

## EVOLUSI WATAK MAKHLUK CIPTAAN *FRANKENSTEIN* SEBAGAI METAFORA PENERIMAAN ASPEK PANTANG LARANG OLEH MASYARAKAT KONTEMPORARI

AHMAD MUHYIDDIN B YUSOF

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Perak  
[ahmadmuhyiddin4@uitm.edu.my](mailto:ahmadmuhyiddin4@uitm.edu.my)

MOHD NAQUIDDIN BIN ZULKARNAIN

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Pahang  
[mnaquiuddin@uitm.edu.my](mailto:mnaquiuddin@uitm.edu.my)  
(Corresponding Author)

NAZIRUL MUBIN BIN MOHD NOOR

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Perak  
[nazirulmubin@uitm.edu.my](mailto:nazirulmubin@uitm.edu.my)

AIRIL HAIMI MOHD ADNAN

Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Perak  
[airil384@uitm.edu.my](mailto:airil384@uitm.edu.my)

### ABSTRAK

Makhluk ciptaan *Frankenstein* sentiasa menjadi salah satu daripada watak yang ditakuti dan dipinggirkan masyarakat dalam banyak filem seram yang telah dihasilkan. Penciptaannya digambarkan sebagai satu cara mencabar kuasa Tuhan. Sejak ianya mula dicipta, makhluk tersebut telah menjadi satu lambang dosa, penderhakaan, kegagalan, dan pantang larang dalam banyak karya sastera. Telah bertahun lamanya watak makhluk ciptaan *Frankenstein* diadaptasi dalam banyak filem. Pada masa yang sama, kriteria dan perwatakan makhluk tersebut juga telah diubah daripada watak yang menjijikkan ramai kepada watak yang lebih menyenangkan umum. Dalam mengenal pasti kesahihan perkara tersebut, tiga watak yang mewakili makhluk ciptaan *Frankenstein* daripada korpus yang berbeza telah dianalisis dengan menggunakan konsep *Entextualization*, salah satu daripada cabang disiplin di bawah Comparative Literature atau dikenali sebagai Kesusasteraan Perbandingan. Makhluk yang pertama diambil daripada buku karangan Mary Shelley yang bertajuk '*Frankenstein*', diikuti oleh makhluk ciptaan *Frankenstein* daripada filem *Van Helsing*, dan akhir sekali daripada satu rangkaian anime Jepun, *Soul Eater*. Dengan menggunakan *Entextualization*, hasil penemuan menunjukkan bahawa kriteria dan perwatakan asal makhluk ciptaan *Frankenstein* yang ditakuti serta dipinggirkan masyarakat telah diubahsuai menjadi watak yang lebih menyenangkan ramai, bersifat gagah berani dan diberi peranan yang penting. Peralihan tersebut dianggap amat penting kerana ianyan dapat disimpulkan sebagai satu cerminan corak sosial dalam aspek penerimaan masyarakat social terhadap sesuatu yang dianggap sebagai pantang larang yang tidak boleh dilanggar sama sekali. Kesusasteraan Perbandingan juga digunapakai bagi menampakkan lagi persamaan dan perbezaan yang terdapat dalam korpus yang telah dipilih. Kajian ini dikenalpasti telah menyumbang kepada perkembangan kajian genre seram secara khusus dan kajian sosial secara umumnya.

**Kata Kunci:** Isu-isu; pantang larang; masyarakat; refleksi; *Frankenstein's monster*

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE FRANKENSTEIN'S MONSTER AS A METAPHOR OF THE CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC'S ACCEPTANCE TOWARDS TABOO

### ABSTRACT

The Frankenstein's monster has always been one of the prominent image of the grotesque and marginalization in countless horror productions. Its creation was meant to challenge God and ever since its creation, the monster has become the embodiment and reference of sin, transgression, failure, and taboo in many literary works. Over the years, the image of the Frankenstein's monster has been adapted into many film productions and simultaneously, its image has evolved from the grotesque to a more pleasant appearance. In further discerning to this matter, three Frankenstein's monsters from different corpus have been analyzed using the concept of Entextualization under the discipline of Comparative Literature. The first monster is taken from Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, followed by the Frankenstein's monster in the film *Van Helsing* and finally the monster is taken from the Japanese anime *Soul Eater*. Through the lense of Entextualization, the findings indicate that the original monster's traits of grotesqueness and marginalized have been shifted to a more pleasant, heroic and accepted, with significant roles. This transitional figure is somehow seen as a reflection of the social pattern in accepting social taboo. The discipline of Comparative Literature is also utilized to observe the degree of convergence and divergence found in the chosen corpus. This study have contributed to the expansion of horror and social studies.

