

**A view of fearsome experiences: A
comparative Study in Mary Shelley's
Frankenstein and Stephen King's Pet
Sematary (Pet Cemetery)**

نظرة على التجارب المخيفة في روايتي فرانكشتاين لماري شيلي ، وستيفن كينغز مقبرة
الحيوانات الأليفة : دراسة مقارنة

Musaab Natiq Ibrahim

م . مصعب ناطق ابراهيم

**Al-Iraqia University, College of Education for
Women, Department of English, Baghdad, Iraq.**

musaab.ibrahim@aliraqia.edu.iq

ملخص البحث : يتناول البحث الأحداث والتجارب المخيفة في روايتي ، فرانكشتاين لماري شيلي ، وستيفن كينغز (مقبرة الحيوانات الأليفة) من حيث دراسة أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين الأحداث ، ولكن بإطار زمني مختلف ، و معرفة الأسباب التي دفعتهم . لكتابة قصة مخيفة مستوحاة من الخيال والرؤى والكوابيس .يركز البحث على ما يعرف بالخطأ المأساوي وإحياء الموتى ولعب دور الآلهة وتجاوز الخطوط الحمراء لتدور الأحداث في إطار مخيف بترقب وتخوف و نهاية مأساوية . ينسجم مع الحياة الشخصية والتجارب لشيلي وكينغ من ناحية ومع عناصر وخصائص الأدب القوطي في قرنين مختلفين .الكلمات المفتاحية : الادب القوطي ، بعث الموتى، فرانكشتاين والعقيدة الدينية

Abstract

The research deals with the frightening events and experiences in the two novels, *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley, and Stephen King's *Pet Sematary* (Cemetery), to examine the similarities and differences of events, but with a different time frame, and the reasons that prompted both writers to write a frightening story inspired by imagination, visions and nightmares focus on what is known as the tragic flaw, resurrecting the dead and playing The role of the gods and crossing the red lines to revolve events in a frightening framework with anticipation, apprehension and a tragic end. It harmonizes with the personal lives and experiences of Shelley and King on the one hand and with the elements and characteristics of Gothic literature in two different centuries. **Keywords: Gothic genre, Resurrection, Frankenstein and religious doctrine.**

Introduction

Stephen King, the best-selling horror author, has been praised for updating the essential concepts of the horror and scare story to be adapted to modern audiences or readers. King attaches importance to great classics of the genre in his seminal paper *Danse Macabre* (1981), in which he decided to devote himself to discussing the difficulties and challenges of gothic literature, eventually confessing his appreciation for the nineteenth-century book (1818), which contains many met fiction links with his own fiction *Pet Sematary* (1983). The plot of King's work is similar to that of M. Shelley's in that it depicts the life of L. Creed, a doctor who resolves to cross forbidden lines to resurrect his loving deceased wife. In every case, these two researchers deny mysterious forces by playing God in an essentially atheist and intellectually based society. Yet, whereas Victor Frankenstein accomplishes his goal as a consequence of his technological preoccupation, Louis Creed's fault stems from his doubt about religion and faith. The main objective of this paper is to compare and contrast both works to highlight how the gothic and ominous are treated and adapted from Shelley's classic to King's modern literary works.

Stephen King's contributions and the revival of Gothicism

If there is one novelist who has maintained a brand name in contemporary recent horror literature for the last decades, it has to be Stephen King. Since the publishing of his first novel, *Carrie* (1974), he has attained such extraordinary status that some naysayers, who are extremely skeptical of literary fiction, have frequently accused him of going to produce volumes at incredible speeds and going to resort to any aim to attain the intended result of sickening the reader. Nevertheless, many critics, such as Samuel Schuman, tried to figure out the distinguishing features that have propelled S. King to the status of the best-selling contemporary novelist. An impressive ability to imagine effective plots, a talent for creating different characters, and a potently moral perception befitting his New England origins have all been cited as impressive strong points of his writing. Even so, King has primarily become an iconic author due to his profound understanding of his reader base as well as his vast knowledge of the genre's greatest works. (1) S. King has exceeded expectations in having reached out to his audience to his conviction with the need to elicit a specific reaction from the audience. Having known his viewer's needs and desires, he selects an influence and creates a fictitious world using any methods required to achieve that influence. Similarly, King has demonstrated his conscientiousness as an author, trying to reflect on abject terror as a style in his non-fictional collection *Danse Macabre*, including his imaginative methodology in his literary theory *On Composing: A Memoir of the Craft*. His enthusiastic interest in "the original work and art of storytelling," (2) as he describes it in his novel *On Writing*, and also his consideration for trying to produce an impact on the reader, have led reviewers such as Burton R. Pollin to compare him to Edgar A. Poe, particularly since King has frequently recognized his debt to the 19th-century short-story author and the father of the type of literature. (3)

