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Abstract

This research examines how violence is represented as the Abject, as described by the theorist Julia Kristeva, in Powers of Horror, in *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, an Iraqi version of Mary Shelley’s novel by Ahmed Saadawi. This novel has a drunken scavenger who collects the body parts of those killed in explosions and stitches them together to form a body. The figure is then inhabited by a displaced soul who begins a campaign of revenge against those who killed the parts constituting its body. I argue that this monster embodies the Abject, moral pollution or “death infecting life.” It is the power of terror. I show how Saadawi’s “the what’s-its-name”, which is how the monster is referred to in the novel, is different from Shelley’s monster; since it has no redeeming human features which we can sympathise with. This essay shows how the violence of war is presented as dehumanizing in Saadawi’s novel. I closely examine how people in the story lose their humanity and become part of a monstrous reality, living off corpses; how the novel shows that terror is an unstoppable violence that renews itself by creating more violence; and how it suggests that violence can never be stopped unless people reject terror and bury hatred, in order to have an agreed system and order: that a shared humanity can only be restored when we reject and bury the Abject.
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This essay will discuss what Julia Kristeva calls the “Abject” in Iraqi literature. Ahmed Saadawi’s novel, *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, which has recently won the Arab Booker prize, is named after Mary Shelley’s creation. However, the author said that he was not specifically influenced by her novel, but by “the vast cultural space that is called ‘Frankenstein,’” which includes movies, comics, and more.1

*Frankenstein in Baghdad* is all about the Abject and violence, which are the motifs and the theme of the novel. Unlike the original story, in which the creature is built by a scientist in his lab, this grim retelling of *Frankenstein* in a contemporary Iraqi context features a monster created by a waste-picker, who stitches together collected human parts fragmented by daily bombings into one body on the roof of a semi-ruined house in an impoverished area of Baghdad. This body is referred to as “shesma,” an Iraqi Arabic word meaning “what’s its name.” The basic idea of the novel is revealed by one of Saadawi’s characters, Farid Shawaf, a young news analyst, who comments on a real event known as Imam’s Bridge Incident that took place in 2005, two years after the US-led invasion of Iraq, in which more than one thousand Shiite pilgrims died on a bridge in Baghdad when somebody warned of a suicide bomber causing a stampede that forced many to jump into the river:

> [A]ll security incidents and tragedies we are experiencing have one source which is terror. The innocent people died on the bridge because of their terror of death. Every day we die fearing death itself. [...] We will witness more and more deaths because of terror.2

This shows that the core of the conflict is terror, which have been exaggerated and turned into a monster. This monster, as Saadawi said in an interview, “is made up of parts taken from Iraqis of different races, sects and ethnicities,” therefore it “represents the complete Iraqi individual. In other words, the ‘what’s-its-name’ is a rare example of the melting pot of identities.”3

In this essay, I will deal with the concept of violence as the Abject in *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, after this I will make a comparison between it and Shelley’s novel. After that, I will discuss the questions raised by Saadawi’s novel about war, guilt and innocence, the role of mass media in war times, the American occupation and Western culture and the concept of salvation.
Violence in Saadawi’s novel is the Abject, as described by the Bulgarian-French theorist, Julia Kristeva, in her book *Powers of Horror*. As she notes, “abjection preserves what existed in the archaism of pre-objectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be.”\(^4\) In other words, for the human subject to be born, it must be violently abjected to be separated from the maternal body. Thus, according to Kristeva, violence exists at the heart of human existence. She suggests that everyone is a monster in some way. To Kristeva, the Abject “disturbs identity, system, order.”\(^5\) Frankenstein, either the original or the Iraqi one, is an embodiment of such “disturbance” of a seamless identity, because he is patched together out of other bodies. Violence caused him to come into being. Kristeva says, “Any crime, because it draws attention to the fragility of the law, is abject.”\(^6\) In other words, violence is monstrosity as the abject is monstrosity as well.

