of immersion is palpable, but Shelley’s narrative goes even further, as the monster in confronting Victor seizes the word from his mouth and demands him to listen (97), and in doing so an even deeper level into the narrative structure is created; the hypodiegetic. The immersive act of ventriloquism is now complete and the reader finds him/herself three levels down into the imaginary world of Shelley, or as this reading will have it; immersed into the deepest part of the subconscious of the implied author. However, what makes the journey into

the narrative structure so utterly fascinating is not the immersion as such, but the setting of the very structure itself, which in turn forces the reader to accept a seemingly different fabric of reality.

Since the narrative of the extradiegetic level is addressed to a level outside of the diegetic world; “[t]o Mrs. Saville” (Shelley 13), Shelley creates the sense of another, greater existence which encompasses the entire diegetic world, while maintaining the notion that the diegetic world is still somehow connected to this “other” existence in the sense that everything that we are privy to in the diegetic world is addressed to the greater realm: the diegetic world as a theater of ‘chaos’, for the mind’s eye to see.

This creation of a “diegetic” level that supersedes the extradiegetic is in turn what, in my opinion, provides the reader with a sense of already having traversed an invisible barrier into a world that is metaphysically different from the world we know, an existential take on *in medias res*; that to board the vessel with Walton is to have already set foot on the fringes of “[...] a part of the world [...] never before imprinted by the foot of man.” (Shelley 14). And thus, the framing of the entire extradiegetic world is, in my opinion, a brilliant utilization of narrative technique that leaves an important clue as to who the speaker of the narrative actually is, and in turn, also that of the ultimate subject to the psychoanalysis.

According to Holmberg & Ohlsson all narratives have a narrator; a speaker (71). In a narrative that pushes the boundaries of the diegesis, there are bound to be several different speakers, generally separate and individual points of view distinguished from each other by manners expressed in “tone, diction and sentence structure” (Newman 171). However, as Newman notes, *Frankenstein* “[...] fails to provide [these] differences [...]” and concludes that this “[...] blurs the distinction that it asks us to make between the voices of its characters.” (ibid). What Newman is referring to is the fact that all the voiced characters in *Frankenstein*, that is to say Walton, Victor and the monster, all use the same tone, diction and sentence structure and thus, in eloquence equaled only by the implied author herself, come across as voices of mutual origin. Or as Newman puts it: “[...] ‘point of view’ is not the point at all.” and continues by stating that *Frankenstein* is “[...] suggesting that its narratives are not expressions of individual human psyches.” (172). However, whereas Newman almost regards the “failure” of distinction as an artistic flaw, I regard the similarities of voice as yet another clue provided by the elaborate enigma of *Frankenstein*.

So it appears that the voices of *Frankenstein* are in fact of the same origin, and also that this origin is not to be found in the diegetic world since the narrative pattern is always that of

a re-telling. This means that the only possible source left “within” the novel, is the implied ever-present existence encompassing the diegetic realm – the implied author; the ultimate viewer of the spectacle, the one to whose mind’s eye the theater of ‘chaos’ is addressed: the one whose subconscious is the ultimate creator, and as such is the one narrator, the one speaker, the one unified voice of the realm.

Although the voice is the same, the nature of the wishes expressed is not, and are as such distinguishable in terms of level of disguise of the latent content, as well as in terms of human needs from a Maslowian point of view; this adds further support to the notion of *Frankenstein* being a journey into the actual depths of the subconscious of the implied author, with the monster representing the deepest, most primal part. However, due to reasons already addressed, I will illustrate this phenomenon in a swift manner, letting the brief account serve only as a set up for the analysis to come, rather than an exploration in its own right.

The first level, i.e. the extradiegetic, is represented by Walton whose actions and stated wants and wishes are not hard to decipher from an implied author’s point of view, as the manifest material seem to correlate quite effortlessly with the proposed latent counterpart. For instance; the great undertaking of discovering the North Pole seems to stem from an attraction to the immense beauty of the unknown; a place where “[...] the sun is forever visible, its broad disk just skirting the horizon and diffusing a perpetual splendor.” (Shelley 13). Walton feels an “[...] ardent curiosity [...]” (Shelley 14) that he must satiate in exploration; so, he explores.

According to Maslow, this is a realization of the least basic of the needs of the human soul; when all other primary needs are met – such as the needs of food, safety, the sense of belonging, friendship and esteem – the need of self actualization; “[...] doing what *he* or *she*, individually, is fitted for [...]” (22), makes itself known, and if one does not heed this urge – this passion – or as in the case of Walton the explorer does not satiate the “ardent curiosity”, discontent and restlessness will ensue.

