



ISSN: 2957-3874 (Print)

Journal of Al-Farabi for Humanity Sciences (JFHS)

<https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/95>

مجلة الفارابي للعلوم الإنسانية تصدرها جامعة الفارابي



Reinventing the Monster: The Frankenstein Archetype in Max Barry's Machine Man

Suhad J.Mohammed Al-Sammarraie Tikrit University\College of Education for Humanities

suhadsss@tu.edu.iq

Lamiaa Ahmed Rasheed Tikrit University\College of Education for Humanities

*Lamia.ahmed62@tu.edu.iq

إعادة اختراع الوحش: نموذج فرانكنشتاين النمطي في رواية "الرجل الآلي" لماكس باري

سهاد ج. محمد السامرائي جامعة تكريت/كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

لمياء أحمد رشيد جامعة تكريت/كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

الملخص

تتناول الدراسة الحالية رواية فرانكنشتاين لماري شيلي (١٨١٨) باعتبارها نموذجاً نمطياً من خلال تحليل تأثيرها على شخصية تشارلز نيومان. الشخصية الرئيسية في رواية "إنسان آلي" (٢٠١١) لماكس باري. ويركز الاهتمام الأساسي على إبراز أوجه التشابه بين نيومان وفرانكنشتاين، الذي ينبع منه هذا النموذج النمطي. تمثل رواية ماكس باري "إنسان آلي" اقتباساً معاصراً لأسطورة فرانكنشتاين، تُسلط الضوء من خلاله على مخاطر الطموح اللامتناهي، والعزلة، والبحث عن الهوية في عالم المكننة الاصطناعية المتزايد يوماً بعد يوم. ومن خلال رحلة نيومان، يدعو باري القراء إلى التأمل في معنى أن تكون إنساناً في عصرٍ يمكن للتكنولوجيا فيه إعادة تعريف الوجود نفسه. الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو تقديم أدلة تدعم مقارنة نيومان بفرانكنشتاين شيلي، فبينما يتحول نيومان إلى هجين بين الإنسان والآلة، تتداخل الحدود بين الخالق والمخلوق، مما يعكس معاناة مخلوق شيلي. وتنتقد الرواية هوس المجتمع بالتقدم التكنولوجي والاعتدال المحتمل الذي يمكن أن ينشأ عنه. تعتمد هذه الورقة البحثية على منهجية التكيف لوضع أسطورة فرانكنشتاين في سياقها ضمن التقاليد الثقافية والتاريخية. وينصب التركيز على فهم العلاقات المعقدة بين النصوص المختلفة، والتقاليد المتباينة، والوسائط الديناميكية التي حُولت إليها رواية فرانكنشتاين. ومن هذا المنطلق، لا تُعزى تفسيرات أي اقتباس، بما في ذلك رواية شيلي، إلى نص واحد فقط، أو محددة، أو مجموعة من الاهتمامات الثقافية، بل تتأثر أيضاً بروابط متنوعة مع اقتباسات أخرى **الكلمات المفتاحية:** النموذج النمطي، فرانكنشتاين، الاقتباس، إنسان آلي، التكنولوجيا

Abstract

The current study handles Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*(1818), as an archetype by analyzing its impact on the characterization of Charles Neumann, a primary protagonist in Max Barry's *Machine Man*(2011). The primary focus is centered on accentuating the parallels between Neumann and Frankenstein, from which this archetype originates. Max Barry's *Machine Man* serves as a modern adaptation of the Frankenstein myth, emphasizing the dangers of unchecked ambition, isolation and the search for identity in an increasingly mechanized world. Through Neumann's journey, Barry invites readers to reflect on what it means to be human in an age where technology can redefine existence itself. The objective of this study is to furnish substantiation for the comparison of Neumann to Shelley's Frankenstein, as Neumann transforms into a hybrid of man and machine, the boundaries between creator and creation blur, mirroring the struggles of Shelley's creature. The novel critiques society's obsession with technological advancement and the potential alienation that can arise from it. This paper employs adaptation approach to contextualize the Frankenstein myth within cultural and historical traditions. The focus is on understanding the complex relationships between the various texts, disparate

traditions, and dynamic media in which Frankenstein has been adapted. From this standpoint, the interpretations of any given adaptation, including Shelley's novel, are not solely attributed to a singular text, a specific myth, or a collection of cultural concerns. Rather, they are also influenced by various connections to other adaptations.

