

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „ГОЦЕ ДЕЛЧЕВ“ - ШТИП
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

UDC80 (82)

ISSN 1857-7059

ГОДИШЕН ЗБОРНИК

2018

YEARBOOK

2018



ГОДИНА 9
БРОЈ 11

VOLUME IX
NO 11

GOCE DELCEV UNIVERSITY - STIP
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „ГОЦЕ ДЕЛЧЕВ“ – ШТИП
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ



ГОДИШЕН ЗБОРНИК
2018
YEARBOOK

ГОДИНА 9
БР. 11

VOLUME IX
NO 11

GOCE DELCEV UNIVERSITY – STIP
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY



ГОДИШЕН ЗБОРНИК ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

За издавачот:

доц. д-р Драгана Кузмановска

Издавачки совет

проф. д-р Блажо Боев

проф. д-р Лилјана Колева-Гудева

проф. д-р Виолета Димова

доц. д-р Драгана Кузмановска

проф. д-р Луси Караниколова -Чочоровска

проф. д-р Светлана Јакимовска

доц. д-р Ева Горѓиевска

Редакциски одбор

- проф. д-р Ралф Хајмрат – Универзитет од Малта, Малта
проф. д-р Нецати Демир – Универзитет од Гази, Турција
проф. д-р Ридван Цанин – Универзитет од Едрене, Турција
проф. д-р Стана Смиљковиќ – Универзитет од Ниш, Србија
проф. д-р Тан Ван Тон Та – Универзитет Париз Ест, Франција
проф. д-р Карин Руке Бритен – Универзитет Париз 7 - Дени Дидро, Франција
проф. д-р Роналд Шејфер – Универзитет од Пенсилванија, САД
проф. д-р Кристина Кона – Хеленски Американски Универзитет, Грција
проф. д-р Златко Крамариќ – Универзитет Јосип Јурај Штросмаер, Хрватска
проф. д-р Борјана Просев-Оливер – Универзитет во Загреб, Хрватска
проф. д-р Татјана Гуришиќ-Беканович – Универзитет на Црна Гора, Црна Гора
проф. д-р Рајка Глушица – Универзитет на Црна Гора, Црна Гора
доц. д-р Марија Тодорова – Баптистички Универзитет од Хонг Конг, Кина
доц. д-р Зоран Поповски – Институт за образование на Хонг Конг, Кина
проф. д-р Елена Андонова – Универзитет „Неофит Рилски“, Бугарија
м-р Диана Мистреану – Универзитет од Луксембург, Луксембург
проф. д-р Сузана Буракова – Универзитет „Павол Јозев Сафарик“, Словачка
доц. д-р Наташа Поповиќ – Универзитет во Нови Сад, Србија
проф. д-р Светлана Јакимовска, доц. д-р Марија Кукубајска, проф. д-р Луси Караниколова-Чочоровска, доц. д-р Ева Горѓиевска, проф. д-р Махмут Челик,
проф. д-р Јованка Денкова, доц. д-р Даринка Маролова, лектор д-р Весна Коцева, виш лектор м-р Снежана Кирова, лектор м-р Наталија Поп-Зариева, лектор м-р Надица Негриевска, лектор м-р Марија Крстева

Главен уредник

проф. д-р Светлана Јакимовска

Одговорен уредник

доц. д-р Ева Горѓиевска

Јазично уредување

Даница Гавриловска-Атанасовска
(македонски јазик)

лектор м-р Биљана Петковска, лектор м-р
Крсте Илиев, лектор м-р Драган Донеv
(англиски јазик)

Техничко уредување

Славе Димитров, Благој Михов

Редакција и администрација

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“ - Штип
Филолошки факултет
ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ 10-А
п. факс 201, 2000 Штип
Р. Македонија



**YEARBOOK
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY**

For the publisher:

Ass. Prof. Dragana Kuzmanovska, PhD

Editorial board

Prof. Blazo Boev, PhD

Prof. Liljana Koleva-Gudeva, PhD

Prof. Violeta Dimova, PhD

Ass. Prof. Dragana Kuzmanovska, PhD

Prof. Lusi Karanikolova-Cocorovska, PhD

Prof. Svetlana Jakimovska, PhD

Ass. Prof. Eva Gjorgjievska

Editorial staff

Prof. Ralf Heimrath, PhD— University of Malta, Malta

Prof. Necati Demir, PhD— University of Gazi, Turkey

Prof. Rıdvan Canım, PhD— University of Edrene, Turkey

Prof. Stana Smiljkovic, PhD— University of Nis, Serbia

Prof. Thanh-Vân Ton-That, PhD— University Paris Est, France

Prof. Karine Rouquet-Brutin PhD— University Paris 7 – Denis Diderot, France

Prof. Ronald Shafer— University of Pennsylvania, USA

Prof. Christina Kkona, PhD— Hellenic American University, Greece

Prof. Zlatko Kramaric, PhD— University Josip Juraj Strosmaer, Croatia

Prof. Borjana Prosev – Oliver, PhD— University of Zagreb, Croatia

Prof. Tatjana Gurisik- Bekanovic, PhD— University of Montenegro, Montenegro

Prof. Rajka Glusica, PhD— University of Montenegro, Montenegro

Ass. Prof. Marija Todorova, PhD— Baptist University of Hong Kong, China

Ass. Prof. Zoran Popovski, PhD— Institute of education, Hong Kong, China

Prof. Elena Andonova, PhD— University Neofilt Rilski, Bulgaria

Diana Mistreanu, MA— University of Luxemburg, Luxemburg

Prof. Zuzana Barakova, PhD— University Pavol Joseph Safarik, Slovakia

Ass. Prof. Natasa Popovik, PhD— University of Novi Sad, Serbia

Prof. Svetlana Jakimovska, PhD, Ass. Prof. Marija Kukubajska, PhD, Prof. Lusi Karanikolova-Cocorovska, PhD, Ass. Prof. Eva Gjorgjievska, PhD, Prof. Mahmut Celik, PhD, Prof. Jovanka Denkova, PhD, Ass. Prof. Darinka Marolova, PhD, lecturer Vesna Koceva, PhD, lecturer Snezana Kirova, MA, lecturer Natalija Pop-Zarieva, MA, lecturer Nadica Negrievska, MA, lecturer Marija Krsteva, MA

Editor in chief

Prof. Svetlana Jakimovska, PhD

Managing editor

Ass. Prof. Eva Gjorgjievska, PhD

Language editor

Danica Gavrilovska-Atanasova

(Macedonian language)

lecturer Biljana Petkovska, lecturer Krste

Iliev, lecturer Dragan Donev

(English language)

Technical editor

Slave Dimitrov, Blagoj Mihov

Address of editorial office

Goce Delchev University

Faculty of Philology

Krste Misirkov b.b., PO box 201

2000 Stip, Republic of Macedonia





СОДРЖИНА CONTENTS

----- *Книжевност*

Цветанка Стоилова

ПСИХОЛОШКИОТ РЕЛАТИВИЗАМ ВО РОМАНОТ ПОКОЛНИОТ
МАТИЈА ПАСКАЛ ОД ЛУИЏИ ПИРАНДЕЛО

Cvetanka Stoilova

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL RELATIVISM IN THE NOVEL THE LATE

MATTEA PASCAL BY LUIGI PIRANDELO 9

Ева Ѓорѓиевска

ИТАЛИЈАНСКАТА ЛАУДА ВО XIII ВЕК:

ДАМАТА ОД РАЈОТ ИЛИ ПЛАЧОТ НА БОГОРОДИЦА

Eva Gjorgjievska

THE ITALIAN XIII CENTURY LAUDA:

DONNA DE PARADISO OR PIANTO DELLA MADONNA 23

Natalija Pop Zarieva, Krste Iliev, Dragan Donev

MARY SHELLEY'S FRANKENSTEIN AND BYRON 29

----- *Преведување*

Светлана Јакимовска

ИНТЕРПРЕТАТИВНАТА ТЕОРИЈА ВО РАМКИТЕ
НА СОВРЕМЕНИТЕ ПРЕВЕДУВАЧКИ ТЕОРИИ

Svetlana Jakimovska

INTERPRETATIVE THEORY IN THE FRAMEWORK OF

CONTEMPORARY TRANSLATION THEORY 37

Даринка Маролова, Роберта Костадиновска

ЛЕКСИЧКА ЕКВИВАЛЕНТНОСТ МЕЃУ ГЕРМАНСКИОТ
И МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК СОГЛЕДАНА ПРЕКУ ПРЕВОДОТ
НА НОВЕЛАТА СМРТ ВО ВЕНЕЦИЈА ОД ТОМАС МАН