As straightforward as the level of Walton might appear as a messenger, a link, a mere window into the subconscious, the proclamation of Walton’s, that “[he] bitterly feel[s] the want of a friend” (Shelley 17) does not only foreshadow one of the most primal wishes of the realm, but also links Walton to Victor, and to the monster as well; suggesting that they are all in fact parts of the same psyche. The difference, however, in Walton’s expression of loneliness and that of, for instance, the monster is that this want does not define him – self-actualization does. It is a part of him, but he is not the embodiment of it.

The diegetic level, however, is not as straightforward in its interpretation. The nature of the latent content manifested is more complex, as are the sources of the wishes and desires; in this level the childhood of our implied author makes itself know as seen in the wish fulfillment of love and security in the portrayal of a fantastically perfect family, and Victor is quite effectively being put on trial by the monster as a failure of a “father” himself; all this while the entire realm of Victor quite literally rests in the hands of Walton as Victor is retelling the previous events from a cabin inside the vessel that Walton brought to the ice. Thus this level is in a sort of flux as it is potentially affected by the appearance of Walton, as well as of the actions of the monster, while unfulfilled emotions of the past, stemming from an even deeper part of the Maslowian hierarchy finds its way through.

However, what defines Victor is his relentless pursuit of knowledge, which in regard to the Maslowian hierarchy of human needs correlates with the level below self actualization; ‘the esteem need’, as in “[t]he desire for [...] achievement, adequacy, mastery and competence.” (Maslow 21). Thus the journey down the subconscious of the implied author simultaneously descends the Maslowian ladder in equal measures, although it hints of fragile barriers and the importance of the past.

The hypodiegetic narrative, on the other hand, is not only the deepest level of the subconscious realm, but also the most complex one in terms of manifest and latent content, as the actions of the monster permeate the realm in a way whose complexity is only matched by that of the underlying meaning of it all (which will be addressed accordingly in the follow chapters). In regard to the Maslowian hierarchy, this level matches the one yet another step down the ladder: the need of belongingness and love, a need considered so fundamental that it is only preceded by the needs of safety and food (Maslow 22).

Thus a journey into the diegetic levels correlates to a descent into the depths of the subconscious, as well as to the needs of the human soul. But how is this possible if the narrative itself is not connected to the “outer realm” by other means than through the eyes of Walton? Or is there perhaps a link to be found within the diegetic realm? I say there is: the link of “passions”.

As the father of the implied author, William Goodwin, was a philosopher, there is little doubt in my mind that the constant reference to “passions” throughout the novel, linked to action of sort, is in turn an intended reference to the argument of “[r]eason as slave of passions” (Arrington 234-5), basically meaning that it is emotions – passions -- that make us

act, rather than rational thought; this is an argument proposed by the British 18<sup>th</sup> century philosopher David Hume, summarized by Professor of Philosophy Robert L. Arrington:

Reason, the understanding, can give us information that will help guide the passions to their fulfillment and help us avoid pain and frustration. But this information does not itself determine what we do or ought to do – only our subjective response to this information has this executive power. Thus reason serves and supports the passions; it has no other function when it comes to human action. (234)

The implied author herself furthers this notion in the preface, telling us that the complexity of *Frankenstein* “[...] affords a point of view to the imagination for the delineating of human passions more comprehensive and commanding than [...] existing events can yield.” (Shelley 11), and continues to dissipate the last shred of doubt as of the general origin and function of “passions” in Walton’s remark on Victor’s reaction to a mad exaltation; “[h]aving conquered the violence of his feelings, he appeared to despise himself for being the slave of passion [...]” (27). Thus the characters of *Frankenstein* are indeed “the slaves of passions”; they are forced to act on the unconscious whims of the implied author; manifest expressions of latent desires.

In this chapter it is established that the voices of the characters are in fact the unified voice of the realm, and that the realm as such is the ultimate subject to the analysis. It is also argued that the narrative levels correspond to different depths of the subconscious of the implied author in regard to the needs of the human soul. Furthermore, I have shown that the characters obey the latent passions of the realm, and are thus the slaves of passions in their own right, manifest expressions of the latent desires of the realm. In the forthcoming chapter, these manifest expressions will be further explained as embodiments of characteristics of the gifted mind; revealing their true nature in this drama of the subconscious.

## Chapter Two: Victor, the Monster and Clerval as Wish Fulfillment

In chapter one, I argued that the realm itself forces the characters to act on its whims, as slaves of latent passions. In this second chapter of the essay I will address the characters of Victor, Clerval and of the monster as embodiments of these latent passions; as manifestations of key characteristics of the gifted mind, in order to set up the premise for the final chapter where I will argue that the clash of these latent expressions spells the end of “life” itself as the manifestation of the latent suicide of the implied author. However, I will begin by defining the term ‘gifted’ and to give an account of common characteristics of gifted children; thus painting a picture of the cognitive world of the 18 year old implied author.