**Keywords:** Issues; taboos; public; reflection; Frankenstein's monster

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to discern the Frankenstein's monster's evolution as a form of metaphor to reflect the contemporary public's acceptance towards taboo. This is done by entextualizing the Frankenstein's monster from the grotesque and marginalized character to a more accepted character. This paper entextualizes and discerns three different Frankenstein's monster from three different sets of corpus which are, the novel *Frankenstein* (1818) by Mary Shelley, the movie *Van Helsing* (2004) directed by Stephen Sommers, and finally the Japanese anime *Soul Eater* (2008) by Atsushi Okubo. Furthermore, with the deployment of the discipline of Comparative Literature, it is made able to interrogate the evolution of the Frankenstein's monster in a wider scope and to observe how other countries deploy the Frankenstein's monster's evolved appearance into their work of fiction. Each of these corpus originated from three different countries; the first corpus which is Frankenstein originated from England, the second corpus Van Helsing is produced in America and finally Soul Eater is aired in Japan.

Since these three materials crosses the boundaries between time and space, which suits the main premise and the discipline of Comparative Literature, therefore these materials are valid to be analyzed. As coined by Venturini.S (2011) "*Central practice for comparatism, since*

*it locates itself at the meeting point of different languages, literatures, and cultures.*” This discipline requires the crossing of different boundaries in culture and spaces. In addition, the art of comparatism also practices interdisciplinary and requires other mediums form of arts such as literature, music, cultures, and Media to compare as this is supported by Scher. P. S. (2004), “*I regard this concise definition as the most successful and persuasive plea so far for the legitimacy of literarily based comparisons of literature with other arts, including, literature and music, as an integral branch of Comparative Literature*”. Thus, it is made clear and substantiated that the practice of Comparative Literature offers a wide avenue to compare and analyze between two different medium of corpus.

Upon comparing the Frankenstein’s monster’s characteristics, this paper moves to analyse on later appearance and characteristics of the Frankenstein’s monster in which becomes the metaphor for the contemporary public’s acceptance towards taboo.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This paper proceeds to the summary of the corpuses. Firstly is the summary of the first text which is entitled as ‘*Frankenstein*’ by Mary Shelley in 1818. This is in a form of a novel and is written in England. This novel revolves around the life of Dr. Victor Frankenstein whom is very talented in science. Due to the plague that haunts his hometown and death is all over the place, he decided to study and make a research on how to bring back the dead in the name of science. He then succeeded, but ironically, he created a monster and abandoned his creation against God. His creation escaped and become the marginalized. It then escaped to the mountains and hills; there it found a family and secretly befriends with a blind girl. Soon after she can see, she was shocked and chased it away. Due to this cruel treatment, the monster seeks revenge on his creator and murdered his creator’s wife. Victor chases the monster to the iciest part of the country; sadly Victor fell ill and died. Later Victor’s friend Walton saw the monster crying over Victor’s dead body and the monster then committed suicide.

On the summary of the second corpus entitled ‘*Van Helsing*’, it is in the form of a movie, directed by Stephen Sommers in 2004 in America; this movie centres on the life of Van Helsing, the knight of the Holy Order. This is a secret organization that vanquishes evil. He received an assignment to help Princess Ana, the princess of Transylvania to vanquish Count Dracula. After his arrival, he discovered that Count Dracula is using and forcing the Frankenstein’s monster to give birth to his children. During Van Helsing’s pursuit of Dracula and rescuing Frankenstein, he was bitten by a werewolf thus giving him the power to transform into a werewolf and able to kill Count Dracula. After freeing the Frankenstein’s monster, it agreed to help Van Helsing and free him from the werewolf’s curse. Even though Van Helsing succeeded in killing Dracula, sadly, he accidently murdered Princess Ana. Van Helsing was cured and the Frankenstein’s monster decided to travel and live his life in isolation.