Darinka Marolova, Roberta Kostadinovska

LEXICAL EQUIVALENCE BETWEEN GERMAN AND

MACEDONIAN CONSIDERED THROUGH THE TRANSLATION

OF THOMAS MANN'S NOVELLA DEATH IN VENICE 43

Даринка Маролова, Николина Лукароска

ЕКСПЛИЦИРАЊЕ НА ИМПЛИЦИТНИТЕ ИСКАЗИ ВО
ПРЕВОДОТ ОД ГЕРМАНСКИ ЈАЗИК НА МАКЕДОНСКИ ЈАЗИК

Darinka Marolova, Nikolina Lukaroska

EXPLICATION OF IMPLICIT EXPRESSIONS IN TRANSLATION

FROM GERMAN INTO MACEDONIAN 51



----- *Јазик*

Марија Леонтиќ

ЗБОРОВНИ КЛАСИ ВО ТУРСКИОТ И ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК

Marija Leontik

WORD CLASSES IN THE TURKISH AND IN THE

MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE 59

----- *Методика*

Марија Тодорова

УЛОГАТА НА АНГЛИСКИОТ ЈАЗИК (J2) ПРИ УСВОЈУВАЊЕ НА
ШПАНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК (J3) ОД СТРАНА НА МАКЕДОНСКИ СТУДЕНТИ

Marija Todorova

THE ROLE OF L2 ENGLISH IN L3 SPANISH ACQUISITION BY

MACEDONIAN LEARNERS 69

Драган Донеv, Крсте Илиев, Наталија Попзариева

КУЛТУРОЛОШКИ ИМПЛИКАЦИИ ВО ИЗУЧУВАЊЕТО НА
ДЕЛОВЕН АНГЛИСКИ КАКО СТРАНСКИ ЈАЗИК И НЕГОВАТА
УПОТРЕБА КАКО ЛИНГВА ФРАНКА

Dragan Donev, Krste Iliev, Natalija Popzarieva

CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS IN BUSINESS ENGLISH ASSESSMENT

AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND ITS USE AS LINGUA FRANCA 77

MARY SHELLEY'S *FRANKENSTEIN* AND BYRONNatalija Pop Zarieva¹, Krste Iliev², Dragan Donev³¹ Филолошки факултет, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Штип
natalija.popzarieva@ugd.edu.mk² Филолошки факултет, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Штип
krste.iliev@ugd.edu.mk³ Филолошки факултет, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Штип
dragan.donev@ugd.edu.mk

Abstract: This paper examines the various influences on the young Mary Shelly in the composition of *Frankenstein*. The delineations in Shelley's novel reflect the moods and feelings of several influences upon her work. These influences include *Paradise Lost* and the myth of Prometheus, which Mary is to have read the year before the conception of *Frankenstein*, and most importantly her close relationships with literary figures, mainly her father, William Godwin, her husband, Percy, and her new acquaintance, Lord Byron. The allegorical composition of the novel provides for examination of all of these influences. To concentrate on one of these influences would probably reduce the value of the work. However, we suggest that the main impetus of the novel lies in the influences of Percy Shelley and Lord Byron. The personas and poetry of both men can be seen as reflected in the characterization of *Frankenstein*, but this paper generally focuses on Byron's influence.

Keywords: *influences, protagonists, quest, love and death, revenge*

“But words are things, and a small drop of ink,
Falling like dew, upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, perhaps millions, think;”
(DJ, ill. 88)

Introduction

This epigraph presents Byron's idea of the role of poetry. The assertion that “words are things” emphasizes the immense impact of written ideas on the audiences, that is, its readers. This is one of the Romantics' well-known claim about the agency of texts which praises the power of the word to produce change through education and literacy.

Shelley's novel *Frankenstein* will be considered from the perspective of a quest. In fact, Mary depicts two types of figures and quests. The first type, suggestive of the poet as a quester in *Alastor*, is Shelley's type of character. His pursuits are beyond society in the search for meaning outside of human existence, in the novel depicted by Victor. The second type is the figure mirroring the image of Byron and his heroes. His quests for meaning and love like Manfred and the Giaour, are situated within society. But being withheld of these, they choose alienation from society and turn to revenge and self-loathing. This type of figure is depicted in the novel by the estranged, unforgiving monster himself.