According to James T. Webb, Ph.D., one of the 25 most influential psychologists on the field of giftedness, founder of the non-profit organization SENG (Supporting Emotional Needs of the Gifted) and main author of *A Parent’s Guide to Gifted Children* (Webb et al 387), most definitions of giftedness are “[...] calculated to identify the top 3-5% of the children [...]” (Webb et al 2), which in terms of IQ correlates to a score of at least 125 to 130 (Webb et al 5). However, being gifted involves more than a mere number (7). Therefore, a common definition of giftedness (Webb et al 2) is “[...] those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking [...]” (ibid).

Considering *Frankenstein* as a “demonstrated achievement” in the field of “creative or productive thinking” and “general intellectual ability”, there is no doubt that the *implied author* was a gifted adolescent. But how does this show in the novel; that is, are there any common characteristics of the gifted that shine through between the lines?

There are; Webb et al identifies a few traits that are amongst “[t]he most typical characteristics” (12); traits that psychologist Mary-Elaine Jacobsen also identifies as defining features in her book *The Gifted Adult*, suggesting that these traits are in fact permanent features in the mind of the gifted as opposed to a finite phase of the gifted child. Subsequently, these traits permeate the characters of Victor, Clerval as well as the monster. Moreover, this notion of characters as embodiments seem to be supported by Sherwin, who recognizes that Victor “[...] becomes a force instead of a person as all the energy of his being concentrates on his grand project [...]” (892).

The first encounter with the countenance of Victor, as described by Walton as a man with eyes that have a general “[...] expression of wildness, and even madness [...]” (Shelley 25),

paints a portrait of an eager man whose eyes tell the story of a glowing mind. Thus, what defines him is an “[i]ntense curiosity” (Webb et al 13) that renders him “[...] extraordinary inquisitive [...]” (13), as shown in the novel when he does not simply ask Walton what way the monster is headed; but “[...] asked a multitude of questions concerning the route [of] the daemon [...]” (Shelley 25). This intense curiosity and “extraordinary inquisitiveness” (Webb et al 13) are in turn the forces behind the most explicitly manifested trait; Victor as the embodiment of the “[d]esire for reasons and understanding.” (Webb et al 15) -- the search for knowledge, or as Victor will have it: the “[...] thirst [...]” (Shelley 35). The meticulous account of the relation of Victor to his surroundings, given by Victor himself, validates this argument as Victor states that “[t]he world was to me a secret which I desired to divine [...] [I felt] gladness akin to rapture, as [the secrets] were unfolded to me [...]” (ibid). In this proclamation of his very essence, Victor also accounts for the “upside” of being gifted; the “gladness akin to rapture” in unraveling a puzzle or a mystery (Webb et al 23-24); the immense joy most gifted children experience in heeding the need to search for complexity (Webb et al 16) – to delve into the notion that the world must consist of more than meets the eye, and of more than our tactile senses foretell.

Thus, what defines Victor is an intense curiosity that leads him to an unyielding search for knowledge; and consequently Victor as a character is the wish fulfillment – and embodiment – of this very trait and quest. Furthermore, the account of Victor also acknowledges a connection to the “upside” of being gifted; the all-consuming joy, experienced when the stimulus is right. Furthermore, this particular part of giftedness, or so I will argue, is manifested in Victor’s closest and only friend, Henry Clerval.

An inevitable part of being gifted is to “[...] see the world through a lens that is simply different from that of most people.” (Webb et al 15); to view the spectacle of life with unclouded eyes. This trait, when combined with the common characteristic of “[s]ensual overexcitability.” (Webb et al 24), makes for a potent blend that can either be the source of great sorrow, or the source of great joy. Gifted children with this characteristic “[...] do not only enjoy looking at art, they experience it” (ibid) as well as deriving great pleasure from “[...] their unusual sensitivity to music, language, and foods” (ibid). This way of experiencing aesthetics can even be so intense and overwhelming that the real world “[...] ceases to exist for a time.” (ibid); it is a gift truly worthy of its name. Moreover, the source of this pleasure does not have to be man-made; sometimes, to the gifted, mere reality beats fiction in the grandest sense:



He [Clerval] was alive to every new scene; joyful when he saw the beauties of the setting sun, and more happy when he beheld it rise and recommence a new day. He pointed out to me the shifting colours of the landscape, and the appearances of the sky. 'This is what it is to live,' he cried; 'now I enjoy existence! [...]. (Shelley 149)

This account of Clerval almost losing himself in experiencing the grand of the mundane, does not only serve as the perfect example of how the gifted child might perceive the world, but also of how the ever cheerful Clerval is the very embodiment of this trait. But whereas Clerval is the *manifestation* of this “upside” of being gifted, the monster on the other hand, is the embodiment of what is arguably the least joyous side of giftedness; the *loneliness* (Webb et al 37).

