

THE CARNIVAL SPIRIT AND GROTESQUE IN JANE C. LOUDON'S *THE
MUMMY!/: A TALE OF THE TWENTY-SECOND CENTURY*



ARZU TUNA

YEDITEPE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
İSTANBUL, 2023

THE CARNIVAL SPIRIT AND GROTESQUE IN JANE C. LOUDON'S *THE
MUMMY! : A TALE OF THE TWENTY-SECOND CENTURY*

ARZU TUNA

SUPERVISOR

PROF. DR. ADRIANA LUMINITA RADUCANU

SUBMITTED TO GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

İSTANBUL, 2023

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 19.06.2023

Name/Surname: Arzu Tuna

ABSTRACT

Illustrating a grotesque combination of utopian science fiction, the gothic, and fantasy genres, Jane C. Webb Loudon's *The Mummy!; Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century* (1827) stands as one of the precursors of modern science fiction, however, its contributions to the literary body of speculative fiction have remained overshadowed without an adequate amount of scholarly study. The present thesis aims to read Jane C. Webb Loudon's *The Mummy!* as an epitome of the *carnavalesque novel* in the framework of Bakhtinian discourse through three main chapters. In the first chapter, the carnivalesque text of the novel will be investigated through the novel's polyphonic (dialogic) composition that incorporates polyglossia, heteroglossia, and parody. It will be discussed that *The Mummy!* embodies the anticanonical nature of the novel genre as theorized by Bakhtin. Besides, intertextuality and metafiction will be evaluated as carnivalesque characteristics in the textual fabric of the novel. Weaving a thread between Kristevan *abject* and Bakhtinian *grotesque*, the second chapter will concentrate on the mummy of Cheops, the first reanimated mummy in English literature, and define him as a carnivalesque monster, which subverts the conventional portrayal of the gothic monster, to establish Cheops' place among the monsters of literature. In the final chapter, the novel's utopian science fiction narrative will be analysed by employing Darko Suvin's *cognitive estrangement* in relation with *uncanny* and grotesque. The chapter will unfold the novel's satirical critique of the socio-political, cultural, literary, and historical dimensions of the writer's period, reflecting the aftermath of the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution in tandem with the political instability, scientific progress, ecological destruction, and imperialism that defined her time.

Key words: carnivalesque, grotesque, science fiction, gothic, utopia, monster, satire

ÖZET

Ütopik bilim kurgu, gotik ve fantastik kurgunun canavarımsı bir birleşimi olan Jane C. Webb Loudon'un yazdığı *The Mummy!; Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century* (1827) modern bilim kurgunun öncülerinden biri olmasına rağmen spekülâtif kurgu edebiyatına olan katkıları hakkındaki akademik inceleme eksikliğiyle birlikte gölgede kalmıştır. Bu tezin amacı Jane C. Webb Loudon'un yazdığı *The Mummy!* adlı romanı Bakhtin'in kuramı çerçevesinde ve üç ana bölümde karnavalesk romanın bir timsali olarak okumaktır. İlk bölümde romanın karnavalesk metnini göstermek için romanın çoksesli (diyalojik) kompozisyonu ve içerdiği poliglossia (çok-seslilik), heteroglossia (çok-dillilik) ve parodi elementleri incelenecektir. *The Mummy!* adlı romanın Bakhtin'in kuramsallaştırdığı roman türünün antikanonik doğasını barındırdığı tartışılacaktır. Ayrıca, metinlerarasılık ve üstkurmaca, romanın metinsel yapısında yer alan karnavalesk nitelikler olarak değerlendirilecektir. Kristeva'nın *abject* kuramı ve Bakhtin'in *grotesk* konsepti arasında bir bağ kurarak ikinci bölüm, İngiliz edebiyatında yeniden diriltelen ilk mumya olan Keops'un mumyasına odaklanacak ve edebiyattaki canavarlar arasındaki yerini belirlemek için onu alışlagelmiş gotik canavar tasvirini altüst eden bir karnavalesk canavar olarak tanımlayacaktır. Son bölüm, Darko Suvin'in cognitive estrangement konseptini *uncanny* (tekinsizlik) ve Bakhtinvari grotesk ile ilişkilendirerek romanın ütopik bilim kurgu anlatısını inceleyecektir. Bu bölüm, romanın yazarının döneminin sosyo-politik, kültürel, edebi ve tarihi boyutlarının hicivsel eleştirisini çözümleyecektir. Bu eleştiride Fransız İhtilali, Sanayi Devrimi, politik kararsızlık, bilimsel ilerleme, ekolojik yıkım, ve emperyalizm gibi yazarın dönemini etkileyen unsurların yansımaları okunacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: karnavalesk, grotesk, bilim kurgu, gotik, ütopya, canavar, hiciv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not be possible without my professors and loved ones to whom I would like to thank.

