Frankenstein as Science Fiction and Shelley’s Scientific Imagination

Posted on July 27, 2022

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/frankenstein-as-science-fiction-and-shelleys-scientific-imagination/

Introduction

Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* emerged from the scientific, philosophical, and literary culture of the early nineteenth century rather than from a purely supernatural tradition. Shelley was born in 1797, began developing the novel during the famous 1816 gathering near Lake Geneva, and published its first edition anonymously in 1818. Victor Frankenstein’s attempt to create life from dead matter allows the novel to explore questions that were increasingly visible in contemporary discussions of anatomy, electricity, chemistry, vitalism, and the limits of human knowledge. The scientific procedure is intentionally incomplete; Shelley never provides a replicable laboratory protocol, because the novel is interested less in technical instruction than in the ethical and psychological consequences of discovery without responsibility. For that reason, *Frankenstein* is often treated as an important early work of science fiction. It builds its central speculation from recognizable scientific questions, then asks what might happen if an ambitious investigator acquired a power that society was not prepared to govern and that he himself was unwilling to manage responsibly.

Natural Philosophy, Galvanism, and the Scientific Imagination

Shelley’s scientific imagination developed in a culture fascinated by the relationship between electricity and living tissue. Experiments associated with Luigi Galvani and later demonstrations by Giovanni Aldini showed that electrical stimulation could make muscles in dead animals and human corpses contract, encouraging public speculation about the boundary between life and death. Romantic Circles scholarship on the novel’s scientific background emphasizes that galvanism, chemistry, anatomy, and debates about the “principle of life” formed part of the intellectual environment in which Shelley wrote. Victor’s education reflects this transition from older natural philosophy toward modern experimental science: his early interest in alchemists gives way to university instruction in chemistry and physiology. Shelley does not claim that electricity literally creates the Creature, and reducing the animation scene to a simple galvanic experiment overstates the text. The significance of contemporary science is conceptual. It makes Victor’s ambition

imaginable enough to disturb readers because his work extends tendencies already visible in experimental culture—curiosity, manipulation of nature, specialization, and the desire to turn uncertain knowledge into technical power.

The Creature as an Experiment in Development and Nurture

The Creature's development is central to the novel's scientific and psychological imagination. He is not born with language, moral philosophy, or social knowledge fully formed. He learns through sensation, observation, imitation, reading, and repeated encounters with other people, which makes his story resemble an informal experiment in development and environment. Sheryl R. Ginn interprets the novel through neuroscience and developmental questions, emphasizing the interaction of innate capacities with experience rather than treating the Creature's later violence as evidence that he was created inherently evil (Ginn, 2013). His observation of the De Lacey family teaches language, affection, social hierarchy, and moral ideals, while books give him concepts through which he interprets his own position. Rejection then becomes equally educational. Victor abandons him immediately, strangers respond violently to his appearance, and the De Laceys ultimately reject him despite his attempts at connection. Shelley therefore links scientific creation with social responsibility: producing a sentient being is only the first act, and the failure to provide care, education, companionship, or accountability shapes what follows.

The 1818 Literary Panorama and the Demand for Plausibility

An anonymous 1818 review in *The Literary Panorama and National Register* criticized *Frankenstein* for what it regarded as a crude plan, improbable events, and insufficiently explained details. That response is valuable because it reveals an early reader's expectation that extraordinary fiction should still maintain internal plausibility. The critical reviews chosen for the essay are Literary Panorama and Ginn's later interdisciplinary analysis, and their contrast demonstrates how standards of evaluation change across periods. The 1818 reviewer treats missing technical explanations and rapid developments in the Creature's abilities as weaknesses because readers are asked to accept events that seem insufficiently motivated. Modern science fiction criticism can interpret the same omissions differently. A speculative work often establishes one impossible or unproven premise, then uses it to investigate human consequences rather than explain every mechanism. Shelley's refusal to describe the precise animation process also prevents Victor's experiment from becoming a technical recipe and keeps attention on secrecy, ambition, abandonment, and ethical failure. The early criticism remains useful even when its assumptions are not accepted completely.

Neuroscience, Physiognomy, and the Problem of Appearance

Ginn's analysis approaches the novel from a very different angle by examining the Creature's learning, emotional development, and the scientific ideas that Shelley could have encountered. This reading also considers physiognomy, the historical practice of inferring character from facial appearance, an idea that helps explain why characters repeatedly treat visible difference as evidence of moral danger. Mary Shelley constructs a Creature whose individual features were selected as beautiful, yet whose assembled appearance horrifies Victor immediately. The contradiction is important because other characters often respond to his body before hearing him speak or observing his conduct. Shelley can therefore be read as exposing the moral danger of judging inward character through outward form, even while the novel uses the visual vocabulary of its period. A neuroscience or developmental lens does not prove that Shelley anticipated modern scientific theories in a technical sense. Its value lies in showing that the Creature's cognition and behavior are represented as processes shaped by sensation, learning, attachment, rejection, memory, and social experience rather than as unexplained supernatural attributes.

Why Frankenstein Functions as Science Fiction

Frankenstein occupies a foundational place in science fiction because its central disruption arises from an investigator's deliberate use of knowledge rather than from magic alone. Victor studies natural processes, develops a method, conducts secret experiments, produces an unprecedented technological result, and then confronts consequences he failed to consider before acting. That structure remains recognizable in later stories about artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, robotics, biotechnology, and other innovations whose creators discover that technical feasibility does not settle ethical questions. The novel also anticipates a recurring science-fiction concern with responsibility after invention. Victor's greatest failure is not curiosity itself but the separation of creation from care: he wants the achievement and knowledge associated with animation, yet refuses sustained responsibility for the being he brings into existence. Shelley simultaneously avoids technological determinism. The Creature does not become violent simply because he is artificial, and scientific discovery is not depicted as inherently evil. Harm emerges from ambition, secrecy, social rejection, fear, and failures of relationship. The novel's enduring scientific relevance therefore comes from connecting invention with institutions, ethics, and human consequences.

Conclusion

Frankenstein becomes more persuasive when evaluated through both its historical scientific context and the different critical expectations brought to it over time. The anonymous *Literary Panorama* reviewer objected to the novel's improbabilities and unexplained mechanisms, raising legitimate

questions about narrative coherence even if later readers are more willing to accept speculative premises. Ginn's interdisciplinary interpretation, by contrast, highlights the Creature's developmental learning and Shelley's engagement with scientific ideas involving sensation, physiology, galvanism, and appearance. Neither perspective requires claiming that Shelley possessed modern scientific knowledge or that every detail of the novel is empirically plausible. Her achievement is imaginative rather than predictive. She transformed contemporary questions about life and experimental power into a narrative about creation, responsibility, education, social rejection, and moral agency. That combination explains why the novel remains central to discussions of science fiction. It does not merely ask whether human beings can cross a technical boundary. It asks what obligations begin once the boundary has been crossed and whether discovery without responsibility can become more destructive than ignorance.

Works Cited

Ginn, Sheryl R. "Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: Exploring Neuroscience, Nature, and Nurture in the Novel and the Films." *Progress in Brain Research*, vol. 204, 2013, pp. 211–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-63287-6.00009-9.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*. 1818.

The Literary Panorama and National Register. Review of *Frankenstein*, new series, vol. 8, 1 June 1818, pp. 411–414.

Romantic Circles. *Frankenstein: Scientific Contexts and Contemporary Natural Philosophy*.