What defines the monster in terms of traits or experiences common to the gifted are the intense feelings of alienation and loneliness (Webb et al 153, 160). Webb explains; “With their intellect, sensitivity, and intensity, gifted children often feel different even quite early in life” (ibid). This sense of being fundamentally different from everybody else, having no-one to talk to who really understands them – or even takes them seriously – may give the gifted child a sense of not being valued and that it does not belong. This in turn quite effectively leads to the gifted child being ostracized by their so called “peers”, finding herself “[...] alone in a world that seems [...] to have shallow views and values” (ibid). According to Webb et al, this is particularly true if the child is being teased and bullied (ibid).

In *Frankenstein*, this feeling of being fundamentally different with no real peer in the world is effectively manifested in the character of the monster; he is a sensitive soul trapped in a frame whose horrid countenance “[...] no mortal could support [...]” (Shelley 56); a “[...] daemoniacal corpse [...]” brought to life, with yellow gloomy skin scarcely covering the “[...] work of muscles and arteries beneath” (ibid). With an appearance as dreadful as described, the monster – in a world of “shallow views and values” – has no real choice but to remain an outsider. Despite eager attempts, the closest thing to an open-minded conversation with a fellow creature – the blind old cottager – ends in catastrophe as the children, capable of sight, chase the poor soul out of the De Lacey-cottage (Shelley 130), and forever out of society.

Thus, the narrative of the monster is not only the manifestation of the Maslowian need of belongingness and love, but also that of the worst part of being gifted, which according to a gifted 14 year old boy cited in Webb et al, is that “[...] there simply isn't anyone [to] talk to [...]” (37). Thus, this particular boy concludes that “[...] the worst part of being gifted is the loneliness.... [...]” (ibid).

In this chapter I have argued that the characters of Victor, Clerval and the monster are in fact the embodiments of key characteristics common to the gifted child, adolescent and adult; that Victor is the embodiment of an intense curiosity and subsequent thirst for knowledge, that Clerval is the embodiment of the “upside” of being gifted, an all-consuming joy in truly experiencing the beauty of nature, and that the monster represents the darkest side of the gift as the very embodiment of loneliness and alienation. In the forthcoming chapter I will show how the will to live and the will to die battle for existence, using the essence of the characters against each other in an epic battle for the realm itself.

### Chapter Three: A Sea of Ice

In the previous chapters I have shown how the separate diegetic narratives each correspond to different depths within the subconscious of the implied author, and also how the different voices of the characters are in fact the unified voice of the realm and furthermore that the characters of Victor, Clerval and the monster as such – commanded by the passions of the implied author – are representations of key characteristics of the gifted mind; the ‘thirst for knowledge’, the immense joy of experiencing the world, and ‘loneliness and alienation’. Thus, it is argued that the implied author is in fact the diegetic realm itself and that the different narratives, as well as Clerval, each are the manifestations of latent aspects of the gifted mind of the implied author.

In this final chapter of the essay, I will argue that *Frankenstein* is in fact the latent wish fulfillment of the very will to die; I will argue that the urge of the ultimate creator – the implied author – to end her own life is manifested in the collapse of the entire diegetic world; illustrated in seven phases that each signifies an event of strategic importance, or a shift in the subconscious levels in the realm itself. However, I will begin by addressing the notion of suicide in relation to giftedness, as well as the potential role of art and creativity in relation to depression and suicide, thus connecting the proposed theme of *Frankenstein* to the implied author.

According to Webb et al, many psychologists claim that gifted adolescents are more likely to fall into serious depression and suicide than the average individual. It is argued that the reason for this being is that “[...] many gifted children have traits that appear to be related to adolescent depression. Patterns of perfection, unusual sensitivity, extreme introversion, over-commitment, and feelings of loneliness and alienation [...]” (153). Furthermore, the particularly creative appear to be more prone to succumb to this dark side of being gifted, as “[a]rtists and writers as well as eminent creative and scientific types have shown higher rates of suicide as adults.” (ibid). Thus, the inferred image of the highly creative implied author is one of her being likely to battle with thoughts of suicide.