Influences and the protagonists

Shelley's contemporary Walter Scott described *Frankenstein* as a novel which aimed "less to produce an effect by the marvels of the narrations, than to open new trains and channels of thought" (Remarks on *Frankenstein*, 2010, p.261). Lee Sterrenburg asserts that the image of the monster in *Frankenstein* manifests the anti-Jacobin propaganda, especially the depiction of her father Godwin as a satanic philosopher and that the novel reflects Mary Shelley's dismissal of her radical background (1982, p.143-71). More recently, Chris Baldick, in *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing*, has shown how her novel's creative daring has contributed to its status as a modern myth. But since the novel has become "a source for a pallet of later figures and works, it also draws from literary and intellectual history." (1987, p. 30-62)

Furthermore, Mary Shelley's position as a writer and at the same time daughter of renowned writers, William Godwin and Wollstonecraft, then her marriage with Percy Shelley and friendship with Byron provide for an additional psychological frame of reading. More challenging is some feminist criticism of *Frankenstein* as a displaced characterization of female experience, which depicts male sexual and political aggression. (M. A. Rubenstein, 1976; S. M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, 1979; G. C. Spivak, 1985)

Shelley's journal lists the readings from 1814 to 1817 which offer abundance of literature on the French Revolution. She was imbued with her parents' ideas from a very young age (*MSJ* i. 85-93, 94-102). Although her parents' ideas impregnate her works, later on, it was Shelley and Byron's influence that provided her with a perspective that transcended national boundaries.

An evident outset of the relatedness of the character of Victor with Shelley is their common interest. In a letter to Mary's father, Percy Shelley informs on his youth passions: "ancient books of Chemistry and Magic were perused with an enthusiasm of wonder, almost amounting to belief" (as cited in Perkins, *English Romantic Writers* p. 1087). His intellectual interest almost coincides with Victor's studies of Cornelius Agrippa and other "forgotten alchemists," for which he claims, "I read and studied the wild fancies of these writers with delight; they appeared to me treasures known to few besides myself" (25). In this fashion Christopher Small has suggested, "Frankenstein himself is clearly and to some extent must intentionally have been a portrayal of Shelley" (1973).

Byron's connection with the monster is probably more obscure and has not often been pointed to. The reason for this may partially be critics who have commonly linked Byron with Walton and Shelley with Victor as a type of Promethean figure (Small, 53-57). Ernest Lovell's discussion on Shelley's predisposition to depict an image of Byron or the Byronic hero is directed to all of Shelley's later novels. Lovell delineates the feature common to each of these Byronic characters and the typical "Shelleyan hero". According to him, the common features of the "Shelleyan hero" are "blond, as the poet was, with light hair, blue eyes, and a delicate fair and ruddy complexion." The reflections of Byron's heroes, on the other hand, are often brunettes. He claims that "Byron is repeatedly pictured as. . . mature and thoroughly masculine, as contrasted with Shelley, the unworldly man of thought and immature dreamer." (1951, p.165)

Mary Shelley depicted her monster as a repulsive creature. Nevertheless, it has been endowed with the beauty of speech, which links it back to Byron and his powerful but articulate poetic voice. Lovell's statement that Byron's "low voice of great beauty, once heard, never to be forgotten" is common for many of Shelley's portraits. He also asserts that "the impact of Byron's voice upon Mary became some sort of a symbol of the highly disturbing effect which his personality was able to exert upon her." (1967, p. 59) It is actually not the sight of the monster, but the sound that he produces that is suggestive of the Byronic hero in this novel.

Nevertheless, if it was Byron's voice that produced a "disturbing effect" on the author, then there is a possibility that Shelley's characterization of Byron as the monster is intended as a critique and a way for her to contest Byron through her depiction of the monster. One evidence for this is provided by Victor's reiteration to be cautious about the eloquence of the monster. The passionate rhetoric of the monster entices Victor, Walton and the readers into complete compassion with the monster. We see him as the victim of the unjust treatment by society, but we are inclined to disregard his violent crimes.

Shelley's awareness of the interrelatedness of birth and death meets the same concerns in Byron's poetry. *Cain*, although preceding *Frankenstein*, expresses Byron's similar views towards birth and death. Cain is aware that by giving life, he is giving death. Before he dies, he says:

Provided that one victim
Might satiate the insatiable of life,
And that our little rosy sleeper there
Might never taste of death nor human sorrow
Nor hand it down to those who spring from him.
(*Cain*, IH. i 80-85)

Byron's character asserts a similar unrest referring death that enfolds Mary Shelley's novel, in which birth arouses from the existence of death. The newly created monster is made of parts of dead bodies and death is the only cause for his life. The monster is conscious of the monstrosity of his birth. After seeing himself in the pool, he discloses to Victor that, "I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification. Alas! I did not yet entirely know the fatal effects of this miserable deformity." (pp. 98-99) There is even a physical link that likens Byron to the monster's "miserable deformity". Byron "came into the world with a physical handicap that caused him throughout his life much bodily suffering and mental agony, and that probably did more to shape his character than it will ever be possible to calculate. He was born with a deformed right foot" (Crompton, 1985, p.73). This physical deformity, like the monster's, is a result of his birth and links the two in a physical not simply symbolic way.