Even though King is well conscious of his status as a successful author, he has frequently used his understanding of major works of the genre to modify and modernize them in his writings, altering old stories to make them marketable and fit for mainstream audiences. As a result, *Salem's Lot* (1975) has been

regarded as King's tribute to Bram Stoker's original vampire fiction, and *The Shining* (1977) as King's original version of the classic ghostly theme in gothic fiction. (4)

In this way, King pays respect to the genre's masterpiece. in his factual chronicle of the history of modern horror literature, *Danse Macabre* professes his affection for *Frankenstein* (1818). Stephen King cynically muses about M. Shelley's novel:

"How did this moderate gothic tale, which was only about a hundred pages long in its first draft (Ms. Shelley's partner, Percy, urged her to expand it), become trapped in a kind of cultural groupthink, intensifying over the years till the, a hundred and sixty-four decades previously, we have a cereal called Franken berry [...] an old Television series called The Beasts [...] Aurora Frankenstein model kit includes [...] and a saying like 'He began to look like Frankenstein'" (5)

Besides demonstrating the immense popularity of M. Shelley's fiction, which continues to be reflected in contemporary culture through films and television shows, S. King's entertaining comment threads from the 1980s also reveal a widespread imprecision on the author's part, almost obviously due to the fantasy of *Frankenstein*'s notoriety. Even if unintentionally, Stephen Makes references to the monster as *Frankenstein* in the last line of his statement, when the monster remains unidentified through M. Shelley's original script, as the relevance in the context of *Frankenstein* only corresponds to the beast's creator's father's surname, Victor. However, the reason that the founder's name is mistaken for the monster's is due to the story's widespread popularity in succeeding versions, particularly in movies, which has significantly contributed to the persistence of this misinformation.

Stephen King's remarks on M. Shelley's story's reputation also mirror Paul O'Flinn's more current argument that "there is no such thing as *Frankenstein*, there are only *Frankensteins*," because the book is "*constantly revised, replicated, refilled, and rebuilt.*"(6)

Similarly, O'Flinn says that *Frankenstein* is a good illustration of the three fundamental ways wherein the book is altered and rearranged, namely, through a body of literary studies, reproduction in cinema, and the cycle of life itself, which inevitably tries to focus and restock a text's contents. Feminism, as a literary analytical device, viewed Mary Shelley's first work as a female person of patriarchal and domestic life in this way. (7)

Classical movie adaptations of *Frankenstein* from Universal Pictures or Hammer Films tried to appeal to audiences by dehumanizing the creature; in many of the movie adaptations, the monster becomes unintelligent and nasty, in stark contrast to its portrayal in the novel. Similarly, regardless of the author's initial aim, the same work has taken on numerous interpretations over time. As a result, King employs this third method of modifying and rearranging a book, adapting the fundamental elements and ideologies of Shelley's titular novel to meet the expectations of current audiences. The central theme of M. Shelley's work cautions against the terrifying perils of pushing science's bounds quite far, as Victor *Frankenstein* crosses the border between life and death to obtain the miracle of eternity through scientific methods. The premise of S. King's work *Pet Sematary* (1983) is similar to Mary Shelley's in that it chronicles the life of a physician, L. Creed, who resolves to cross prohibited lines to resurrect his cherished dead. In both novels, these two researchers resist the uncertainty, playing Almighty in progressive atheism and technologically oriented community, even though each novel emphasizes a different aspect of the intellectual or theological debate. (8)

The biographical elements and the influence of the myth

Each Shelley and King appeared particularly keen to explain the personal events that inspired their stories in the prefaces of their respective field of work. Shelley's version of *Frankenstein*'s origins, which she included in the introduction to the 1831 publication of the book, has increased in popularity through time (9).