Keywords: archetype, Frankenstein, adaptation, Machine Man, Technology.

1.1 Introduction Since the 1960s, there has been a notable advancement in academic discourse of adaptation, particularly in the realm of theoretical analysis of the interplay between literature and film. The concept of adaptation has been a longstanding feature in the history of cinema. However, it is only in recent decades that scholars have devoted significant attention to the study of adaptation theory. Despite gaining recognition as a field of study, the topic of adaptation remains a subject of debate among the majority of scholars. As Slethaug (2014) states that "the majority of the preceding academic literature on film adaptation is often rudimentary, preliminary, and contentious" (p. 26). According to Linda Hutcheon's *Theory of Adaptation* (2006), the act of adaptation involves "modifying, changing, or rendering appropriate" and she suggests various methods to accomplish this task. An adaptation, when viewed as a formal entity or product, refers to a publicly declared and comprehensive transformation of a specific piece of work. The process of "transcoding" refers to the transformation of a work of art from one medium or genre to another. This may involve a shift in context, such as retelling a story from a different perspective, resulting in a distinct interpretation. The term "transposition" can also refer to a change in the ontological status of a subject matter, wherein it is shifted from a factual or historical account to a fictionalized narrative or dramatic representation. The process of adaptation, as a creative endeavor, invariably entails both reinterpretation and subsequent recreation. Depending on one's viewpoint, this has been referred to as either appropriation or salvaging. From a reception standpoint, adaptation can be viewed as a type of intertextuality. Adaptations are perceived as palimpsests, with the memory of other works resonating through repetition with variation. This is reminiscent of the manner in which fairy tales, legends, folklore, and myths are experienced (Hutcheon, 2006). Hutcheon elaborates, saying that despite how simple the concept of adaptation may appear at first glance, it is quite challenging to define, partly because we use the same word for both the process and the result. An adaptation can be formally defined as a form of creative reinterpretation and palimpsest intertextuality, more precisely as a product (both of production and reception as comprehensive, individual transcoding). By centering attention on the process, we are able to consider how adaptations enable people to tell, show, or interact with stories, moving the field of adaptation studies beyond its traditional focus on medium specificity and individual comparative case studies. However, when viewers interact with stories in third-person virtual reality or through machine, the perspective shifts, and the grammar adapts accordingly. There is an argument to be made that all three modes are "immersive," though to varying degrees and in different ways; for instance, the telling mode (a novel, play, or short story) immerses us through imagination into a fictional world. Second, the showing mode (theatre and film) completely submerges us in the experience through our auditory and visual senses. Third, the latter is related to Renaissance perspective painting, Baroque trompe l'oeil in that the participatory mode (videogames) immerses us physically, and kinesthetically (Hutcheon, 2006). When employing the telling mode, such as in narrative literature, the reader's involvement commences within the domain of imagination. This realm is governed by the specific, guiding language of the written work, yet also emancipated from the confines of the visual or auditory senses. The recipients possess the ability to discontinue their perusal of the text at any juncture, selectively revisit or bypass certain sections, or physically manipulate the book to gauge the extent of the narrative yet to be consumed through both tactile and visual means. The transition towards the mode of exhibition such as in theatrical and cinematic adaptations, results in individuals being entrapped in a ceaseless and progressive narrative. The objects in question have transitioned from the realm of mental imagery to that of immediate sensory experience, encompassing both specific particulars and a wider perspective. The performance mode instructs individuals that language does not exclusively serve as the sole means of conveying significance or narrating tales. The utilization of visual and gestural representations is abundant in intricate associations. Music provides aural "equivalents" for the emotions of characters, thereby eliciting affective responses in the audience. Additionally, sound has the ability to amplify, strengthen, or even oppose the visual and verbal components. Conversely, a demonstrated portrayal falls short in replicating the intricate linguistic maneuvers of oral poetry or the seamless integration of depiction, storytelling, and clarification that prose narrative effortlessly achieves (Hutcheon, 2006). Hence, during the postmodern era, the act of narrating a story through written or spoken language is distinct from presenting it through various performance media that engage both visual and auditory senses. While some adaptations may originate from a singular source text, several