First and foremost, my profound and heartfelt gratitude goes to my dear advisor, Prof. Dr. Adriana Luminita Raducanu, who has been an empowering role model from the start of my MA journey. It is a privilege to be one of your students and I cannot thank you enough for your guidance, intellectual and moral support, and contributions to my academic growth.

I am also indebted to my lecturers at Yeditepe University, Prof. Dr. Mediha Göbenli, Prof. Dr. Charles Daniel Sabatos, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Catherine Macmillan, and Asst. Prof. Dr. Hatice Karaman as it was their distinguished academic perspectives along the way that helped me to expand my knowledge in the field.

I would like to extend my gratitude to Asst. Prof. Dr. Defne Demir Türker whose insightful guidance and encouragement have always pushed me further since I was an undergraduate student. I am immensely thankful for your presence in my journey.

My special thanks go to my family, my mother and grandmother, my siblings without whom this rollercoaster would not be this fun, and a bluesman dear to my heart. I love you 3000.

This thesis is supported by TÜBİTAK within the scope of BİDEB 2210/A scholarship program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: Ambivalent, Disruptive, and Boundless: Carnivalized Text of <i>The Mummy!</i>	9
1.1. The Dialogic Principle in Carnival(-esque) Language.....	11
1.2. <i>The Mummy!</i> 's Polyphony of Voices, Time-Space, and Masks.....	14
1.3. Novelistic Discourse in <i>The Mummy!</i> : Polyglossia, Heteroglossia, and Parody...20	
1.4. Intertextuality and Metafiction in <i>The Mummy!</i>	28
CHAPTER 2: A Gothic Monster in the Carnival: The Mummy of Cheops.....	35
2.1. The Genesis of the Mummy.....	35
2.2. The Grotesque-Abject Body of the Monster.....	41
2.3. The Laughing Devil of Romantic Grotesque.....	52
CHAPTER 3: Through the Magic Glass: The Carnavalesque Discourse.....	57
3.1. A World Upside-Down: A Dialogue between Socio-Political Classes.....	60
3.2. A Brave, New, Unhomely World: A Dialogue of Human, Science, and Nature....68	
3.3. A (Un)civilised World: A Dialogue between Coloniser and Colonised.....	77
CONCLUSION.....	83
REFERENCES	88

INTRODUCTION

I came to explore the wreck.

— Adrienne Rich. “Diving into the Wreck”

The futuristic and fantastic stories of speculative fiction, the brave new worlds in the future or in galaxies far far away, have been captivating their audience in the works of literature and motion picture of the last century. In these stories, one can find doctors who live in blue telephone boxes which are ‘bigger on the inside’, zombie apocalypses that are always on the verge of a breakout, dark lords who can use the force to choke people from a long distance, inter-galactic hitchhiking which is not convenient without bringing a towel, machine-fabricated simulations in which men who take red pills can stop bullets in the air, and many more. Yet, if we take the time machine of H.G. Wells and rewind the time a little further back in the past, to the beginning of the nineteenth century, we would have read the first print of a “wild and strange” story which is among the pioneers of the modern speculative fiction today. This thesis will unfold that unknown yet extraordinary novel: Jane C. Webb Loudon¹’s *The Mummy!; Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century*.

An ‘invocation of the muse’ marks the beginning of *The Mummy!*; the narrator of the story seeks inspiration to pen a novel that is unlike the ones that are written before, looking to find “something quite out of the beaten path” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 1). Lost in the train of thought, the narrator reaches a valley with idyllic scenery², and falls asleep on the grass while dreaming, at which moment a spirit appears. “Take this,” says the spirit, “it is the Chronicle of a future age” and asks the narrator to “[w]eave it into a story” which will fulfil her aspirations for literary novelty as it unfolds “a hero totally different from any hero that ever appeared before” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 6). Indeed, Jane Webb’s novel gives a new hero to

¹ The writer’s full name is Jane C. Wells Webb Loudon. Since this thesis take the Gutenberg version of the novel as reference, in which version the author name is written Jane Webb-Loudon, the thesis will adopt the name “Jane Webb” hereafter.