However, as Carter notes; “[...] Freud clearly regarded the artist as a unique individual who avoids neurosis and sheer wishful thinking through the practice of his art” (72). This does not mean that art per se is to be regarded as an escape from reality that allows the artist or writer to simply forget their troublesome issues, but as a “[...] means of dealing with inner contradictions and re-establishing a productive relationship with the world” (ibid). Thus, I

concur with associate professor of psychology and psychotherapist Will W. Adams who claims that “Shelley was able, via *Frankenstein*, to transform her suffering and hope into a deep, enduring work of art.” (57). Hence, there is little doubt in my mind that this is precisely why the ‘chaos’ of the implied author chose suicide as the latent theme of *Frankenstein*.

The theme of suicide is first introduced when Victor finds himself adrift in a sailboat, with no apparent concern other than the “[temptation] to plunge into the silent lake [...]”, hoping that “[...] the waters might close over [him] [...] forever” (87); this is a manifestation of a sense of meaninglessness in life, or a contemplation of an existence in “[...] a sad and a bitter world [...]” (84), devoid of an apt moral. However, although this is the first contact with the theme of suicide in *Frankenstein*, the notion is first felt by the monster in another narrative that chronologically has already taken place; an event that in turn signifies the first in a series of phases that will ultimately lead to the collapse of the diegetic realm, the destruction of the subconscious world of the implied author, the latent suicide.

Phase one is announced by the monster, who, in sensing the agony of ‘alienation and loneliness’ as a result of being driven out of the De Lacey-cottage, presents the latent theme of suicide, as well as addressing the creator as the source of the misery: “[c]ursed, cursed creator! Why did I live? Why, in that instant, did I not extinguish the spark of existence which you had so wantonly bestowed?” (131). In a fury fueled by the realm itself (ibid), infusing the monster with an insanity that “[...] burst all bounds of reason and reflection” (ibid) the monster sets fire to the De Lacey cottage in an act of war on man and on “[...] him who had formed me [...]” (ibid); signifying both Victor and the implied author herself.

However, since the monster is metaphysically separated from Victor due to them representing different Maslowian levels of the subconscious, the monster has to find a way to lure Victor down to his level in order to confront him or kill him. And, intuitively – guided by the implied author – he does; in taking the life of William and framing Justine for the crime.

Thus the second phase illustrates the strategy of the monster and also the logic of the realm, as the murder of William and the framing of Justine sends Victor on a dark path towards the awaiting nemesis in the level below. The framing is particularly interesting, as it might be regarded as a “Freudian slip” – the wanting to say a certain thing but unconsciously saying another – though in a strategic sense. In framing Justine – and thus showing Victor the obviously flawed morality of human society as what appears to be the epitome of innocence is sentenced to death for its “crimes”, the monster unconsciously uses the memory of the dead mother as a means to this “murder” of faith in man: a “[...] miniature that she possessed of

your mother.” (70), Just as the mother of Victor died from nursing the ill Elizabeth, the mother of the implied author, Mary Wollstonecraft, died from giving birth to her. Thus both the mother of Victor and the mother of the implied author died from “giving life”. This is no mere coincidence, nor is it a coincidence that a picture of the dead mother was used in the “murder” of Justine. As the ever rational Alphonse states: “[this picture] [...] was doubtless the temptation which urged the murderer to the deed.” (ibid). Furthermore, Berthin concurs in stating that this trinket “[...] from the mother [...] [is also] a signifier of ‘mother’ [...] (101), making it apparent that the latent meaning behind the episode is that the implied author is still being hurt by the memory of the past, by the loss of the mother; this is manifested in two lives taken in the subconscious world of the implied author. Subsequently; the hurt Victor loses track of his essence and is drawn to the level below, signified by letting a primal passion infuse his character as he “[...] gnashed [his] teeth and ground them together, uttering a groan that came from [his] inmost soul.” (84).

The third phase illustrates a near merger of the Maslowian levels of Victor and of the monster. As Victor is put on a path where dark passions lurk; they seduce him and send him seeking the mountains and thus forcing his character even closer to that of the monster. As he moves closer to the deeper level in the Maslowian sense, he simultaneously moves further from his original intellectual persona. In this altered, heart-driven state, he launches an attack on the far superior enemy of the monster; an attack that is easily evaded. This event, however, reveals that all is not lost in the eyes of the realm, that the question of “to be, or not to be?” is still without a definitive answer as the monster claims that “[l]ife, although it may only be an accumulation of anguish, is dear to me, and I will defend it.” (95). Thus the will to live has gained an unlikely, but powerful champion in the one character that instigated the very war on the realm; and in doing so foreshadowing the contradiction of nature in the monster who is in a sense rendered incapable of acting out, in fear of becoming truly alone. Thus, the monster puts the sensation of being ostracized into words and also presents a solution to the agonizing situation; the creation of a mate.