Like Shelley’s, Saadawi’s creature is an excellent example of the Abject. According to Kristeva, the corpse is the utmost example of the Abject object. She says:

> The corpse, seen without God and outside of science, is the utmost of abjection. It is death infecting life. Abject. It is something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Imaginary uncanniness and real threat, it beckons to us and ends up engulfing us.\(^7\)

> The corpse is described here as infection, pollution and a real threat to selfhood. Moreover, Kristeva associates it with disgust because it is “the most sickening of wastes.”\(^8\) It is a border that has been encroached upon; a border between the human and the nonhuman. More importantly here, the corpse is linked to violence. The living body uses violence to expel the waste. In fact, all bodily functions are abject, especially those associated with waste or decay.\(^9\) This process of expelling waste continues until the body violently expels itself and becomes a corpse. Kristeva says:

> There, I am at the border of my condition as a living being. My body extricates itself, as being alive, from that border. Such wastes drop so that I might live, until, from loss to loss, nothing remains in me and my entire body falls beyond the limit—cadere, cadaver.\(^10\)

*Frankenstein in Baghdad* is centered around the word “waste” or abjection. Human lives are wasted and human bodies are treated like waste. We first meet Saadawi’s protagonist, Hadi al-Attag, an old drunken scrap vendor, as he searches for the perfect nose
to complete the “hybrid body” he is assembling.\textsuperscript{11} The reader is faced with the Abject, violence and brutality in the daily scene of Iraq in which parts of the human body were “discarded like garbage”, scattered on pavements and streets, and could easily be picked up.\textsuperscript{12} At first, it seems difficult for the scrap vendor to find an intact nose. In an unflinching description, Saadawi writes:

[Hadi] did not want to snatch any of the faces that were offered before him or that he had jumped on during their final moments on the pavement. He wanted a single nose, alone and neglected, that no one else wanted. This is what made his mission so difficult.\textsuperscript{13}

The novel’s tone is one of black humour as much as horror, almost like Nikolai Gogol’s satirical novella \textit{The Nose}, in which a government official loses his nose. In both novels, the abjectness is marked corporeally through distorted noses. In \textit{Frankenstein in Baghdad}, Hadi’s task of finding the right nose is not hard after all. In another shocking scene, Saadawi describes how Hadi finally finds the missing part for the corpse that is “rotting”.\textsuperscript{14}

Today, he found it: a great nose with two wide nostrils. He raced with the firemen, who were washing away the blood and corpses’ remains, and snatched the nose off the pavement before the water hose pushed it into the gutter.\textsuperscript{15}

In her description of the Abject, Kristeva notes:

The corpse […] is cesspool, and death […] A wound with blood and pus, or the sickly, acrid smell of sweat, of decay […] These body fluids, this defilement, this shit are what life withstands, hardly and with difficulty, on the part of death.\textsuperscript{16}

By using similar terms of the Abject such as “rotting,” “remains,” “blood” and “gutter,” Saadawi intends to show how violence has become part of the daily routine in Baghdad, which makes people lose their sense of the sanctity of the human body. Once mutilated and strewn about in the wake of suicide bombers, it becomes part of the waste littered on the streets. Nobody seems to care or to be bothered about it.

\textit{Frankenstein in Baghdad}, as Saadawi said, was not an adaptation of Shelley’s work. However, similarities as well as differences can be drawn between the two novels. In an interview, Saadawi says that there are only two references to Frankenstein in the novel:
Apart from these two references, the people of the Baghdad in the novel call the strange monster the “what’s-its-name” or “the one who does not have a name,” and perhaps it does not concern them whether it looks like Frankenstein or not. 17

For Saadawi, the main difference between his and Shelley’s novel is the theme. He says:

Frankenstein in this novel is a condensed symbol of Iraq’s current problems. The Frankenstein-esque atmosphere of horror was strongly prevalent in Iraq during the period covered by the novel. 18

We can track other differences as well, such as that the impoverished Hadi in the Iraqi version lacks Victor Frankenstein’s “high hopes” and “lofty ambition.”19 Hadi intends to make something useful out of the cadaver, though he does not know what that is to be; he only knows it is a “terrible and mad deed.”20 However, both Victor Frankenstein and Hadi al-Attag have made a secret discovery. Victor has found “the secret of life.” He says: “I was surprised that among so many men of genius who had directed their inquiries towards the same science, that I alone should be reserved to discover so astonishing a secret.”21 Hadi has made a totally different discovery, which has nothing to do with science. It is more about violence and its basis, which lies in disregarding human sanctity. He has found the secret of violence in waste or abjection. Hadi, who is also a storyteller in the coffee shop of his Egyptian friend Aziz El Masry, tells his audience about the story of the creature he has assembled so that it can have a decent burial. Hadi says, “I constructed a full corpse so that it won’t turn into garbage [. . .] to be respected and buried like the dead bodies of other people.”22