The summer Percy and M. Shelley spent in Swiss in 1816 as Lord Byron's neighbours were uninviting and wet, so they wanted to write a horror story in response to the writer of *Childe Harold*'s demand. M. Shelley struggled to come up with a plot at first until the origin of her *Frankenstein* began to take shape in a vision. Lord Byron and Percy Shelley have been talking about it recently. Due to Erasmus Darwin's observations and Luigi Galvani's investigations, and whether it was possible to reanimate a body that had been bereft of life. Mary had been a quiet but attentive participant during all of their discussions. She may have dreamed of an eager student who, ready to play the part of the Creator, had imbued dead matter with the glimmer of life, and while he slept, his creation stood by his bed, staring at its maker, as a result of these intellectual

disputes. Mary started to be haunted by this dream, so she determined to include it in her story, assuming that what had horrified her would indeed scare others. (10)

Correspondingly, S. King discusses how he managed to come up with the central concept for *Pet Sematary* (11) in the opening of his novel. In the 1970s, King was summoned to spend a year as a writer in a residential area and faculty member in fantastic education at the University of Maine. Towards that final moment, King's household rented a place in a rural village near a university. Although it was a peaceful area, a neighbour alerted them about the risks of the nearby street, which was congested with road tankers heading to the chemical factory down the road. When King found a path to the little pet cemetery in the wooded area, where the young kids from the community used to bury their pets, several of whom had been run over there on the street, he began to gain perspective into the nearby menace. (12)

S. King and his wife, Tabitha, had an eight-year-old girl and a boy under the age of two at the period. As a result, they grew particularly worried about the danger that a busy highway near their home would cause. However, their suspicions were confirmed when their kid's kitten, a kitten named Smucky, was run over and buried in the neighbourhood's pet cemetery. As King confesses, that was the first occurrence in his daughter's life that made her deal with death. Similarly, King was about to have one of the most unpleasant experiences of his life when he went flying a kite with his kid, and although he was only a baby at the time, he began to rush towards the road as a large truck approached quickly. King acted fast, averting a disaster, but from then on, he couldn't help but wonder what would have occurred if he hadn't been careful enough on that specific occasion. According to King, his novel *Pet Sematary* was inspired by his anguish at the time, and he revealed that once he completed writing it, he was hesitant to publicize it and thus left the piece of writing unreleased for years, owing to the despair and shocking impact the events depicted in the novel nevertheless had on him. In this respect, King himself has confessed that *The Shining* (1977) is the work that terrifies his audience the most, although he's always regarded *Pet Sematary* to be the most terrifying book he has ever produced, owing to the intimate and terrifying memories that inspired the novel. (13)

The basic concepts that underpin *Frankenstein* and *Pet Sematary* came to their various writers as a result of direct events that occurred during the period. However, it appears that, on a more instinctual level, it is required to obtain an understanding of the reasons why the authors' observations were so terrifying. M. Shelley's nightmares about the physician staring at the abominable creature he had given life to may have arisen from Byron and Percy Shelley's debates about the rule of life, but it was also potentially tied to M. Shelley's insecurities about parenthood and delivering a baby. Only 10 days after Mary's birth, her mother, the feminist literary Mary Wollstonecraft, died of childbed fever. After being reared solely by her father, Mary attempted to maintain a sense of family through her marriage to Shelley the famous poet of the Romantic Age. (14) Despite this, she had a string of preterm babies who died right after birth, and her first child, William, sadly died at the age of 3. *Frankenstein* was envisioned by Shelley as a fiction of initiation into the thuggish tactics of existence and via the need to adopt deadly disease and not try to interfere with the natural order of birth and death, as an interpretation of her motherhood gone wrong, and as a fiction of induction into the immoderate remarks of existence through the need to adopt fatal disease and not try to interfere with the instinctual order of birth and fatality. In this aspect, feminist interpretations of M. Shelley's narrative have concentrated on a masculine appropriation of motherhood that ends in clear tragedy, since Victor Frankenstein and, by implication, physician L. Creed in Stephen King's novel is both males who dare to bring life. Because Captain Walton's account spans nine months and a day, Nora Crook has attracted attention to understanding *Frankenstein* as a creation myth. (15) Likewise, S. King's masterpiece *Pet Sematary* appears to be heavily influenced by his parenthood and family experiences. King, like Mary Shelley, was taught alone by his mother after his father left the family when he was two years old. King, like M. Shelley, lauded the virtues of family life especially because he had experienced the deprivation of a father as a child. As a result, the disaster that could have occurred if he hadn't been vigilant enough to keep an eye on his two-year-old kid who was playing beside the street seemed to hide even deeper anxieties, such as whether he could regard himself as a decent and dedicated parent in contrast to his dad. (16)