However, in noting that “[...] the temperature of this place is not fitting to your fine sensations; come to the hut upon the mountain” (97) the monster acknowledges that Victor and himself are not yet on the same metaphysical level; that Victor is not yet miserable enough to join him in his frozen landscape and therefore, he lets the hut serve as a limbo between the levels, where Victor – the embodiment of the ‘search for knowledge’, an intellectual being – in coming closer to the realm of the monster – the embodiment of

‘alienation and loneliness’, issues of the heart rather than reason, is capable of seeing eye to eye with the monster who in turn agrees to meet Victor half-way as he is content in reasoning with him (140). In this susceptible – more heartfelt – state of mind, Victor is capable of seeing the hurt in the monster, and thus agrees to the proposition of creating a spouse, thus looking to to save him – and the implied author – from the Maslowian hell of loneliness.

Phase four occurs as Victor leaves the limbo of the hut; his nature is beginning to become restored and the metaphysical levels of the subconscious world again begin to drift apart; as Victor notes “[a] change indeed had taken place in me: my health, which had hitherto declined, was now much restored; and my spirits [...] rose proportionably [sic].” (145). In drifting further from the monster, so does the “[...] immediate necessity [...]” of fulfilling the wish (ibid). And as Victor is briefly joined by Clerval, the ‘embodiment of joy’ and the only one who appears to be capable of elevating Victor’s mind to a level of “[...] [his] own!” (67), Victor sees in him “[...] the image of [his] former self [...]” (153) and is thus reminded of who he really is: deep inside; an intellectual capable of great joy. However, this renders him less able to sympathize with the monster as the notion of misery no longer concerns him to the same extent. This is in turn what leads him to reconsider the agreement altogether, reasoning that – despite the pledge of the monster to leave him and the human race be – he cannot risk the monsters bearing children, concluding that he “[...] could not [risk] sacrifice[ing] the whole human race” (180), should the offspring turn on humanity. However, as the chosen site for the completion of the spouse – a miserable hut on a remote island outside of Scotland that is little more than a “[...] rock, whose high sides were continually beaten upon by the waves” (158) – signifies a limbo between the levels, the monster is never far away. And as Victor heeds to the will to die of the implied author, “[...] trembling with passion, [tears] to pieces [...]” (161) the horrible frame in the making, the monster being never far away is watching from outside the hut, through a window from his side of the invisible barrier. Realizing the magnitude of this betrayal the monster withdraws “[...] with a howl of devilish despair and revenge [...]” (ibid).

The will to live, expressed through the monster in the proposition of curing the loneliness has now been countered by the will to die in an act of passion. “[...] [T]he winds were hushed, and all nature reposed under the eye of the quiet moon” (161), signifying the entire realm holding its breath, waiting for the next move of the torn soul of the implied author. As the monster enters, he exclaims: “Slave [...]” (162) accusing Victor of being the slave of the passions of the implied author in heeding the will to die rather than the passion of living, and

in a shift of focus tries to remedy the situation, thus giving the will to live a fighting chance in confronting him: “[y]ou are my creator, but I am your master - obey!” (ibid). A stern Victor refuses, and thus the mind of the monster is made up, as seems to be the mind of the implied author: “I may die, but first you [...]” (163). The monster leaves, but not before foreshadowing the most devastating blow to the subconscious world, in effect sealing the faith of all in the murder of Clerval; “[...] soon the bolt will fall which must ravish from you your happiness forever” (162).

As the will to die grows in strength in the fifth phase, the realm obscures the moon (the moon signifying the presence of the monster) with clouds and lulls Victor to sleep on the sailboat after having disposed of the spouse, which is in effect an attempt on his very life (166). Victor, subsequently waking up lost at sea, realizes that this sea may very well be his grave and exclaims: “‘Fiend’ [...] your task is already fulfilled!” (166). This profound statement from Victor, addressed to the one attempting to take his life, seems to have provoked a change in the realm as the powerless Victor is miraculously brought back to shore by the will to live. The unsuspecting Victor subsequently utters the voice of the realm after realizing the close brush with death: “[h]ow mutable are our feelings, and how strange is that clinging love we have of life even in the excess of misery!” (ibid). However, this *joie de vivre* does not last long as Victor is immediately apprehended for the murder of Clerval upon setting foot on land (168), and is once again in the clutches of the will to die.