In Saadawi’s novel, Hadi’s “intact corpse” comes to life when a displaced soul enters the body and sets out to seek revenge for the victims.23 In Shelley’s story, the creature is animated by an electrical spark. Victor says:

With an anxiety that almost amounted to agony, 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 [. . .] by the glimmer of the half-extinguished light, I saw the dull yellow eye of the creature open; it breathed hard, and a convulsive motion agitated its limbs.24

By contrast to this scientific process, the human spirit that enters inside ‘what’s-its-name’ is the lost soul of a guard of a nearby hotel, whose entire body has vanished in a suicide explosion of a municipal garbage truck. Hadi was there when the explosion took place, but he escaped death. The guard’s soul steers the body towards revenge, so that it starts a campaign of killing those who caused the death of the people from whose remains his body is composed. After each killing, a part of his body falls away or decays and he has
to replace it with body parts from the people he kills. The incident of the explosion was real and took place in 2005. It is cleverly used by Saadawi to show that booby-trapped garbage is used to explode people and turn them into garbage and thus into the Abject. The idea of the monster’s revenge, which is found in both Shelley’s and Saadawi’s texts, indicates the continuation of the process of killing and waste or abjection. The monster becomes, like Hamlet, Heaven’s Scourge. His terrified victims think of him as “the scourge of God.”

That sends us back to Kristeva, who says that the Abject is “premeditated crime, cunning murder, hypocritical revenge […] because they heighten the display of such fragility” of the law. These abject acts of revenge disturb order by being outside the law.

When Hadi narrates his story of the monster he built, two journalists are among the listeners in the coffee shop, including a blond German woman and a brown-skinned young man, Mahmoud Al-Suwadi, from southern Iraq. The woman decides to leave because she is bored and tells Al-Suwadi that Hadi “is narrating from a movie … a well-known movie starring Robert De Niro.” She is probably referring to the 1994 film version of *Frankenstein* directed by Kenneth Branagh, starring Robert De Niro as the monster. Though this suggests that the film is better known than Shelley’s novel, Saadawi reminds us here that his story is also a fiction, but he wants to interweave fantasy with reality to show the monstrosity and terror of war in Iraq, where it is not a crime to be like Hadi, lifting body parts from scenes of explosions. Saadawi says in the novel, “You could mock [Hadi], or phone the police to inform them of his whereabouts. But he did not steal anything from anyone. He only took what was discarded like garbage.” Saadawi refers here to Shelley’s novel in which the monster is created from a mixture of stolen body parts. Victor Frankenstein tells his story to Captain Walton, “Who shall conceive the horrors of my secret toil as I dabbled among the unhallowed damps of the grave or tortured the living animal to animate the lifeless clay?” However, Shelley depicted a normal society where it is a crime to steal corpses, as in war-torn Iraq. It is Saadawi’s way of emphasizing the anomaly of a garbage-diver becoming a litter-picker of dead bodies. Saadawi narrates that:

[It] is what [Hadi] usually does anyway, gathering others’ refuse off pavements and from garbage dumps, then selling them on to antique and scrap dealers. What drives him to pick up corpses’ remains may just be an extension of his appreciation for human waste.

Hadi’s creature, like Victor’s, is nameless. In *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, the name (‘what’s-its-name’) signifies an unidentified source of terror. It is, perhaps, like the nameless terror in which Vladimir and Estragon find themselves shot through with in Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*. Or, maybe, it refers to the lack of self or identity, as in Beckett’s novel
Unnameable. Kristeva refers to “that conglomerate of fear, deprivation, and nameless frustration, which, properly speaking, belongs to the unnameable.” In *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, ‘what’s-its-name’ represents the power of terror caused by sectarian strife. He has a body, but he represents a group of people, the unknown criminals and suicide bombers that provide the body with spares. The name also refers to innocent victims. It even refers to everybody and how everybody is involved in that sectarian war. “Only God, who is not sectarian [in Iraq],” says one of the characters in the novel. On the cover of his book, Saadawi writes, “everybody discovers that they form, relatively, this Frankenstein’s creature, or they provide it with sustenance and growth.” He accuses everybody of having some sort of criminality that disfigures humanity. So the Abject is not the extraordinary here, in Iraq, but has become the everyday – like violence itself.