adaptations incorporate numerous sources into a fresh framework or structure. The aforementioned adaptations exhibit a degree of accuracy, yet when situated within an alternative framework, they diverge from the original text in a novel or distinct manner. The adaptation, whether sourced from a singular or multiple origins, surpasses the constraints of its source/s. This negates any hierarchical structure and implies that the interpretation of both the origin and adaptation is uncertain. However, the adaptive encounter no longer accords greater importance to the primary text over the iteration. Hutcheon's perspective aligns with that of Dudley Andrew, who questions the conventional paradigms' "transcendent order". Hutcheon (2006), shares this view by advocating for a "de-hierarchizing impulse," which seeks to contest the cultural devaluation of postmodernism, parody, and adaptation. These concepts are often regarded as inferior and secondary. Hutcheon's observation is particularly intriguing as it highlights the morally charged discourse of fidelity that rests on the underlying assumption that adapters strive to merely replicate the adapted text. The concept of adaptation involves the act of repeating a process or behavior, but in a manner, that does not involve exact duplication. The act of adaptation can be driven by various intentions, and it is evident that there are numerous possibilities. It is equally probable for individuals to desire to consume and obliterate the memory of the adapted text, as it is for them to intend to honor the original work by replicating it (Greenberg, 1998). When the recipient of an adaptation is familiar with the original text, adaptation inherently involves a form of intertextuality for the reader, viewer, or listener. The process is characterized by ongoing dialogue whereby we engage in a comparative analysis of our existing knowledge with the work we are currently encountering (Stam, 2000). French semiotic and post-structuralist theories of intertextuality, as exemplified by Barthes (1971/1977) and Kristeva (1969/1986), have played a significant role in challenging the prevailing post-Romantic ideas of originality, uniqueness, and autonomy by emphasizing the relationship between individual works and the broader cultural system. According to scholarly discourse, texts are considered to be a collection of both apparent and concealed references, audible and inaudible, that have already been authored and perused. They are akin to a mosaic of citations. Adaptations are also recognized as adaptations of particular texts, with the additional caveat that they are acknowledged as such. According to Hutcheon, adaptation can be defined as the recognized transposition of one or more identifiable works. The act of appropriation/salvaging can be viewed as a creative and interpretive endeavor that involves engaging with an adapted work through an extended intertextual approach. Thus, an adaptation can be defined as a creation that is not merely derivative, but rather a work that is secondary in nature without being subordinate (Hutcheon, 2006). This can be exemplified by the adaptation of the archetypal character "Frankenstein" from Mary Shelley's novel, *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus*. The term "archetype" originates from the combination of two Greek words, namely "arche" which denotes the concept of a starting point, and "type" which refers to an impression or imprint. The term in question was originally conceptualized by the Swiss psychologist Carl Jung, who possessed a keen interest in the study of mythology and religion throughout history. According to Jung, archetypes are representative of patterns of psychic energy that stem from the collective unconscious and are most frequently and typically manifested in dreams. The author outlines four distinct archetypes of human beings, namely Persona, Self, Shadow, and Anima/Animus. The term "Persona" can be traced back to its Latin origin, which derives from the word "persona" meaning "mask". The manner in which we project ourselves to society is of utmost importance. The concept of the self pertains to the amalgamation of an individual's conscious and unconscious aspects. As per the individual's definition, the collective unconsciousness is not a product of individual development but rather an inherited phenomenon. According to Jung, the archetypes are pre-existing forms that can only attain consciousness secondarily. These archetypes are responsible for providing a specific form to certain psychic contents (Gijo and George, 2021). According to Jungian terminology, the archetype of the Self holds utmost significance and is represented by a circular symbol known as a mandala, as per Jung's depiction. The concept of the psyche comprises both the conscious and unconscious aspects of an individual's mind. It serves as the core of one's personality and encompasses all facets of the psyche. According to Jung, the psyche is analogous to the relationship between a moved object and its mover, with the Self-serving as the mover. The concept of the self serves as the foundation from which the ego develops. As noted by Jung, "the phenomenon can be interpreted as an inadvertent foreshadowing of the ego (as cited in Steven, 2002, p. 111). The shadow represents the domain of our innate impulses, comprising our primitive, obscure, and unacknowledged aspects. It encompasses our capacity for homicide, torture, theft, deceit, hostility, impropriety, and general deviance. According to Jungian theory, the internal struggle between the two facets of consciousness is a manifestation of the polarized nature of the psyche. This is consistent with the principle that all energetic systems rely on the tension between opposing forces (as cited in Steven, 2002). According to Jung,