Narrative and Characters Development

S. King's work *Pet Sematary* exhibits major interpretive connections with M. Shelley's famous novel *Frankenstein* in aspects of characterization, narrative, and even fundamental themes while maintaining the required historical difference. Victor Frankenstein's equivalent in Stephen King's story, L. Creed, is a

romantic hero and committed physician who transcends the constraints that characterize human beings. L. Creed is a family man and a medical practitioner who believes that death is inevitable in all existence. In King's work, however, it is Louis' wife, Rachel, who is the protagonist. Elizabeth Lavenza, in Shelley's fiction, is her equal. A death aversion as a consequence of seeing her mother's agonizing death Rachel was 8 years old when her crippled sister was born. (17)

As V. Frankenstein departs for Ingolstadt's Higher education institution, L. Creed and his household, including his spouse Rachel and two children Eileen and Gage, relocate from Chicago to Maine once Louis receives word that he has been approved for a university post. Even though both Victor and Louis are devoted to their households, Victor progressively develops distanced from them because of his consuming passion for science, while Louis can't even help but wish he was on his own, free of all responsibilities and obligations. Victor says this in M. Shelley's novel:

"I was unyielding in the quest of my objective. My face had looked pale as a result of the study, and my physique had shrunk as a result of confinement. On many times, I came dangerously close to assurance, but I clung to the hope the next days that or the next hours would deliver. One mystery that I single had was the aim I had set for myself." (18)

L. Creed's hidden nightmare that he was occasionally alone, away from his own family, and so determined to accomplish his wish is repeated by Victor Frankenstein's willing solitude to continue his medical pursuits far away from his house. In S. King's book, Louis fantasizes about avoiding his obligations as a caring father by doing the following:

"Unexpectedly, a wild but enticing suggestion arrived at him: he'd recommend they go back to Bangor for some food while they decided to wait for the moving truck, and when his three captives to wealth got out, he'd ground the throttle and drive away, foot to the mat, the wagon's huge four-barrel fuel system gobbling costly fuel." He'd go to Orlando, Florida, and apply for a job as a Disney World doctor underneath the new username." (19)

V. Frankenstein begins his attempts to resuscitate rotting flesh though still a student at a higher education institution, has come to accept his mom's unjust misfortune while giving birth to his brother William. When one of his patients, Victor Pascow, dies in his surgery, and his daughter, Eileen, has to face the death of her kitty, Church, who was killed by a vehicle, L. Creed learns the significance of death in King's artwork. (20)

V. Frankenstein encounters dissenting viewpoints while using his considerable technical expertise to find a means to fight death. Doctor Krempe attempts to stop Victor from continuing his research by mocking his enthusiasm for middle ages occultists like Cornelius Agrippa and Paracelsus, claiming that *"every minute that you have spent on those publications is absolutely and completely lost"* (21).