*Frankenstein in Baghdad* raises questions about guilt and innocence. ‘What’s-its-name’ kills both sides, Sunnis and Shiites: a leader in Al-Qaida in the Sunni Abu Ghraib area and a militia leader in the Shiite Sadr City. This is because his body is a hybrid of all sects and ethnicities, innocent people and criminals. It wants the help of the media to achieve its mission of vengeance without trouble, sending messages to the media through a tape recorder that belongs to Al-Suwadi, saying:

I was careful about the flesh used in reconstructing my body and that my aides
don’t bring me ‘illegitimate’ ones that belong to criminals. But, who can determine
the rate of criminality in a person?  

What’s-its-name has many followers, including Saddam’s magician, an old man, who finds in him a tool to take revenge on those who assaulted him after the fall of the regime; the Sophist, who hates the magician and later kills him; The Small Mad, The Bigger Mad and the Biggest Mad, the last three of whom have a great number of followers. By depicting these deranged groups of followers, Saadawi thematicizes the sectarian violence and its mad supporters, who are “the senseless abyss” or “the abyss of abjection” as described by Kristeva in *Powers of Horror* because madness “threatens this passing through the identical, which is what scription amounts to”. *Frankenstein in Baghdad* shows how people go mad, supporting shedding blood for the sake of shedding blood. In another book of hers, Kristeva says that “today’s milestone is human madness,” which is “antisocial” and “apolitical.” The characters in Saadawi’s novel are caught in madness without social context when political life becomes unreal.

There is an incident in the novel when the eyes of ‘what’s-its-name’ start to decay
and fall apart when he is on a road and gets himself caught up in crossfire between sectarian militias. He sees the approach of a man in his sixties, carrying a bag containing vegetables and bread. ‘What’s-its-name’ thinks of this man as “a lamb brought by God into my direction”.37 He kills the man, takes his eyes and places them in his own face, using the man’s eyeglasses to fix them temporarily till he gets help from his aides. ‘What’s-its-name’ does not feel guilty because he believes that he, “only enhanced the man’s death because he is dead anyway. All innocent people, passing by this ghastly road tonight, shall die like this man’.38 The Magician tells ‘what’s-its-name’ that, “there is no purely innocent people and none who are fully criminals,” because “in every one of us there is a rate of criminality next to a specific rate of innocence”.39 He also tells him that he is “now half a criminal. Half of the flesh of [his] body belongs to criminals,” warning him that he will wake up one day to find he has become a “super criminal… composed of criminals, a bunch of criminals.”40 For the Magician, even the saints are criminals, “as long as the saint possesses a weapon, he becomes a criminal”.41 Here, we sense an almost unrelieved pessimism with regard to human nature. This pessimism is echoed by Kristeva in her citation from Louis-Ferdinand Celine’s novel, Journey to the End of the Night, which is about “the filthy thing” of war:

I had suddenly discovered, all at once, what the war was, the whole war. I’d lost my innocence. You need to be pretty well alone with it, face to face, as I was then, to see it properly, in the round, the filthy thing.42

Both Saadawi’s and Celine’s novels are nihilistic accounts of savage, exultant misanthropy, combined with cynical humour. Céline describes war as madness and the people involved in wars as monsters, saying:

How much longer would this madness have to go on before these monsters dropped with exhaustion? How long could a convulsion like this last? Months? Years? How many? Maybe till everyone’s dead? 43

Later in the novel, Al-Suwadi asks Hadi about the end of ‘what’s-its-name’. Hadi replies:

- He will kill all of them. All criminals who committed crimes against him.
- And what next?
- He will fall apart, then decay and die.