a comprehensive understanding of the polarized psyche, as it manifests both individually and collectively, necessitates the inclusion of the archetype of shadow in the discourse; the shadow is comprised of elements of our self that we have rejected and relegated to our unconscious psyche. The concept of Anima refers to the feminine archetype within the male psyche, while Animus represents the male archetype within the female psyche. These archetypes are believed to symbolize the individual's authentic self (p. 250). Archetypes are a literary device that has been added to the repertoire of diverse literary techniques, which includes metaphor, imagery, and symbol. As stated by T.S. Eliot (2010) "the use of literary devices serves not only as a tool for artistic expression, but also as a means of imposing structure" (p.86). The statement holds particular significance within the framework of modern history, which is distinguished by a pervasive feeling of uselessness and disorder. The discussed phenomenon pertains to the aspect of the human psyche that functions beyond conscious awareness and is expressed through the use of 'archetypes,' 'motifs,' or 'primordial images.' The use of mythology has proven to be a highly efficacious mechanism in achieving heightened suggestiveness and expanded significance, as it allows for the communication of a plethora of ideas through succinct means. This concerns the cultural and belief systems of the past. The patterns and representations previously mentioned are commonly denoted as "archetypes" in scholarly discussions. The term "universal symbols" is frequently utilized to denote these symbols. To clarify more, an archetype refers to a repetitive symbol or theme found in literature that signifies fundamental models of human behavior. It can be argued that there is no singular character that can be considered as the definitive archetype for all subsequent heroes. In addition, it is noteworthy that literary works encompass instances of archetypal myths that are either universal or manifested in repetitive images, symbols, or patterns. These may comprise of motifs such as the quest or the heavenly ascent, recognizable character types like the trickster or the hero, symbols such as the apple or snake, or images like Frankenstein (Jung, 1991). The genesis of the Frankenstein mythos was not a product of singular events, but instead was situated within a wider context of historical and cultural influences. The origin of the Frankenstein myth is frequently attributed to Mary Shelley's literary work, "*Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*," in modern discourse. The myth in question heavily incorporates various myths, legends, and archetypes. The Frankenstein myth has its origins in conventional myths and customs, while simultaneously posing certain challenges to them. The intricate intertextual networks present in Frankenstein render it a highly suitable subject for an adaptation studies approach, particularly in the context of the twenty-first century. Jorgan Bruhn et, al. (2013) observe that a "discernible trend in adaptation studies is the shift away from a singular correspondence between a single source, such as a novel, and a single film" (p.8). Moreover, the concept of adaptation is perceived in a broader context that encompasses the cultural and textual networks in which any textual phenomenon is comprehended. Historically, the various iterations of Frankenstein have been perceived as exploitative renditions, reproductions that consistently fall short of the original. According to Harriet Margolis, adaptation studies provides an opportunity for adaptations to transcend mere imitation and surpass the status of an inherently inferior replica, as she adds, it is hard to imagine "a literature class including [*Frankenstein*] without confronting the Hollywood versions of Mary Shelley's vision" (1990, p.160). Subsequently, the aforementioned film underwent an adaptation process resulting in a literary work authored by the postmodernist writer Max Barry. Barry employed the identical title of the motion picture. Max Barry embarked on his literary journey as a contemporary novelist. His work in question delves into the era of ubiquitous technology. Barry employs the myth of Frankenstein to shed light on various human phenomena, a technique that has been utilized by previous writers and philosophers to elucidate diverse human circumstances. Barry has integrated various recurring motifs of archetypes, and a comprehensive examination demonstrates the significance of these archetypes in clarifying his complex themes. The depiction of Frankenstein is a commonly recurring motif. The novel *Machine Man* (2011) centers around the character of Charles Neumann, a mechanical engineer employed at Better Future, a company that specializes in military research. After experiencing the amputation of one of his lower extremities as a result of a hydraulic clamp, he embarks on a course of experimentation involving prosthetic legs. The prosthetic devices fabricated by the individual in question exhibit a level of complexity that is noteworthy, to the extent that he elects to undergo the amputation of his remaining leg in order to maximize their utility. The subsequent storyline can be construed as a contemporary adaptation of the Frankenstein symbolism, in which Charlie's ambitions for a fairer community are taken advantage of by his higher-ups at the military contracting corporation, who perceive his concept as a way to improve their collection of cyber weapons. The convergence of prosthetics and cybernetics represents a pivotal moment in Charlie's exploration of Mad Science, presenting a substantial obstacle to his pursuits (Graça, 2020).

