

Title: Why is Sharikov Dead or The Fate of Creatures in *Frankenstein* and *Heart of a Dog*
Author: Natalia Dame, University of Southern California

Many critics have mentioned Mary Shelley's novel "Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus" as one of the literary predecessors of Bulgakov's novella "Heart of a Dog" (Burgin, Glenny, Gomel, Proffer, Zholkovsky). Nevertheless, a brief comparison of the two works has not yet gone beyond establishing their basic thematic and structural similarities whose roots lie in the conventions of the science-fiction genre. In this paper, I will investigate the changes in the nature of the scientific failure and in the creator-creature relationship. In fact, one of the major differences between the two works is that Bulgakov justifies what Shelley does not – the destruction of the creature menacing its creator's life. Therefore, this paper will attempt to provide answers to why Professor Preobrazhenskii is allowed to successfully dispose of Sharikov as an annoying nuisance, whereas Frankenstein is prevented from stopping or killing the monster in an act of rightful vengeance.

After having analyzed the nature of the scientific mistake in "Frankenstein" and "Heart of a Dog," this paper will examine both creators' willingness to take responsibility for the results of their experiments. Next, this paper will compare and contrast the creatures, Shelley's monster and Bulgakov's Sharikov, in terms of their origins, identity, spiritual development, education, appearance, and behavior towards their creators and the rest of the society. Finally, this paper will show how the narrative structure and space contribute to the final pronouncement on the fate of the creatures. In conclusion, I will demonstrate how Bulgakov successfully reverses the Frankenstein tradition of a complicated creator-creature relationship into a straightforward good creator/bad creature discourse by silencing the creature and saving the creator.

natali_79@hotmail.com