The third corpus is a Japanese anime entitled ‘*Soul Eater*’, created by Atsushi Akubo in 2008 in Japan and this anime is made up of fifty one (51) episodes. This anime centres on the life of Evans and Maka, a student from the Death Weapon Meister Academy (DWMA) which is an academy run by the grim reaper to train students against the evil witches and Kishin who was sealed by the grim reaper himself. The students need to master and control their weapons. One of the teachers in the academy has a similar appearance to the Frankenstein’s monster, named Professor Stein; he trains and protects the academy. One day the Kishin has escaped, and it is up to Professor Stein and his students to defeat the Kishin and save the world from destruction.

The summary of the three materials are now clear and definitely fits the premise and requirements for Comparative Literature. Subsequently, it is now the time to proceed to the fundamentals on the subject of the Frankenstein' monster. This section lists out the fundamental criteria of the original Frankenstein's monster and who or what the Frankenstein's monster is. The original traits of the Frankenstein's monster which are based on the novel, the monster has sewn marks and patches of different human meat and skin from top to toe. *"I collected the instruments of life around me that I might infuse a spark of being into the lifeless thing that lay at my feet."* (Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: 57). Other visible trademark of the monster is, it has screws sticking out from his head and neck. This man made has a gargantuan body, grotesque and and have outrageous strength. This can be seen in the novel,

*"A flash of lightning illuminated the object, and discovered its shape plainly to me; its gigantic stature, and the deformity of its aspect more hideous than belongs to humanity, instantly informed me that it was the wretch, the filthy daemon, to whom I had given life to."* (Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, 1818).

In general, the fundamental traits of the monster are consisting of sewn marks and patches of different human bodies, screws sticking out its head, has a gargantuan sized body, grotesque form and has outrageous strength. The monster's fundamental traits shall be used as a benchmark to compare with the other corpus, focusing on the evolution of the monster's fundamental traits. Aside than its grotesque characteristics, the Frankenstein's monster is the character of the periphery. It is always marginalized by normal human beings, due to its horrific and disgusting nature. There are scholars whom agree after reading Shelley's work. *"Readings of Frankenstein which argue that the novel critiques a cultural male tendency to marginalize and even alienate itself from those aspects of society and culture"* (Allen. G. 2008). Based on this, the criteria is clearly of the grotesque and the marginalized. On the contrary, Pearce (2008) would not simply highlight the monster's appearance as the prime reason of marginalization, as Pearce plead that Shelley's creation of the monster itself is the embodiment or the symbolic act of sin and taboo due to challenging God and atheism, therefore the monster is positioned as the marginalized in the story.

Other previous studies in relation to the figure of the Frankenstein's monster was conducted by Rollin (2003), as he states that the Frankenstein's monster as the modern Prometheus and his creation of the Frankenstein's monster is a metaphor or symbolism on the failure of genetic engineering of animal. Rollin (2003) also claims that such perversion and manipulation towards nature is unethical and it reflects the unethical creation of the Frankenstein's monster and bound to failure. On the same note, Michaud (2013) associates the Frankenstein's monster with issues such as genetic modified organisms. Michaud (2013) further points out his concern, to the fact that even in Shelley's novel, the monster itself do not understand its existence, and how will human understand and comprehend fully on the subject of genetic modified organisms. Nevertheless, Hunter (2016) curves the direction of the Frankenstein's monster metaphorical image from a scientific perspective to racial perspective. Hunter (2016) coined this phenomenon as the *Black American Frankenstein Monster*, and such term is a reflection of the white American's hostility towards the African-American during the Civil Rights Movements.

In regards to the aspects of taboo, Fershtman, Gneezy & Hoffman (2011) and Syahputri, Keumala, Rahma, Idami, & Saputra (2019) state that the term originally comes with the words *'tabu'* or *'tapu'* in the Tongan language of Polynesia, and these Polynesian terms have an explicit religious association; it was only acquainted with English during the eighteenth century. Taboo is characterized as a dependant belief that denies an activity which assumes