1.2 Discussion The utilization of archetype by Barry in the novel serves as a means of effectively and comprehensively developing the characters. Neumann is depicted as embodying both the Alchemist archetype and the Mad Scientist archetype. The primary objective of the archetype of the Alchemist is to transmute or generate matter into an altered state. Both novels have a few similarities and some differences. *Machine Man* is the story of Frankenstein but it was written in modern day. As noted by Mahdi Moinzadeh and Sepideh Motamedi, (2017) "Frankenstein depicts the tale of a scientist who brings to life a human-like creature, and subsequently abandoning it" (p.15). While the story of *Machine Man* portrays an incident in the industrial sector that results in the amputation of a scientist's leg. However, the scientist transforms this life-altering event into an opportunity to overcome the crisis. Charles Neumann has turned a crisis, such as the loss of a limb, into an opportunity to create a replacement that surpasses the capabilities of natural limbs. The novel portrays a protagonist who embodies the characteristics of the 4TH Industrial Revolution, which has been influenced by the digital era and the significant transformation brought about by the World Wide Web and exponential technological advancements. The narrative delves into the protagonist's interactions with artificial intelligence and their ability to navigate the integration of machines in both the physical and biological realms. The protagonist of the novel is Dr. Charles Neumann, an individual affiliated with the esteemed Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). Dr. Neumann, who is heavily invested in the field of engineering science, experiences the unfortunate loss of his right leg as a result of a workplace accident. During his hospital stay, he encounters Lola Shanks, a prosthetic specializing in artificial limbs. Shanks provides him with a mechanical leg, initially referred to as Exegesis Archion, which is subsequently enhanced by Charlie with Shanks' consent and subsequently renamed Contours. Dr. Neumann displays a strong preoccupation with the functionality of their mechanical leg. They have recently become aware of issues with their biological left leg, prompting the consideration of replacing it with an artificial alternative that boasts significantly superior performance capabilities, namely the ability to function autonomously. "A warm body is not a requisite for fuel" (Barry, 2011, p. 53). In light of the circumstances, Charlie, who has undergone trans-humanization, exhibits a profound interest in the advancement of technology and proceeds to construct a set of prosthetic legs that surpasses the functionality of his natural limbs. Subsequently, Dr. Neumann intentionally causes an incident in order to dispose of their remaining limb on the left side, ultimately resulting in its amputation. Upon Charlie's loss of his legs, Cassandra Cautery, the crisis manager at Better Future, along with a team of psychiatrists, conducted an investigation to determine whether he was at risk of suicidal behavior and endangering his life. The novel's adaptation of the character of Frankenstein as an archetype impacted a significant addition, as it shapes the portrayal of the Frankenstein narrative in contemporary literature. It can be argued that the individual experiences a form of insanity, given that rational individuals typically do not intentionally undergo self-amputation. Dr. Neumann serves as a cautionary tale regarding the dangers of fixation and the inclination to automate. In due course, he becomes akin to a mechanism, specifically a computing device. His physical features bear resemblance to Neumann, but there is no further correlation beyond the superficial level, Jung (1991) posited that "archetypes are not solely conceptual constructs, but rather physical entities that materialize within the individual" (p.171). Archetypes can be regarded as a form of psychological genetic material, a dynamic framework of responses and possibilities that are linked to the individual through the medium of emotion. Within the medical facility, healthcare professionals have exhibited antagonistic behavior towards the individual, prompting the need for security personnel to be present. Charlie becomes aware of a transformation in his physical form, yet he recollects his previous embodiment with limbs. "I was not wearing them. The aforementioned items were of the latest technology and were constructed by my own hands" (Barry, 2011, p. 63). Charlie's transformation from a human to a machine has commenced due to his isolation and disconnection from society, lacking any familial or amicable bonds. Hence, by transforming into a machine, he is connecting with the shadowy desires that he kept all over his life, when he recalls his memories, he used to dream of becoming a train: "As a boy, I wanted to be a train. I didn't realize this was unusual that other kids played *with* trains, not as them. What I liked was pretending my body was two hundred tons of unstoppable steel." (p.1) A dream that reflects his sense of isolation and alienation. The archetype of Shadow holds a significant and widespread presence, having been personified in literature through numerous malevolent and destructive characters. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the archetypal shadow character does not inherently possess a disposition towards destruction. The archetype of "shadow is characterized by the concealment, suppression, and lack of awareness of a particular aspect of oneself" (Jung, 1959, p.170). Le Breton (2015) posits that disengaging from such bond's entails discovering a sense of direction in one's