Doctor Waldman, on the other hand, becomes Victor's supervisor, and while he is hesitant to tell him his findings at first, Victor is inspired by Waldman's ideas to play God and provide eternal life to the deceased, and Waldman finally admits to Victor that he is thrilled to have a pupil. Jud Crandall, a local neighbour, is the first to alert Louis about the nearby pet cemetery, where Eileen's kitten is subsequently buried, in Stephen King's narrative. Despite his initial reluctance to tell Louis the narrative of that site, Jud finally admits that the region adjacent is truly known as the Micmac burial site and that it was formerly regarded as a sacred site for Indian Americans. (22), much like Doctor Waldman in M. Shelley's book. Jud Crandall, like Doctor Krempe, cautions Louis of the grave ground's enchantment, as well as its resurrection potential, eventually admitting he knew of both pets and neighbours who were entombed and went back alive, but behaved in a strange, and at sometimes, even malicious, manner.

In the end, Jud informs Louis that *"perhaps death is better"* (23), concluding that burying the dear ones in the magical earth to turn them back to life could be catastrophic. Unless Victor realizes the progress of his experimental studies when he sees a heinous creature walking by his bedside and gazing at him, L. Creed discovers the enchantment of the burial ground when, after dumping his daughter's kitty, it comes back survived, even if acting erratically, and Louis satirically refers to it as *'Frankencat.'* (24)

However, Louis' misery begins when his kid Gage unexpectedly dies, forcing him to choose between burying him in the Micmac cemetery or simply accepting his passing. Creed, frustrated to get his kid back into existence, buries Gage in the holy graveyard, despite Jud Crandall's caution. Like Victor Frankenstein, who decides to discover the boundaries dividing life and death out of sadness at the mother's death, Creed, despair to bring his child back to life, buries Gage in the holy land, despite Jud Crandall's caution. Although V. Frankenstein's creation is harmful, Gage returns to life with violent instincts in King's story, bringing

death and damage to Louis' family. As a result, both Victor Frankenstein and Creed are eventually condemned for daring to make these choices. (25)

The Trends of Parallelism and Alterations

Both works contain great examples of recurring motifs, as well as strikingly similar sections. For example, V. Frankenstein's initial appearance of the monster appears to be a direct allusion to Creed's dream of his recently deceased patient Victor Pascow reappearing by his bed, echoing M. Shelley's statement about the writer's nightmares. In King's writings, the event is represented in the following way:

Victor Pascow had slammed the door wide with a thud. He sat the "Long after that, someone shocked him awakened, a big boom that made him jump out of bed, thinking maybe Ellie had slipped or if Gage's bed had fallen." He observed Victor Pascow standing in the doorway as the moon flew out from behind a cover, lighting the chamber in icy white illumination with his head hideously smashed in behind the left temple. On his forehead, the blood had crusted in maroon stripes, like Indian war paint. His white clavicle was visible. "His face was bright with a smirk." (26)

Victor Frankenstein's realization that the beast has been birthed to a new existence is depicted in identical concepts in Mary Shelley's fiction:

"When I saw the wretched - the terrible creature that I had produced, by the dull and yellow light of the moon as it made its way through the glass windows, I roused with fear; a cold dew covered my temples, my teeth babbled, and every muscle became contorted." His eyes, unless they could be termed that, were fixed on me as he lifted the bed drape. His mouth opened and he murmured some incoherent words while a smirk creased his cheeks." (27)

The two chapters share strong similarities in a pivotal sequence in both works, in which the heroes acquire vision into the creature's sight for the first time and so realize the impending devastation that awaits them. Despite the obvious intertextual connections between the two novels, S. King repurposed M. Shelley's myth, making some major changes to modernize the story and make adjustments to the field of fictional works, but also because of the myth's inevitable transformation over time and successive adaptive responses, particularly in film, since the novel's publishing. V. Frankenstein is portrayed as determined and belligerent in M. Shelley's fiction, completely reliant on research to investigate prohibited bounds. L. Creed is also a physicist, but he is depicted as a loving father rather than an independent in the Romantic way, and his efforts to bring them back from the dead are motivated by his struggling to manage the anguish and sorrow of his son's death, not by ambition or scientific advancement. (28)

Similarly, in M. Shelley's work, the creature is seen to be naturally nice, sensitive, and clever. Even though, he is tainted by the community when he discovers that his repulsive presence only provokes fear and hatred, leading to his transformation into an evil monster as a result of his repeated rejections in the community. Louis, on the other hand, holds to the belief that the monster will still be his child in King's story despite clear evidence of his child's metamorphosis when he arrives from the Micmac burial mound. As a consequence, while Shelley's creation is outwardly repulsive but has a heart of gold, S. King's monster is a flawless younger version of the adored dead but is truly immoral and evil. (29)