that if such conduct is to be attempted by a normal person, it will be treated in either an unreasonably sacred and blessed event or an absurdly unsafe and accursed activity (Fershtman et al., 2011 & Syahputri et al., 2019). Taboos may include sexual and dietary restrictions, repugnant and appalling actions or behaviour, and “*taboo tradeoffs*” that can entail putting a monetary value on “*sacred*” values like life, love or friendship (Fershtman et al., 2011). According to Nazir, Ali & Farouq (2019), taboos are those disallowed, embarrassing, or offensive acts, things or talks which are mostly set by the religious or cultural customs. Fershtman et al. (2011) also adds up to the idea, stating that taboos are also sometimes referred to as doing the ‘*unthinkable*’; even thinking about violating a taboo is problematic, and the sanctions associated pertain not just to the behavior that contradicts the taboo, but also merely thinking or considering such a behavior. Under this fundamental, the notion of taboo is a form of ‘thought police’ that governs not just human behavior, but also its thoughts (Fershtman et al., 2011).

There have been a few studies on the usage of taboo. First of all, a research done by Syahputri et al. (2019). The study helmed by Syahputri et al. (2019) elaborates the verbal and nonverbal taboo, focusing on the people of Nagan Raya, Aceh. As summarized by Syahputri et al. (2019), the study seeks to find out the types of verbal and nonverbal taboo in the area of Nagan Raya, and their reasons to categorize the words/phrases and the actions as parts of taboo in their daily life. Syahputri et al. (2019) have concluded their study with two main points: First, it is found that there is verbal taboo such as ‘xxx’ used as swearing, and the main reason underlying the usage is because people want to express their angry feelings. Second, the nonverbal taboo is related to actions that are prohibited in some certain time of the day, as most of this type of prohibition is strongly related to Islam, and the underpinning reason is to make their youth to be more obedient; both to parents and God. Besides, another study is also done by Al Farisi, Adi & Astuti (2019), focusing on a sociolinguistic analysis of taboo words in a movie entitled as *Alpha Dog*. The research is done as Al Farisi et al. (2019) found out that the characters in the movie frequently use taboo words in their conversations and it is also based on a true story, which has made the research more easily to be analyzed considering the context would be the same as in real life. Al Farisi et al. (2019) summarize that the purposes of the study are set to identify and describe the types of taboo words uttered by the characters and to describe the functions of taboo words uttered by the characters in the *Alpha Dog* movie. It is found that all the designed four types of taboo words that consist of obscenity, profanity, vulgarity, and epithet appear in the movie (Al Farisi et al., 2019). Also, Al Farisi et al. (2019) have also mentioned that the four designated functions: to show contempt, to draw attention to oneself, to be provocative, and to mock authority are also found to appear in the corpus. Last but not least, another study is also done by Nazir et al. (2019), discussing about social taboos in Pakistani Prime Time Urdu Dramas. The study found out that those prime time dramas which are telecasted consist of nine types of social taboos such as obscene language, nudity, disrespectful attitude, violence, drug abuse, racism, divorce, extra-material relation and abortion (Nazir et al., 2019). Nazir et al. (2019) also state that those types of social taboos are used by the views in the society after the dramas in social life, which will not only affects the religious and cultural values, but also the new generations’ social life. All in all, it can be said that these studies are discussing about a certain set of people or character, not focusing on only one. According to Hartini (2014) in constructing a holistic character in which simulatensouly reflects a certain society, a character must be instilled with aspects such as mindset, behaviour and livelihood. In further understanding the idea of mindset in the constructing of a holistic character, Broderon (2019) mindset is a reflection of taboo and it prohibits the character from committing a sin or mistake in which leads to destruction of a particular race or society. Thus, the functionality of atboo is proven to be relevant in constructing and simultaneously

preserving a particular culture, race or society from . This paper is set to take upon the character Frankenstein's monster alone, to find out how the portrayal and acceptance of the character has evolved throughout time.