existence. The virtual Charlie's sense of accomplishment is closely tied to his unwavering dedication to technology, which holds immense significance in his life. The preface of Frankenstein asserts that the novel presents a favorable portrayal of "domestic affection" (Shelley, 1818). The assertion appears peculiar within the context of a literary work replete with instances of homicide, calamity, and despondency. However, it can be argued that the root cause of tragedy, murder, and despair lies in the absence of social or familial bonds. In alternative terms, the central malevolence depicted in Frankenstein does not stem from the characters of Victor or the monster, but rather from the state of being isolated. Victor's immersion in his studies leads to his withdrawal from human society, resulting in a loss of awareness of his obligations and the repercussions of his conduct. The creature's transformation into a vengeful being is attributed to its seclusion, which engenders an intense sense of animosity and wrath, rather than inherent malevolence. A. Stevens (2002) stated that "Jung recognized the necessity of Legend for individuals to maintain a strong connection with the archetypal essence of their being (p. 61); both novels recognize the significance of archetype aligning with that of Jung. Shelley's extensive familiarity with mythology endowed her with a significant level of awareness and understanding regarding the intrinsic essence of myth and its significance in the advancement and refinement of the self, a phenomenon which Jung (1993) referred to as "individualization" (p.38). Both texts include the theme of runaway technology. In Frankenstein the main character, Victor, created a machine, which he called a monster. On his way back to his dorm, he dreaded seeing what he created in his house, he said, "I dreaded to behold this monster, but I feared still more that Henry should see him." (Shelley, 2011, p.158). But, when he arrived the creation wasn't there. Victor's impressions on technology lead to him to have the over-lasting conflict in his persona. He wanted to "create life" "seeing himself as the God-like man with super powers". Victor Frankenstein embodies the archetype of the Mad Scientist. His insatiable desire for knowledge pertaining to life and his fixation on assembling "The Being" serve as substantiating factors for his character. Shelley provides an illustration of the protagonist's fixation in a particular chapter, wherein he is engrossed in the process of fabricating "The Being". The protagonist's all-consuming preoccupation is articulated as follows: "...the great object, which swallowed up every habit of my nature" (Shelley, 1818, p. 66). Victor is unaware that his creation will become the root of his anguish, thereby invoking the archetype of the persona. This is due to his excessive pursuit of knowledge that surpasses the limits of human understanding. Upon acquiring this knowledge, his life is irrevocably disrupted. The same thing could be applied to Neumann's persona, but because the time is more modern, this time the formation is a "machine" since he knows he cannot create life literary, so he decides to "build a machine" (Barry, 2011, p.39), at the beginning, he used technology for "a better life than he had that kind of conflict in his personality that transform his mind into a computing device so that he can enhance the quality of his self. Neumann once said "we had the technology but we had the wrong place" (Barry, 2011, p.128) Neumann has implemented the concept of self-enhancement via advanced artificial components. Following a traumatic incident resulting in the loss of his leg from the thigh down, he has devoted himself to the development of prosthetic components that surpass typical human biological capabilities. Even his name is symbolic, which mean "new-man", as he immerses himself in his creative endeavors, he encounters various dilemmas, including the ethical quandaries surrounding the development of potentially hazardous technologies. There appears to be a lack of coherence among the characters' perspectives. Charlie is engaged in independent innovation, "Better Future", his company, regards this concept as a potential avenue for the development of advanced weaponry, which would result in heightened influence and financial prosperity. Concerning the similarity between the two novels, and as stated by Collin Pearson (1998) "archetypes are psychological constructs that are represented through symbols, images, and themes, and are universally present in all cultures and throughout history". These constructs are experienced as distinct aspects of the self, but their manifestation can vary depending on individual factors such as culture, context, and historical period. This implies that our perception of the world is shaped by our unique perspective, and that our interpretation of events can differ from person to person. Joseph Campbell (1988) asserts that human beings manifest their shared characteristics through their myths, which serve as narratives of our pursuit, significance, and essence. The utilization of the Archetypal of Frankenstein as an internal knowledge management system by consultants and facilitators of Barry's modern novel highlights Neumann's struggle with the belief that technology can universally enhance the human anatomy, resulting in his own internal conflict.