As is foreshadowed by the monster in phase four, in this sixth phase the murder of Clerval shakes the very foundation of the realm. The special significance of Clerval – the joy of life – to the realm is apparent as Victor contemplates: “[t]wo I have already destroyed; other victims await their destiny: but you, Clerval, my friend, my benefactor [...]” (171). Thus it is concluded that the implied author “[...] had better seek death than desire to remain in a world which to me was replete with wretchedness” (173). This severe blow by the will to die is in fact a point of no return; the latent suicide of the realm is now inevitable. Thus, Victor acknowledges that life itself is “[...] poisoned for ever [...]” (176) and is gradually transformed to a “[...] shattered wreck – the shadow of a human being” (177). Subsequently, the metaphysical nature of Victor moves significantly closer to that of the monster, within the reach of revenge and the completion of the latent suicide.

In this final and seventh phase of the series of events of the latent suicide, Victor has almost become one with the monster as he is left with no company other than the thoughts of ridding the world of the one responsible for the misery; in effect this makes him experience

the characterizing notions of 'loneliness and alienation'. However, the monster, in a way, still represents the will to live, as he in fear of becoming truly alone in the world applies measures in keeping the struggling Victor – his sole companion – alive in a hostile world: the realm of the monster; a barren, cold part of the mind where only the darkest of emotions can live and prosper (197, 198). Thus, Victor feeds on the monster, in effect making the monster the only thing that is keeping his miserable being alive, while the monster – in the cloak of a sinister motive of a battle to the death (198) is in fact reluctant to let go. Thus, the tug of war between the will to live and the will to die still permeates the unfolding events, and as Victor is finally closing in on the monster to make an attempt at his life – in essence an attempt on the life of the very realm itself – the will to live alters the very nature of the realm in a final effort of saving the life of the implied author:

The wind arose; the sea roared; and, as with the mighty shock of an earthquake, it split, and cracked with a tremendous and overwhelming sound. The work was soon finished: in a few minutes a tumultuous sea rolled between me and my enemy, and I was left drifting on a scattered piece of ice, that was continually lessening, and thus preparing for me a hideous death. (201)

However, Victor does not meet his fate on a drifting piece of ice, but is picked up by Walton – the link to this theater of 'chaos', heralding to a Maslowian level far away from the murky depth of 'loneliness and alienation'. However, the clear-eyed and ardent explorer Walton notes that: "[t]he only joy that he can now know will be when he composes his shattered spirit to peace and death." (203); thus the only joy left in life, is to heed to the will to die. And as the frozen soul of the implied author surrounds the vessel of Walton with "[...] mountains of ice, [...] and threaten[s] every moment to crush [the] vessel" (205), the link – the intruder into the icy masses of 'loneliness and alienation' – is, in effect, exiled from this metaphysical world his nature of 'self-actualization' is not fit to exist, and is thus gradually – and inevitably – thrown out of the theater of 'chaos' itself. This renders Victor physically unable to complete his sole purpose of killing the monster, which is in turn what instigates his final demise. As prophesized by the monster in their first meeting, they are "[...] bound by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of us" (95), and as Victor is unable to annihilate the monster, he quickly deteriorates and leaves the Maslowian world he was never meant for. Thus the subconscious world of the implied author is not only bereft of the upside of being gifted, but also of the trait of 'intense curiosity'. The monster, sensing this tie being broken, quickly appears at his side, filled with emotional turmoil as the will to live realizes defeat: "[...] every feature and gesture seemed instigated by the wildest rage of some uncontrollable passion"



(210). Thus, the monster seeks repentance but receives none from the rational and accomplished Walton who is able to shake the persuasive presence of the heartfelt, and points out that the monster only “[...] lament[s] [...] because the victim [...] is withdrawn from [his] power” (212). Claiming to have been infused by *passions* out of his control, the monster states that he “[...] did not satisfy [his] own desires” (213) in destroying Victor, as he still craved “[...] love and fellowship [...] (ibid). Thus, the unfortunate creature admits to being the embodiment of ‘loneliness and alienation’, and finally gives in to the will to die as he lets the implied author speak through his voice; “[m]y work is nearly complete. Neither yours nor any man's death is needed to consummate the series of my being, and accomplish that which must be done; but it requires my own” (214). And so, the latent suicide of the implied author is completed as the stage is cleared in the theater of ‘chaos’, and the curtain falls as the gifted mind of the implied author is emptied, leaving the parting words of its last inhabitant echoing in the hollow mind of the implied author; “[m]y spirit will sleep in peace; or if it thinks, it will not surely think thus. Farewell” (215).