² Jane Webb is also the writer and illustrator of botanical books, which marks a turning point in her writing career that began with *The Mummy!*. Webb’s interest in nature can be seen in the novel’s idyllic imagery. After her marriage with the botanist John C. Loudon, Webb focuses on gardening books, an event that is regarded as “disastrous” by critics since she does not continue writing fiction (Alkon, p. 231). Some of her botanical works are *British Wild Flowers* (1845) and *Ladies' Flower-Garden of Ornamental Annuals* (1840-1848).

literature becoming “the first full-fledged mummy fiction” (Mir, 2014, p. 426). Thus, the narrator starts telling the story of the twenty-second century. It remains ambiguous whether the narrator is Jane Webb herself, who publishes her novel to make a living by her pen. Writing under a male pseudonym to elude the prejudices generated by the male-dominated literary canon, she also does not want to write about canonical heroes whom she regards as too common and monotonous. She describes her novel with the following words:

I had written a strange wild novel called *The Mummy*, in which I had laid the scene in the twenty-second century, and attempted to predict the state of improvement to which this country might possibly arrive. (Loudon & Loudon, 1844, p. xxxv)

With a satirical tone, Jane Webb reflects the status quo of her period in the utopian future of the novel, in which the whole world is altered by progress in science. *The Mummy!* criticizes the conceit and greed of humans, their never-ending desire for more, by portraying a prosperous society living with a corrupted morality. In the twenty-second century of *The Mummy!*, England is ruled by a female monarch who accepts to take the throne to save her country from the horrors of anarchy which prevails due to the conceit of people who all want to be masters. The prosperity and peace that is brought by the founding Queen last until the death of her successor Queen Claudia, as the new heirs to the throne, Elvira and Rosabella, become revels and the country is led to political instability once more. Meanwhile, Edric and Dr. Entwerfen travel to Anglo-Egypt and reanimate the mummy of Cheops who accidentally finds himself in England and begins to manipulate the social and political affairs in the country.

Jane Webb reanimates the mummy of Cheops in her novel in 1827, not many years after Mary Shelley animates one of the most renowned monsters in the history of literature in *Frankenstein* in 1818, and only one year after Shelley’s dystopian apocalyptic novel *The Last Man* published in 1826. Although both authors are contemporaries who created innovative examples of speculative fiction, it can be seen that while the texts of Mary Shelley have attained a canonical appraisal, the work of Jane Webb and her contributions to the literary body of speculative fiction has remained

overshadowed without an adequate amount of scholarly study³. *The Mummy!* holds a significant place that needs more critical attention for both defining the genre of science fiction – as it is one of the precursors of modern science fiction – and also for studying the evolution of the genres within speculative fiction in a broader context as the novel is a bricolage of utopian and science fiction along with the gothic and fantasy. The novel's narration in which these genres are not stratified but overlapped with each other offers an insightful perception of the debates revolving around the classifications of these genres⁴. Yet another significant aspect of the novel is the mummy of Cheops, an archetypal monster to whom scholarly attention should be given to claim its place among the canonical monsters of literature. Last but not least, Webb's novel presents an invaluable record of her historical time through a satirical commentary on the transforming world and ways of life in the early 19th century in the aftermath of the revolutions in France and the industrial areas, and the political instability during the Regency Period. Providing a multifaceted perspective on the progress of science, *The Mummy!* also poses a critical stance towards the ecological destruction and colonization which are practised for imperialist interests. Addressing this gap in speculative fiction studies, the present thesis is dedicated to an extended reading of Jane Webb's *The Mummy!* to establish a critical discourse on the novel and set light on further studies.