Hadi himself is on the wanted list of ‘what’s-its-name’. 44
Saadawi believes that the monster will end up killing itself because it is made up of the body parts of victims who belong to different groups, each of which views the other as its enemy:

In other words, ‘what’s-its-name’ is the fictional representation of the process of everyone killing everyone. This character is the visual representation of the larger crisis, rather than the solution. 45

Being on the wanted list of ‘what’s-its-name’, Hadi requests to be the last person to be killed. He is wanted, not because he rejected it, as the case with Victor and his monster, but because he caused the death of the guard of the hotel, whose soul moves the creature. In the scene of the explosion, Hadi was walking that evening near the hotel, carrying “a big suspicious-bag on his back,” which made the guard of the hotel leave his secure position to check on him, then the explosion took place, killing the guard and throwing Hadi away:

The pressure of the sound of the explosion in [Hadi’s] head pushed him a few metres into the air and he lost his canvas bag, his dinner and the bottle of drink. He twirled in the air, feeling stoned and dizzy, feeling that he had died. 46

From this scene, we understand that Hadi is a victim of the explosion as well as the guard. It is again the questions of revenge, justice, innocence and guilt which are shown to have relative meaning. Al-Mustafa Najjar, the editor at the English edition/translator at Asharq Al-Awsat newspaper, calls it “a novel that suspends moral judgement” because of “the concept of ambivalence” that preoccupies Saadawi novel and the “moral relativism” that is a dominant theme in it whereas Shelley’s novel clearly lays blame at the feet of a high-ranking representative of power. 47

Frankenstein in Baghdad emphasizes the role of the media in daily violence. In her book Media Matrix, Barbara Creed points out that although it repels, the Abject also fascinates. She says:

The human subject is deeply attracted to those things which the culture defines as uncivilised, “other,” non-human [ . . . ] the public has turned more and more to the media as the main avenue for contact with, and understanding of, the abject. The media bring images of abjection—war, violence, sexual perversity, child abuse, cruelty, death—to the public.” 48
In the media, as indicated in *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, the sectarian war in Iraq has been reduced to a source of entertainment. After hearing a tape recording of ‘what’s-its-name’, Al-Suwadi, the journalist, writes an article with the title, “Frankenstein in Baghdad.” The article is published under a big photo of De Niro taken from the movie “Frankenstein.” The tragedy on the bridge is turned into statistics for TV channels. People are dehumanized when their death becomes a number.

*Frankenstein in Baghdad* implicitly questions this concept of salvation. ‘What’s-its-name’ is depicted as Christian. Later in the novel, he is made by his followers to think of himself as a “leader,” a “saint” and even Jesus, “the saviour and the awaited” who is sent by “my Father in Heavens,” as ‘what’s-its-name’ puts it. Al-Saadawi said in an interview:

> Another way of reading it is that the monster represents the saviour, given its desire to take revenge on behalf of all victims. Bringing justice to the increasing number of victims in Iraq today means salvation for everyone. Here, we sense a reflection of the metaphysical vision of the concept of salvation being achieved at the hands of a single person.

The image of the saviour here is Abject, according to Kristeva, who says that the Abject is “the killer who claims he is a savior” because he “does not respect borders, positions, rules.” The followers of The Biggest Mad think that ‘what’s-its-name’ is the image of God embodied on earth and they prostrate themselves on the ground when they encounter him. They even cover their heads with their hands to avoid seeing him because they believe it is forbidden to look at him. This shows the social and psychological decay in times of war. People are driven not by their minds, but by their illusions. It is an attempt to show the destruction, not only of body, but also of the psyche. In his article, “New Writing from the Arab World,” Noam Schimmel states that the novel “depicts the terrors of war, its violence and the way it distorts the psyche both ethically and emotionally.” The distortion caused by the monstrosity of violence is huge and fast-growing. According to Saadawi, the monster can be viewed as the epitome of mass destruction: “In other words, ‘what’s-its-name’ becomes a dramatic representation of destruction that has been growing with a sort of a snowball effect.”

