

Frankenstein questions:

Do I think that the story would have been differently if Victor would have taught the creature?

There was an interesting article in the New York Times from August (<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/20/well/family/what-twins-can-teach-us-about-nature-vs-nurture.html>) that basically said it's not either environment or genetics that determine someone's personality, but both. So, there is a possibility that the creature would have not been violent had Victor taught him, but there is also a possibility that the creature would have turned out evil anyway. From what I gather, the creature might have not been evil at all or less evil had Victor taken care of him. The creature says: "I now hasten to the more moving part of my story. I shall relate events that impressed me with feelings which, from what I was, have made me what I am." The creature thinks nurture defines him.

In my opinion, should the creature have rights and be able to join society if he wanted?

I absolutely think the creature should have rights. He displays intelligent thought, consciousness, morality, and feelings. The fact that he essentially kills himself because he feels guilty for what he has done shows this maturity of feeling and thought. Would an early 19th century society accept him? Probably not.

Why did the creature wait until after Frankenstein's death to ask for forgiveness about Henry's and Elizabeth's deaths?

Like many famous stories of revenge, the perpetrator of the revenge does not realize that their rage has clouded their mind until the target of the revenge is dead or miserable. Think of Miss Havisham from *Great Expectations*, she has a very similar revelation to the creature on her death bed.

Were there any other science-fiction books written during the time period that didn't play out like Frankenstein?

Mary Shelley wrote a post-apocalyptic science fiction story called *The Last Man*, which is less a commentary on science and more a commentary on religion and politics.

How much knowledge did the creature have at its conception?

In the beginning the creature is mainly innocent, just wandering through the woods in search of food, accidentally scaring or causing harm to the people who come across him. It is not until he reads that he begins to gain real knowledge.

Has anyone done an adaptation where Victor is a responsible parent?

If you haven't seen *Young Frankenstein*, then I would recommend it as a "more responsible" Victor Frankenstein. It is a parody, but still has a kinder Victor.

Why do we associate the name Frankenstein with the monster instead of Victor?

The creature is unnamed, so as *Frankenstein* increased in popularity, we needed some name to call the creature and since there were so many adaptations, many things in the original got confused. In the first adaptation, *Presumption*, the creature is called Hobgoblin—guess that didn't catch on!

In the book is Walton sending letters from wherever is stuck in the ice? How is he doing this?

Great question. The letters are written, but not sent. We never see any responses back from Margaret and he remarks that he might never see her again.

How does one think of a story like Frankenstein?

Have a ghost story telling contest? It is always difficult to figure out how brilliant pieces of literature get created, but this is one of the only Mary Shelly works that is widely read, most of her other novels are barely studied.

What other differences between 1818 and 1831?

There are no longer 3 volumes, the book is now 24 chapters. Elizabeth is not Victor's cousin, but she is adopted. The *Paradise Lost* epigraph is taken out. Victor has less free will in the 1831 edition, his study of chemistry and biology is by chance and something that he does not intentionally pursue.

Was Frankenstein actually ugly as we define it today or was it just the fact that his body being unproportioned and different colors from different skin types?

These two images are from the 1823 *Presumption* play, which is the first adaptation. The creature's skin is blue, but as you can see he looks normal except for being huge.

Number 431. COMPLETE. One Penny.

DICKS' STANDARD PLAYS.

FRANKENSTEIN.

BY R. B. PEAKE.



ORIGINAL COMPLETE EDITION.—PRICE ONE PENNY.

* THIS PLAY CAN BE PERFORMED WITHOUT ONE OF THE SCENES
ANY RIGHTS.

LONDON: JOHN DICKS, 211, STRAND.



Do I think that the creature has a genuine conscious or if he just mirrors How Victor reacts?

I think the creature does have a morality. When Victor dies, he does not need to perform any role, so his self-sacrifice at the end feels genuine.

Why are we reading "Frankenstein in Baghdad" in particular?

It does something with adaptation that is much different than *WSS* and *Foe*. I also like that is a translation, which will provide another interesting layer to talk about.

What's the most interesting adaptation of Frankenstein that I've read?

There is a brand-new book called *Pride and Prometheus*, which is an adaptation remix of *Pride and Prejudice* and *Frankenstein*. It is really good.

Why is Frankenstein so popular?

No other story is so well suited to talk about the pitfalls of amoral scientific pursuit. I am just surprised that in 200 years since its publication that we have yet to write a more compelling story.

Do I think that the creature is a manifestation/symbol of Victor?

I think that Walton is the manifestation of pre-creature Victor. I think that the creature reflects the fact that Victor views the people he "loves" as means to an end, not means within themselves.

When was Igor introduced?

Igor was actually introduced in the 1823 play, *Presumption*, which is the first adaptation of Frankenstein.

How many times have I read this book?

If we just count the 1818 version, then five. If we are talking all six books, then probably close to 15.

Why does the different adaptations vary so much? Money?

Money definitely explains the more contemporary fixation on the story, but I think there has yet to be a more compelling story of the pitfalls of scientific inquiry than this one.

Is there any correct depiction of Frankenstein?

I think you mean the creature? If so, then the *Presumption* creature is pretty close. If you mean Victor, then I think the 2011 stage production is the most accurate (<http://ntlive.nationaltheatre.org.uk/productions/ntlin4-frankenstein>)

Why is Frankenstein an inherently misunderstood character in modern media?

I think we focus too much on visuals and aesthetics, so the creature and Victor need to appear like archetypes. Also, the story has complicated morality, which generally doesn't play well to a general audience, so we need to reimagine the story as less complex.

What was the monster's name?

He is never given one.

Do I think the creature is born evil or if he learned it?

See my answer for question 1. I think it is a little of both.

Did the monster die?

Yes, he sets himself on fire as he burns Victor's body (this happens after the book ends).

Where do I think Victor gets his morals if they are not from science?

Victor seems to get some of his morality from religion, but that seems to come more from his childhood and is deep seeded. I don't think he has much of a morality now. That is the issue, science becomes his moral center and science does not have any morals.

Does the 1831 Edition give us more details after Victor dies?

Nope, same ending!

Do I think the creature was truly remorseful at the end of the book?

Yes, I do. I think the fact that the creature kills himself makes me think he feels terrible for the evil deeds he has done.

Where does the creature go when he dies? Does he even have a soul?

Great question. Some adaptations have dealt with this issue. These are not addressed in the text. My own opinion is that the creature would probably be sent to purgatory.