The violent anger that the monster exhibits, as typical Byronic rage, is captured in the fight with William. He depicts his rage when talking to Frankenstein, "the child still struggled and loaded me with epithets which carried despair to my heart; I grasped his throat to silence him, and in a moment he was dead" (127). Byron describes similar eruption of wrath in a passage in *Cain*. In a fit of violent wrath because of an unjust God, Cain murders his brother.

Enraged of being reprimanded by society for his endeavors to find love, Shelley's monster loses any possibility to acquire love and a place in society. His torture was increased by the sense of the injustice and ingratitude which society has shown. Thus, the monster is determined to have "deep and deadly revenge, such as would alone compensate for outrages and anguish" (126) he had experienced. Yet, similar to Byron's Giaour, his vengeance has little effect on rectifying the injustice that has been done to him. The Giaour, although in a dissimilar way, has been held back love in his life. In an almost similar fit of rage, he murders the person whom he considers the cause of his loss and torment. Yet, although he professes his guilt to the Friar, his vengeful act cannot be rectified:

Each feature of the sullen corse
Betrayed his rage, but no remorse.
Oh, what had vengeance given to trace.

Despair upon his dying face.
The late repentance of that hour,
When Penitence hath lost her power,
To tear one terror from the grave,
And will not soothe, cannot save.

(*The Giaour*, 1091-1098)

Consolation is unattainable for the Giaour. There is nothing to alleviate his pain, just as there is no possibility for saving his soul. He is deprived of the chance to see regret and anguish on the face of his antagonist. Shelley's monster is provided with this cruel contentment, yet he is in the same desolate position as the Giaour. Byron's tale seems to propose that as a result of inhumanity and brutality of man and the absence of any benevolent force to repair injustice, vengeance and gloomy despondency are the only passages for anger and suffering. To a certain degree, Shelley probably supports this attitude, particularly the idea of the absence of benevolent power. The negative attitude towards Byron inferred in Shelley's depiction of the monster is suggestive of the fact that she does not support his options of violence and despair. Once the monster and the Giaour perpetrate actions of violence in order to deprive justice, they deprive themselves of any possibilities to gain the love and compassion they have been denied.

It is the desperate passion of Byron's heroes that compels the monster to attack and murder William, and eventually condemn himself to perpetual despair. More likely than not, the monster would not have been created a mate by Victor. With this in mind, there is no reason for blaming the monster for taking the actions in a world devoid of affection and concern. It is this need for justice to be served that underlies the violent emotions of Byron's hero; especially this sense of justice which urges the Giaour and Cain to kill. It is exactly this sense of retaliatory justice which Shelley is pointing to in the centre of her critical attitude towards Byron. Byron's first speech to the House of Lords poses the question of how much violence social injustice has instigated. Byron questioned the conservative understanding of violent action as merely the result of innate criminality traits in barbarous men. Anne Humphreys has suggested that the type of the "nature versus nurture" discussion was regarded as openly subversive and socially unsettling at that time (1993).

While Byron points to the broad social conditions that have instigated violence, Mary Shelley portrays both, the creature and its creator, as accountable for the violence. But she depicted them with a difference in the degree. Shelley's criticism suggests that both the monster's yearning for sympathy and to be part of society, and Victor's desire to contribute something to humanity are counteracted by their deeds.

The passage where Victor and the monster concur that the monster is morally justified for having killed William is set on the hillside of Mont Blanc. This accord upon morality not only underlies the entire novel but offers a similar setting as in Byron's *Manfred* and Percy Shelley's "Mont Blanc". When Victor climbs the mountain, the awe-inspiring and majestic scenery offers him the greatest solace he could take in. The answer to the question whether there is anything to console Victor is left open-ended, just like the question in Shelley's "Mont Blanc" of whether there is anything at the top of the mountain. What seems significant in reference to Byron, is that Shelley is in search for a meaningful answer in the mountain, while Byron's Manfred descends the mountain to announce that there is no answer to be found. Although Mary shows a sympathetic attitude towards her monster's complete rejection of knowledge and his suffering, she cannot view the destructiveness and despair of his Byronic nature. Manfred's hopelessness and self-annihilation are not contributive to human life similar to the Giaour's retribution or the monster's rage. All eventually end up ruining not only their own lives and chances for love but also other people's lives.