Both Victor and Louis are fooled by impressions, with Victor failing to recognize his son behind the monstrous form, and Louis mistaking a creature that resembles his son for his real son. The monsters in King's fiction are mindless and non-human, unable to communicate or think rationally, even though V. Frankenstein's monster learned how to read on his own and is extremely brilliant. Victor seems to be unable to discern the creature's goodness and cleverness, while Louis has been unable to discern its stupidity and depravity. The technique used to bring the people back from the dead in Shelley's fiction is also overturned in King's writing, as Victor Frankenstein must dig up corpses to bring them back to life, whereas Louis must bury them to achieve everlasting life, as the Micmac burial site becomes a malignant fleshly womb. (30)

In addition, S. King's work includes a significant change to M. Shelley's original story. The monster in Frankenstein requests Victor to supply it with a female spouse, but Victor declines because of the risk that the spread of these monsters could represent to all of humanity. In Stephen King's story, many creatures emerge from the Micmac burial mound to bring devastation and ruin, confirming Victor's concerns. As an army of evil duplicates of the prior beings they had lately been, the presence of these entities grows pandemic in this way. Victor's monster is thus seen as distinctive, a social outsider, and the outcome of a man's delusions of adequacy, while the creatures emerging from the Micmac burial site in King's fiction

are multiple and endanger to disperse, implying that Louis' major error as a result of sadness could happen to anybody in the same circumstance, and thus, by the end of the book, it is inferred that the villainous creatures' dispersion will never be stopped. (31)

Parental and Biographical background

Considering the time and regional distance between them, each Frankenstein and Pet Sematary depict the degradation of the family situation and the loss of identity, therefore evoking the eras in which they were produced. S. King's writings have generally been understood within a conservative narrative that typically prevails in literary fiction, and as a result, some of his most famous achievements frequently explore the consequences of abandoning family life. Carrie, in this manner, King's main hero was raised as an only kid by a deeply religious mother. Danny Torrance seems to have been molested as a consequence of his dad's drinking in Stephen King's horror masterpiece *The Shining*. (32)

Similarly, M. Shelley's book was written in response to the repressive rationality that characterized Modernity and was influenced by Romantic ideals. The emphasis on logic and rational thought may have recalled Mary of her dad, William Godwin, with whom she shared a lonely and secluded upbringing at home, often hearing in quiet her father's chats with scholars of the period. As a result, the lofty rationality of the time allowed no room for the expression of one's emotions or the indulgent nurture of a child in domestic life. In this regard, Madlen Dolar has viewed Mary Shelley's monster as *"the manifestation of the Enlightenment subject,"* because it is produced ex nihilo, outside of nature, and his deformity just mirrors the monstrous of culture without nature. (33)

Both stories share many characteristics that define the gothic style. However, each piece made a significant contribution to undermining and changing the way Gothicism had been perceived at the time. Not only is Frankenstein often regarded as the very first science fiction story, but as Fred Botting shows us, the novel by M. Shelley mirrored standard gothic conventions and contained little gothic traits. Even after being acknowledged as the narrative's protagonist, Victor Frankenstein also is the plot's truly awful antihero. The fiction is placed in the eighteenth century instead of middle ages durations, there are no destruction palaces or old churches but rather a depressing research lab, and despite being acknowledged as the story's hero, V. Frankenstein is also the story's bad main villain... Similarly, S. King situates his novels in contemporary culture, frequently in broad daylight, turning the ordinary into the extraordinary, and thereby changing the core motifs of the ghost story to adjust them to present times for realism's sake. As a result, the majority of King's works are set in American middle-class neighbourhoods and portray the normal lives of a household when, seemingly out of nowhere, everything starts to fall. (34)

As a result, rather than relying on gothic stereotypes, both writers' conceptions of terror had a powerful psychological foundation. M. Shelley remarked that she wanted her story *"to communicate to our hidden concerns and awaken exhilarating horror - one to make readers dread looking around, fermenting the blood, and hastening the pulse rate"* (35). M. Shelley's definition of fear, according to Nora Crook, might be interpreted as lying in the *"unconscious and unexplainable origins of psychic disturbance"* (36), and so addressing our deepest concerns.