## Conclusion

Tantalized by the Romantic notion of ‘creating out of chaos’, I sought to re-visit *Frankenstein* through the lens of psychoanalysis in order get in touch with this ‘chaos’ once again. By elaborating on Freudian analysis in incorporating Maslowian theory on the needs of the human soul as well as taking the cognitive disposition of the implied author into consideration, I endeavored to offer a contrastive psychoanalytical approach to the complexity of *Frankenstein*, I suggested that the narrative structure – the diegetic world itself – is the setting for the latent suicide of the implied author; a view that differs from earlier psychoanalytical readings that relate the characters to each other, but fails to put these relations into a wider perspective.

In chapter one, I aimed to establish that the voices of the characters are in fact the unified voice of the diegetic realm, arguing that the realm as such is the ultimate subject of this psychoanalysis. I also argued that the narrative levels correspond to different depths of the subconscious of the implied author with regard to the Maslowian needs of the human soul, and furthermore that the characters themselves obey the latent passions of the realm, and as thus are slaves of passions in their own right: manifest expressions of the latent desires. All this in order to establish that the owner of the realm – the implied author, the ultimate subject to the analysis – wields it’s will through the characters by the means of passions.

In the second chapter I argued that the characters of Victor, Clerval and the monster are in fact the embodiments of key characteristics common to the gifted child, adolescent and adult; they are thus the embodiment of different aspects in the cognitive world of the implied author. I argued that Victor is the embodiment of an ‘intense curiosity’ and subsequent thirst for knowledge, that Clerval is the embodiment of the “upside” of being gifted, an all-consuming joy in truly experiencing the beauty of nature and that the monster, in turn, represents the darkest side of the gift as the very embodiment of ‘loneliness and alienation’.

In the final chapter I argued that these embodiments of the mind are used by the implied author not only to come to a final decision in the ultimate question, but also that the subsequent collapse of the narrative levels, the merger of the Maslowian depths into one, represents the dominion of the will to die. Thus, it is argued that the collapse of the diegetic world is in fact the manifestation of the prevailing will to die, i.e. the collapse of the diegetic world as the latent suicide of the implied author.

## Bibliography

Primary source:

Shelley, Mary. 1818. *Frankenstein – Or, the Modern Prometheus*, London: Penguin Books ltd., 1994. Print.

Secondary sources:

Adams, Will W.. "Making Daemons of Death and Love: *Frankenstein*, Existentialism, Psychoanalysis". *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. 41.4 (2001): 57-89. *Sage Publications*. Web. 11 May. 2013

Arrington, L. Robert. *Western Ethics: An Historical Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing ltd., 1998. Print.

Berthin, Christine. *Gothic Hauntings: Melancholy Crypts and Textual Ghosts*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.

Cain, William E., et al. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2001. Print.

Dickie, George. *Introduction to Aesthetics*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. 1899. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Trans Brill A. A.. New York: Random House, Inc., 1994. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. 1923-1925. *The Standard Edition of The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud: Volume XIX The Ego and the ID and Other Works*. Trans. Riviere, Joan. London: The Hogarth Press, 1978. Print.

Holmberg, C.-G. Ohlsson, A. *Epikanalys*, Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 2009. Print.

Jacobsen, Mary-Elaine. *The Gifted Adult A Revolutionary Guide for Liberating Everyday Genius*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1999. Print.

- Maslow, Abraham. 1954. *Motivation and Personality, third edition*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1987. Print.
- Newman, Beth. "Narratives of Seduction and Seductions of Narrative: The Frame Structure of *Frankenstein*". *Frankenstein*. Ed. Fred Bottling. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 2005. 166-191. Print.
- Reisner, Gavriel. *The Death-Ego and the Vital Self: Romances of Desire in Literature and Psychoanalysis*, Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. 1603. *Hamlet*. Ed. Jonathan Bale and Eric Rasmussen. Houndmills: MacMillan Publishers Ltd., 2008. Print.
- Shen, Dan. "What is the Implied Author?" *Style*. 45.1 (2011): 80-98. *Literature Online*. Web 28 March. 2013
- Sherwin, Paul. "Frankenstein: Creation as Catastrophe". *Modern Language Association*. 96.5 (1981): 883-903. *JSTORE*. Web. 5 May. 2013
- Stillinger, Jack and Lynch, Diedre S.. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: Vol D. 8<sup>th</sup> ed.*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2006. Print.
- The Seventh Seal*. Dir. Ingmar Bergman. AB Svensk Filmindustri. 1957. DVD
- Quinn, Edward. *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*, New York: Checkmark Books, 2000. Print.
- Wayne C. Booth. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*
- Webb, James T., et al. *A Parent's Guide to Gifted Children*, Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press, Inc., 2007. Print.