Conclusion

Max Barry's *Machine Man* reconfigures the Frankenstein archetype through a distinctly posthuman lens, demonstrating the enduring psychological and cultural resonance of Shelley's foundational myth. By employing

Carl Jung's theory of archetypes, this study has shown how key figures—such as the mad scientist, the artificial being, and the fragmented self—manifest in Barry's narrative as expressions of the collective unconscious, updated to reflect contemporary anxieties about identity, control, and technological dependence. Through Jung's archetypes of the shadow, the persona, and the self, *Machine Man* dramatizes the internal conflict between humanity and mechanization, suggesting that the true monstrosity lies not in the machine itself, but in the human desire to transcend vulnerability at any cost. Hence, the creature in Frankenstein's novel can be interpreted as a metaphor for the outcome of the modern technology. Barry's adaptation of Frankenstein exhibits a contracted alignment between technology and humanity, embodying a postmodern amalgamation of diverse and incongruous elements that reflects upon the fragmented and hybrid essence of the individual. One could posit that the portrayal of Barry's human –computing alike serves as a fitting symbol for the multifaceted nature of technology produced in the contemporary postmodernism era.

References

- Al-Jaf, A. I. (2017). Significance of Archetypes in Literature with Reference to Literary Criticism. *Lark Journal for Philosophy, Linguistics and Social Sciences*, 1(26).
- Barry, M. (2011). *Machine Man*. Vintage.
- Bruhn, J. (2013). *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*. A&C Black.
- Bruhn, J., Anne, G., and Eirik, H. (2013). There and Back Again: New Challenges and New Directions in Adaptation Studies. In Jorgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik, and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen (Ed.) *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions* (pp.1-16). Bloomsbury.
- Cham, M. (2005). *Oral Traditions, Literature, and Cinema in Africa*. Oxford University press.
- Elliott, K. (2014). Rethinking Formal–Cultural and Textual–Contextual Divides in Adaptation Studies. *Literature Film Quarterly* 42 (4), 576–593.
- Gijo, D. AND George, k. (2021). Archetypal Criticism: A Brief Study of the Discipline and the Sempiternal Relevance of its Pioneers. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences* 6 (2), 54-60. <https://ijels.com/> Journal DOI: 10.22161/ijels
- Hutcheon, L. (2006). *Theory of Adaption*. Routledge
- Margolis, Harriet E (1990). Lost Baggage: Or, The Hollywood Sidetrack. In Stephen C. Behrendt (Ed.) *Approaches to Teaching Shelley's Frankenstein* (pp. 160-165). *Modern Language Association of America*.
- Moinzadeh, M., & Motamedi, S. (2017). Frankenstein or Prometheus: An Investigation in Essentialism of Medical Technology. *Int J Body Mind & Culture*, 4(1), 17.
- Pearson, C. (1986). *The Heroes Within: Six Archetypes We Live By*. Routledge Press.
- Shelley, M. (1993). *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus*. Ed. M. Butler. Oxford University Press.
- Slethaug, G. (2014). *Adaptation Theory and Criticism Postmodern Literature and Cinema in the USA*. Bloomsbury Academic Press
- Stam, R. (2000). "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation." In James Naremore (Eds.), *Film Adaptation*. (pp.79-105).Athalone.
- Stevens, A. (2002). *Archetype Revisited*. Brunner-Routledge.