The novel tries to show ‘what’s-its-name’ is different and alien, or the Abject, which is, according to Kristeva, “a non-assimilable alien, a monster, a tumor, a cancer.” In *Frankenstein in Baghdad*, the indirect reference to the invasion of Iraq is shown as the cause of the appearance of this alien. Being Christian, ‘what’s-its-name’ symbolises Western military and cultural invasion. Frankenstein is a popular figure in Western culture, in horror
movies and in Halloween parties. Frankenstein represents the ugly part, the Abject, of Western civilization. Their high technology has reached Iraq in a destructive and monstrous shape of weaponry or a Cyborg. Like a Cyborg, ‘what’s-its-name’ cannot be killed with bullets. In fact, he is the demonic nihilism of Western culture projected onto Iraq. He is the tumor and the cancer caused by the invasion of aliens. ‘What’s-its-name’ referring to its ancestors is another allusion to those who occupied Iraq in the past: “I know I have many ancestors, who appeared here on this land in past epochs and times.”

Although his novel might seem fantastical, Saadawi has depicted reality, a decaying reality, of people moving among dead bodies, of a disfigured humanity and of the dehumanizing horrors of war. The permanent presence of death manifests itself in this monster, as Kristeva says the “Abjection is a resurrection that has gone through death (of the ego)” in a transformative process. The monster seems to experience this “source in the non-ego, drive, and death;” and it also materializes a “resurrection,” as a living corpse. ‘What’s-its-name’, which embodies the Abject, is moral pollution or “death infecting life.” He is different from Shelley’s monster, since he has no redeeming human features which we can sympathise with. In his essay “The Gothic Scene of International Relations,” Richard Devetak describes monsters in fiction thus,

Monsters were metaphors of human anxieties. Part of the reason for this is that monsters are liminal creatures who ‘defy borders’ and defy “normality”. Their defiance of borders is taken as a threat demanding measures to reinforce the borders between the human and inhuman, to defend the civilised against the barbaric, and to uphold good in the face of evil.

In Frankenstein in Baghdad, people lose their humanity and become barbaric and part of a monstrous reality, living off corpses; and that terror is an unstoppable violence that renews itself by creating more violence, which distorts the psyche, both ethically and emotionally. Frankenstein in Baghdad, which takes place in 2005, ends with ‘what’s-its-name’ standing solidly in a derelict building, looking out through the windows, just one day before the bombing of the shrine in Samarra, which triggered the civil war in Iraq.

In conclusion, the novel suggests that violence can never be stopped unless people reject terror and bury hatred, in order to have an agreed system and order: that a shared humanity can only be restored when we reject and bury their corpse-like hatred or the Abject. This hatred is like a dead body that can “pollute the divine earth,” therefore it should be buried. This would allow us to a state of being in which the Abject is kept out of sight, in other words, since it can’t be done away with.
Notes


2 Ahmed Saadawi, Frankenstein in Baghdad (Beirut, Al-Kamel, 2013), 137. All quotes from this version are my translation.


5 Kristeva, Powers 3.

6 Kristeva, Powers 4.

7 Kristeva, Powers 4.

8 Kristeva, Powers 3.


10 Kristeva, Powers 4.


12 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

13 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

14 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

15 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

16 Kristeva, Powers 3.

17 Najjar, “Iraqi Author Ahmad Saadawi.”

18 Najjar, “Iraqi Author Ahmad Saadawi.”

20 Saadawi, “from the novel” 54.

21 Shelley, *Frankenstein*.


23 Saadawi, “from the novel” 52.

24 Shelley, *Frankenstein*.


28 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

29 Shelley, *Frankenstein*.

30 Saadawi, “from the novel” 51.

31 Kristeva, *Powers* 35.

32 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 318.

33 See Ahmed Saadawi’s comments on the back cover of his book *Frankenstein in Baghdad*.

34 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 173.


37 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 178.

38 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 178.


41 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 173.


44 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 146.

45 Najjar, “Iraqi Author Ahmad Saadawi”

46 Saadawi, “from the novel” 52-3.


49 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 135.

50 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 156.

51 Najjar, “Iraqi Author Ahmad Saadawi”.


54 Najjar, “Iraqi Author Ahmad Saadawi”


56 Saadawi, *Frankenstein* 171.


References


[http://www.gutenberg.org/files/84/84-h/84-h.htm](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/84/84-h/84-h.htm).