Similarly, S. King's popularity as a trade-mark novelist in classic horror literature can be ascribed in part to his understanding of his people's emotional demands, and hence his willingness to cater to them to have a specific effect on his audience. King can construct a list of anxieties, or genic sensitive areas, as he refers to them, that he believes are widespread among individuals and, as a result, are likely to be reached in his works. When King alleges that his notions for horrific stories come from his bad dreams, he appears to be going to quote Shelley's speech from her non-fictional article *"The Horror Market Writer and the Ten Bears"* (1973), stating, as M. Shelley did in the foreword to her fiction, that *"a good assumption to started with is what shocks you will scare somebody else else"* (37). As a result, after King has chosen the specific fear he wants to address, he employs a variety of methods to achieve the desired effect on the reader, including triad techniques such as dread, horror, and, if required, the pretty disgusting. (38)

The novel by M. Shelley is regarded as the first science fiction novel. V. Frankenstein's lab transforms into the Micmac burying cemetery in S. King's narrative, a magical location where the deceased can be reborn. This shift in settings also highlights how the key subjects explored in each novel have changed. The story of M. Shelley has been viewed as a morality tale illustrating the mortality that could emerge from the technological substitution of humanity and nature, emphasizing the exploitation of knowledge for nefarious aims. Extending life's moral lines for the sake of desire and pride, as well as disregarding any which was before order, can only result in a disordered and horrific world. (39)

The thriller story *Pet Sematary* by S. King turns the emphasis of interest away from science and toward religious doctrines. Doctor L. Creed believes that the reason puts an end to all existing in a progressively indifferent culture. Despite his background in science and reasonable demeanour, Louis wants to believe in the supernatural when Jud Crandall reveals the magic ascribed to the Micmac burial site.

Louis, like V. Frankenstein, made the fatal mistake of employing this profound discovery for his gain, assuming the role of Almighty despite his human frailties. (40)

Conclusion

Pet Sematary, a thriller novel by S. King, refers to M. Shelley's *Frankenstein* by integrating and twisting themes from the characters of the novel, narrative, and themes. Both books are also informed by massive personal events that occurred during the writers' lives, which are revealed in the prologues of both stories. Almost all of the personalities in King's work are changed to fit the needs of modern readers, but several themes, like the demise of conventional family life and the dangers of technology innovation without moral standards, are still pertinent today. Similarly, King's novel modifies conventional gothic beliefs while also transforming the mythology by including aspects from popular entertainment expressions such as movies, adding to the advancement of the modern gothic genre within popular literature as founded on major works.

Works Cited

Baldick, Chris. "The Politics of Monstrosity." *Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-Century Writing*. Oxford University Press, 1990.

Berthing, Christine. *Gothic Hauntings Melancholy Crypts and Textual Ghosts*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Clery, E. J. *The Rise of Supernatural Fiction: 1762-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Crow, Charles L. *History of the Gothic: American Gothic*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2009.

Geary, Robert F. *The Supernatural in Gothic Fiction: Horror, Belief, and Literary Change*. Lewiston, NY etc: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

Hogle, Jerrold E. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hoppenstand, Gary, and Ray B. Browne. *The Gothic World of Stephen King: Landscape of Nightmares*. Bowling Green State University, Popular Press, 2001.

King, S., *On Writing: A Memoir of the Craft*. London: Hodder and Stoughton .2001

Shelley, Mary, and J. Paul Hunter. *Frankenstein: The 1818 Text, Contexts, Criticism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2022.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus*. 1818. London: Penguin Books, 2008.

Smith, Andrew. *Gothic Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Smith, Lloyd Allan. *American Gothic Fiction: An Introduction*. New York: Continuum, 2005.

Viglione, Julia Douthwaite. *The Frankenstein of 1790 and Other Lost Chapters from Revolutionary France*. The University of Chicago Press, 2012.