In doing so, it somehow makes sense to think that the enumeration of taboos and their significance may change over time (Fershtman et al., 2011). As taboos are enforced by social punishment, some taboos may weaken or even disappear, while others may become stronger and more dominant (Fershtman et al., 2011). This actually happens when the millennials are brought into the subject. David P. King (2016) mentions that millennials are more socially tolerant of diversity and difference. Millennials, or which most scholars generally agree as those born between 1980 and 2000, whom are often seen as realistic and pragmatic, are now the largest generation; there are more than 80 million millennials, just under 30 percent of the population (King, 2016). Taboos are not something that can hold them back, as it is a popular perception that millennials are the "nones" - those that check "none of the above" on surveys to identify their religious affiliation (King, 2016). The change of social pattern and acceptance cannot be denied anymore, as the transformed agents of change are generous and purposeful: they know who they are and from where they have come, and they know their passions as per what drives them (King, 2016). Those who are empowered as an agent of change out of their faith commitment have discovered how the stories of their faith align with their work in the world, and it is this type of transformation that leads us to generous way of life (King, 2016). This is also supported by Gutierrez & Giner-Sorolla (2007), as they state that in today's Western society, a common liberal standard of tolerable behavior is rights-based: people can and are allowed do as they please, as long as they do not violate other people's rights or disturbing others, by doing so.

After looking at the studies and perceptions on taboos, it can be concluded that taboos are no longer something in which the generation nowadays, or millennials, think of to be of too much negativity. As long as they can or will get something beneficial, they are more willingly to accept than to deny the facts that taboos are just something different, and the difference is to be accepted and tolerated, not to be marginalized and looked down upon.

### **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The fundamental of the discipline of Comparative Literature is, one must look at the points of convergence and divergence. This is because, the aspects deal with the similarities and differences when comparing texts that differ in their origins. By stressing upon these notions, one is able to identify and distinct what are present and not present while comparing the texts. In addition, one can also discuss the similarities and differences in themes, issues, and culture of the texts. "*In the comparative literature convergence and divergence stand apart as perhaps the most important themes*" (Cox. H. R., 1993). This is to emphasize the crucialness of these two aspects when analyzing texts using this discipline. "*Scholars who study convergence note that similar pressures, such as industrialization, urbanization, and breakdown in traditional community relationships, account for similarities in development of welfare states. Other scholars, by contrast, emphasize the divergence in development*" (Cox. H. R., 1993).

Under the discipline of Comparative Literature, there are two so-called School of Thoughts, namely the French school and the American school. Guillen (1993) states that there were no French 'school' and American 'school' as these are inappropriate terms to be used for the twentieth century, and it is preferable to be termed as the French hour and the American hour. The French hour allowed space for for investigations of very different types, but the

studies were based on national literatures— on their preeminence— and on the connections between them (Guillen, 1993). Adding up, Guillen (1993) also states that the major emphasis was placed on phenomena of influence, transmission, communication, transit (passage), or the link between activities and works belonging to different national spheres. The American hour, on the other hand, is quest for a more daring and more genuine solidarity, a denunciation of the prevalence of the investigation of influences in the principal national literatures (Guillen, 1993). Instead, comparatists proposed a deeper humanism, a wider, more lucid perception of our own time, as they benefited to a remarkable extent from such a conjunction of spirits and learning, reaching new heights in specialties as diverse as the history of art, physics, sociology, psychology, psychoanalysis, architecture, political science, history of science, linguistics— and also comparative literature (Guillen, 1993). The rigidity and enclosed sense of the French comparatists made this study more keen to deploy the American school or hour as the base of study, as it is more dynamic in comparatism of using different forms of texts, not limiting it to only at the international level.

Entextualization is also a branch from the discipline of Comparative Literature. This theory is an act where one takes a criteria or aspect from the original source, and places it to a different discourse or any forms of media that crosses time and space. As coined by Urban.G and Silverstein. M. (1996), “*Entextualization is understood as the process of rendering a given instance of discourse a text, detachable from its local context, replication is one way, seemingly, of implementing detachment*”. On the same page, Thomas. A and Ali Behdad (2014) suggests the notion of Entextualization as “*Analysis is entextualization – a term pointing towards processes of lifting text out of context, placing it in another context an adding metapragmatic qualifications to it, thus specifying the conditions for how texts should be understood, what they mean and stand for, and so on*”

An example of applying this theory is by taking either taking any character from its original universe as a whole or strictly only its characteristics and places it into another universe or story. At the perspective of Entextualization, this has somehow give a new image and perspective to the Entextualized character from the original text. Other than giving the Entextualized character a new perspective, the notion of Entextualization can also operate to oppose and challenges the stereotypical norms, thus putting the Entextualized character onto a positive spotlight; “*in the New Age case, the entextualization process is simultaneously normative and oppositional*” (Davis. E. J., 2002).