The “Shelleyan” character, Victor, at the end of the novel remains like a Satan figure. He is unwilling to take responsibility for his actions as noted by Tannenbaum. Victor places all the condemnation of the Monster who like Satan blames God for his fall (1977, p. 105). Victor Frankenstein is a product of the Enlightenment who depends upon science for answers, not religion (Dussinger, 1976, p. 47). His transgressive deeds cannot be absolved by his repentance, as is the case with other trespassing wanderers, because the nature of his transgression goes beyond his ability to have control over it. His quest for knowledge results in his loss of control over his creation. Victor’s complete relying on science excludes the possibility of trust in God so he is unaware of the parallel between himself as a creator of the Monster and God. Hence, he is unable to understand that like God he should be a loving father to his creation.

Conclusion

The idea of Mary Shelley’s critique is not just to support or disapprove of either poet’s ideas. One of the purposes of the novel is based on expressing the author’s fatalistic attitude towards the pointlessness of human attempts to comprehend and surmount the limitations imposed upon them. This can be associated with the poetry of both Byron and Shelley. Furthermore, the novel illustrates the eventual insignificance of human ambition. The aims of the male protagonists in the novel are depicted as either the generous and philanthropic intentions of Victor to “pour a torrent of light into our dark world” in order to restore “life where death had apparently devoted the body to corruption”; or as the basic need for love, presented in the monster’s appeal for “society and sympathy” (119). In the cases of both characters, the Byronic and the “Shelleyan” one, their benevolent intentions are not important as they are subverted by their actions. This obliterates any possibility for the good which is their ultimate goal.

Bibliography

Baldick, C. (1987). *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing*. Oxford. UK: OUP.

Byron, L. G. (1970). *The Complete Poetical Works of Lord Byron*, Leslie, S. (Ed.). New York. W.J. Black Co.

Crompton, L. (1985). *Byron and Greek Love: Homophobia in 19th- Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dussinger, J. A. (1976). Kinship and Guilt in Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein. *Studies in the Novel*. Vol 8. pp. 38-55.

Gilbert, S. M., Gubar S. (1979). *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Humphreys, A. (1993). “Police Intelligence” Newgate Narratives and the Construction of Crime. *Victorian Mysteries. The Dickens World Conference*. The University of California. Santa Cruz.

Lovell, E. G. (1951). Byron and the Byronic Hero in the Novels of Mary Shelley. *The University of Texas Studies in English*. Vol 30. Austin: U of Texas P. 158-183.

Lovell, E.G. (1967). Byron and Mary Shelley. *Keats-Shelley Journal*. Vol 2. 35-49.

- Mellor, A. K. (1989). *Mary Shelley: Her Life, her Fiction, her Monsters*. New York: Routledge.
- Perkins, D. (1995). (Ed.) *English Romantic Writers*. Forth Worth. Texas: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Randel, F. V. (1984). *Frankenstein, Feminism, and the Intertextuality of Mountains*. *Studies in Romanticism*. Vol. 23. 515-532.
- Rubenstein, M. A. (1976). *My Accursed Origin: The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein*, *Studies in Romanticism*, Vol. 15, no. 2, 136-47
- Scott, S. W. (2010). Remarks on *Frankenstein*. In *Sir Walter Scott on Novelists and Fiction* (Routledge Revivals). Ed. Williams, I. London. England: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited.
- Shelley, M. (2018). *Frankenstein, or, The modern Prometheus: the 1818 text*. Oxford: UK: Oxford University Press.
- Shelley, M. (2015). *The Journals of Mary Shelley, 1814-1844. Volume 1, 1814-1822*. (Eds.) P. R. Feldman and D. Scott-Kilvert. Oxford: UK. Oxford University Press.
- Shelley, P. B. (1926). *The Complete Works of P. B. Shelley*. (Eds) R. Ingpen and W. E. Peck. New York: Scribners.
- Small, C. (1973). *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: Tracing the Myth*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P.
- Spivak, G. C. (1985). Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism, *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 12, pp. 243-61.
- Sterrenburg, L. (1982). Mary Shelley's Monster: Politics and Psyche in *Frankenstein*, in Levine and Knocpfmacher (eds.), *The Endurance of Frankenstein*. London. England: University Press of California Ltd.
- Tannenbaum, L. (1977). From Filthy Type to Truth: Miltonic Myth in *Frankenstein*. *Keats-Shelley Journal*. Vol. 26 101-13.