## **ANALYSIS**

Upon combining and applying these theories together, this paper initiates its analysis by first deploying the theory of Entextualization towards these three Frankenstein’s monsters. This is primarily functioned to discern the evolution of the Frankenstein’s monster’s crude traits to a more refined and human-like appearance. Furthermore, through the use of Entextualization, this paper also observes the monster’s social circle and role.

In the literature review section, it has already been established in regards to the monster’s main traits which are found in the novel which are sewn marks, different patches of human skin or limbs, gargantuan sized, with demonic strength and marginalized. Now this paper proceeds its analysis to the second corpus, *Van Helsing*. In the film, the monster still retain some of its original traits; sewn marks, gargantuan like size and demonic strength. Yet there are a few evolved noticeable traits, such as the monster has less patches of different human limbs, is more masculine, has visible mechanical support on its limbs such as an

electrical generator behind its head, a mechanical contraption located at its chest, a steel waist and leg support, and a massive screw is placed on its neck. Other visible traits that are worth mentioning are its eyes, facial expressions and compassion characteristics. The monster has a pair of different coloured eyes; one is blue and the other one is green. It has a gentle and compassionate expression if compared to Shelley's Frankenstein's monster. The monster is also seen as very compassionate, and the evidence can be seen in the film where the monster values Van Helsing's life more than its own.

Frankenstein's monster: *"There is a cure."*

Van Helsing: *"What?"*

Frankenstein's monster: *"Dracula has the cure to remove the curse of the werewolf. Go find the cure. Save yourself."*

In the aspect of the monster's social circle, the monster is seen to befriend and accepted by Van Helsing and his team. Van Helsing is very determined to save the Frankenstein's monster after it was captured by Dracula and his minions.

Van Helsing: *"I'll find you, I'll get you back and set you free. I swear to God."*

In the film, the monster is given a role, compared to Shelley's Frankenstein's monster as the monster roams the world after its creation and returns only to kill his creator. In the film *Van Helsing*, the monster holds the key to Dracula's evil plan. If the monster falls into Dracula's hands, the world will be doomed, and vice versa. At this point the monster's spotlight has moved from the marginalized spotlight to the supporting spotlight.

Frankenstein's monster: *"If you value your lives and the lives of your kind, you will kill me. If Dracula finds me, I am the key to my father's machine. The key to life, life to Dracula's children"*.

This paper now proceeds to the final corpus, which is *Soul Eater*. In this corpus, the monster has been taken up to a more refined state compared to the previous corpus. In regards to its appearance, compared to the Frankenstein's monster in Shelley's and *Van Helsing's*, the monster is found to only preserve three of the original traits of the Frankenstein's monster which are sewn marks, demonic powers and a massive screw pierced through its head. The rest of the monster's appearance are, its face is of a normal human face with sewn marks, having a normal human height, wears a spectacle, can speak very well, and it even wears a scientist's uniform with a sewn mark design.

In the corpus, the monster is no longer a monster, as it has its own identity and is given major roles. It is called Professor Stein, and he is one of the weapon experts and a teacher at the Death Weapon Meister Academy (DWMA). He is also one of the main examiners for the young candidates to enter the academy,

Professor Stein: *"You are in the passing grade, good job. Your extra lessons have been completed, you gave up your own body to protect your own meister. That's all you need to earn a pass from me."*

He has a wider social circle compared to the previous corpus. He is well respected, smart, meticulous and feared even by his colleagues and students.



Grim Reaper: “*Its only possible if a human has a soul that is incredibly flexible. Stein does, that is one of the reasons why he is so difficult to defeat in a fight.*”

Furthermore, other traits that Professor Stein have are, his weapon of choice is a massive sickle and it is able to omit a high voltage of electricity. This refined character is beginning to appear more like the archetypal hero. This is as supported by Eckard (2015), the archetypal hero is usually equipped with his or her weapon of choice. Examples of the archetypal heroes and their weapons are King Arthur and his undefeated Excalibur or Hercules with his massive club.

Mery Shelley’s “ <i>Frankenstein</i> ”	<i>Van Helsing</i>	<i>Soul Eater</i>
Physical traits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewn Marks.</li> <li>• Different patches of limbs.</li> <li>• Gargantuan size.</li> <li>• Screws on its head.</li> <li>• Demonic Strength.</li> </ul>	Physical traits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewn marks.</li> <li>• Less different patches of limbs.</li> <li>• Gargantuan size.</li> <li>• Screw on its head.</li> <li>• Demonic strength.</li> <li>• Equipped with electrical contraptions.</li> <li>• More human like expression.</li> <li>• Patches of green and blue eyes.</li> <li>• Compassionate.</li> </ul>	Physical traits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewn marks</li> <li>• No patches of different limbs.</li> <li>• Screw on its head.</li> <li>• Wearing a scientist attire with a sewn mark design.</li> <li>• Have a more human-like appearance.</li> <li>• Have a normal human size.</li> <li>• Handsome.</li> <li>• Great in combat and smart.</li> <li>• Wiolds a weapon of choice.</li> </ul>
Roles and Acceptance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginalized</li> </ul>	Roles and Acceptance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Van Helsing’s friend</li> <li>• Key to Dracula’s evil plan</li> <li>• Becoming the supporting character</li> </ul>	Roles and Acceptance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A weapon’s expert, teacher and examiner at the DWMA.</li> <li>• Respected and feared by colleagues and students.</li> </ul>

Based on the table, it is clear that the monster’s appearance from the original work of Mary Shelley has indeed undergone a massive evolution. Furthermore, these characters have broke free from its original and stereotypical characteristics. Through the application of Entextualization, the monster alone has been taken out from its original context, lifted and relocated to another discourse. It has reconstructed and positioned the character under a more positive spotlight. Moreover, the monster as the marginalized character is no longer at the periphery and feared. Instead, the monster has been refined, is having positive traits, is accepted and is having significant roles. Thus, these have made the character to be accepted by the society, and it is also put able to blend in together with the rest of the society.

As it has been explained previously, a taboo is a lens through which social processes of mainstreaming, policing, disciplining and othering become evident (Flubacher & Hagi-Mead, 2019). They also added that taboos can be conceptualized as what is unsayable, unspeakable and undoable – most often connected to, yet not limited to such acts of violence, sexuality or consumption (Flubacher & Hagi-Mead, 2019). As time passes by, people began to accept this taboo occurrences. This is what has happened with the character Frankenstein’s monster. In the novel, he does not have his own will, and even his creator, Frankenstein, curses himself for creating him, and asks him to go away.

*“Cursed be the day, abhorred devil, in which you first saw light! Cursed (although I curse myself) be the hands that formed you! You have made me wretched beyond expression. You have left me no power to consider whether I am just to you or not. Begone! Relieve me from the sight of your detested form”* (Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein, 1818).

As we can see from the excerpt, even Frankenstein himself said that the monster has a detested form. This somehow shows that the monster is not being liked, or simply said, hated, by his own creator. However, things have come out a bit positive in the movie *Van Helsing*, as the monster is being accepted more than it is supposed to be treated, as in the novel by Mary Shelley. It is accepted by Van Helsing himself, and it is actually showing that the original in-novel appearance, traits and characteristics of the Frankenstein’s monster has been changed and modified for the portrayal of the character to be blended and accepted by the society. In this case, it is likely the same as taboo. Moreover, in the last corpus, the Frankenstein’s monster has his own role, in protecting his students and defending their school.

From a glance, the Frankenstein’s monster may be seen as an embodiment of fear, grotesqueness, the marginalized and the detested. Through the lens of Entextualization, however, the monster has evolved itself from the negative embodiments, thus portraying the metaphor of acceptance in reflecting the current pattern of the social which embraces taboo as not a ‘sin’. This is a fact which proves that Frankenstein is no longer the metaphor of the grotesque, failure, sin, taboo, and periphery but a dynamic figure whom has the capability to evolve, to be accepted and to blend in. Suggested by Misran Rokimin, Mawar Safei and Che Abdullah Che Ya (2011), a work of literature is a reflection of society told in a form of tales, the Frankenstein’s monster has become an agent of reflection, reflecting the social patterns of change liberating themselves from the social chain, taboo. Although, the liberation from social bind allows a culture to advance at some field. Such act of liberation at some point will corrode away a particular cultural inheritance and leads to the lost of a cultural identity (Mohd Yusaidy Mohd Yusoff, 2019)

## **CONCLUSION**

In a nutshell, it can be summarized that the character Frankenstein’s monster is no longer being put aside, as only a sidekick or an unimportant character. From the no-one cares or thinks of character, the monster has been given a more important role. This evolution is what the study has been focusing to find out, and the answers are surprisingly unexpected. What Frankenstein has done is actually a taboo in which no one really expected from such a person with a good family background. The monster himself is a taboo, as Frankenstein is actually playing God; he gives or creates life when he is not bound to do so.

## REFERENCES

- Alfarisi, M. S., Adi, A., & Astuti, E. S. (2019). A Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Taboo Words In Alpha Dog Movie. *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 146-155.
- Allen, G. (2008). *Shelley's Frankenstein*. A&C Black.
- Atsushi Okubo. (2008). *Soul Eater*. Anime. Japan: Bones.
- Behdad, A., & Thomas, D. (Eds.). (2014). *A Companion To Comparative Literature*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brodersen, E. (2019). *Taboo, Personal and Collective Representations: Origin and Positioning Within Cultural Complexes*. Routledge.
- Cox, R. H. (1993). *The Development of the Dutch Welfare State: From Workers Insurance to Worker Entitlement*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Davis, J. E. (2002). Narrative and Social Movements: The Power of Stories. *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social*
- Fershtman, C., Gneezy, U. & Hoffman, M. (2011) Taboos and Identity: Considering the Unthinkable. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 3(2): 139–164
- Gutierrez, R. & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2007) Anger, Disgust, and Presumption of Harm as Reactions to Taboo-Breaking Behaviors. *Emotion*, 7 (4): 853-868.
- Hartini (2014). Character Education Values Of Female Characters In. *Jurnal Melayu Jilid*, 12(1), 44.
- Hunter, P. J. (2016). *Frankenstein (Second International Student Edition) (Norton Critical Editions)*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- King, D. P. (2016) Millennials, Faith and Philanthropy: Who Will be Transformed? *Bridge/Work: 1(1)*, 2.
- Michaud, N. (Ed.). (2013). *Frankenstein and Philosophy: The Shocking Truth* (Vol. 79). Open Court.
- Nazir, F., Ali, A., & Farooq, M. (2019) Social Taboos in Pakistani Prime Time Urdu Dramas. *Global Regional Review*, 4, 67-77.
- Pearce, J. (2018). *Frankenstein: Ignatius Critical Editions*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Rollin, B. E. (1995). *The Frankenstein syndrome: Ethical And Social Issues In The Genetic Engineering Of Animals*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rokimin, M., Safei, M., & Ya, C. A. C. (2011). Mobiliti Sosial Dalam Interlok Karya Abdullah Hussain Social Mobility In Interlok By Abdullah Hussain. *Jurnal Melayu*, 8.
- Scher, S. P. (2004). *Essays On Literature And Music (1967-2004)* (Vol. 5). Rodopi.
- Shelley, M. (2012). *Frankenstein*. UK: Transatlantic Press Book.
- Sommers, S. (2004). *Van Helsing*. Movie. USA: Universal Pictures.
- Syahputri, V. N., Keumala, M., Rahma, E. A., Idami, Z., & Saputra, E. (2019). “Don't sweep the floor!” Verbal and nonverbal taboo in Nagan Raya, Aceh. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(2), 309-318.
- Urban, G and Silverstein, M. (1996). *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Venturini, S. (2011). Synopsis of the Current Situation of Comparative Humanities in the U.S. And Europe. 452 F. *Electronic Journal of Theory of Lotearature and Comparative Literature*, 5, 13-31.
- Yusoff, M. Y. M. (2018). Pemuliharaan Warisan Budaya Melalui Perundangan Warisan Dan Agensi Pelaksana Di Malaysia. *Jurnal Melayu*, 2(17).

**Biodata Penulis:**

**Ahmad Muhyiddin Yusof, Nazirul Mubin Mohd Noor, dan Airil Haimi Mohd Adnan** adalah pensyarah UiTM cawangan Perak, manakala Mohd Naquiuddin Zulkarnain adalah pensyarah UiTM cawangan Pahang.