Inasmuch as there is a need to study Webb's novel, it is equally challenging to analyse the novel as its multi-genre narrative defies any categorizations. *The Mummy!*

³ For some of the scholarly work on *The Mummy!* that are referred in writing this thesis, see Lisa Hopkins' "Jane C. Loudon's *The Mummy!*: Mary Shelley Meets George Orwell, and They Go in a Balloon to Egypt," Paul Alkon's "Fantasy and Metafiction: From *Les Posthumes* to *The Mummy!*" in *The Origins of Futuristic Fiction* (1987), and Alan Rauch's "Science in the Popular Novel: Jane Webb Loudon's *The Mummy!*" in *Useful Knowledge: The Victorians, Morality, and the March of Intellect* (2001).

⁴ A brief explanation of these discussions on the categorisation concerning the genres intersecting in *The Mummy!*'s narrative is as follows. Utopian fiction is regarded to be a part of science fiction (hereafter SF) both by Darko Suvin (1988) who argues utopia as a subgenre of SF, and by Margaret Doody (1997) who classifies Thomas More's *Utopia* as an example of SF (p. 38; p. 232). About SF and its roots, there are polarised arguments leading to a category crisis, which revolves around its relation with fantasy. According to Suvin (1979), the factor of cognition in SF separates it from the fairy tales – for Suvin, a combination of both is a "creative suicide" for SF – and from the other works of fantasy, including Gothic and horror, which bear "anticognitive laws" that does not belong to SF (p. 8). On the other hand, some critics emphasize the consonance among SF, Gothic, and fantasy, such as Brian Aldiss (1973) who argues that Gothic novels gave birth to SF and that SF cannot be thought apart from fantasy, by referring to Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* as the first SF novel (p. 8). While Margaret Doody's argument also points out the relationship between fantasy and SF, she traces the first examples of it way back in history. She writes that "the emergence of the new fantastic form we have come to call science fiction [is] ... rooted in the comic fantasy of Lucian, especially in *Vera Historia*" written in the second century, which is also the first satirical SF according to her (Doody, 1997, pp. 283, 30). Therefore, her example also reveals the roots of SF in the critical texts of the past.

merges multiple genres of speculative fiction -namely utopian and science fiction, gothic, and fantasy- while also incorporating the literary conventions of adventure, romance, and satire. To begin with utopian fiction, the word utopia⁵ is first coined by Thomas More in his work *Utopia* which portrays a namesake island that is described as having a perfect society, politics, and laws. More's text also shapes the modern definition of utopia as "[a]n imagined place or state of things in which everything is perfect" ("Utopia", n.d.). In *The Mummy!*, Webb pictures a utopian future where countless revolutions take place to achieve a socio-political state that is ideal for everyone, however, the aftermath of the failed revolutions demonstrates the impossibility of creating a perfect order of things which satisfies everyone. Webb (2018) writes that the people of England realize "that perfect equality was not quite the most enviable mode of government" (Chapter 1, para. 8). In that sense, Webb's novel exemplifies Frederick Jameson's (2005) theorization of utopia in *Archaeologies of the Future* as a *desire* for what is not possible to fulfil. The employment of the features of utopian fiction in *The Mummy!* functions in line with the satire in the novel to reveal the moral corruption engendered by the greed of humans who are not contented with what they have and desire more.

Standing among the predecessors of science fiction, the narration of *The Mummy!* exhibits *novum* that Darko Suvin asserts as the essence of science fiction. In *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction*, Suvin (1979) aims to form a frame for science fiction and writes that "SF [science fiction] is distinguished by the narrative dominance or hegemony of a fictional 'novum' (novelty, innovation)" (p. 63). In consonance with that, literary *novelty* occasions *The Mummy!* as the narrator aspires to write a novel that has never been written before. For Suvin, novum "entails a change of the whole universe of the tale," which also can be seen in Jane Webb's 'tale of the 22nd century' since the whole world is altered by the advancements in science. In his discussion, Suvin (1979) further states that novum manifests itself in the text with "different degrees of magnitude" which ranges from the minimum of "invention" such as a "gadget" or "technique" "to the maximum of a setting (spatiotemporal locus), agent (main character or characters), and/or relations basically new and unknown in the

⁵ The etymological roots of the word utopia which means "nowhere" can be traced back to the coinage of the Greek words "ou" meaning "not" and "topos" meaning "place" (Harper, n.d.). The first syllable also contains a pun on the Greek word "eu" which means good, creating a double interpretation of utopias that are good places but nowhere to be found.

author's environment" (p. 64). Referring to the former one, Webb's (2018) novel is abundant in inventions such as chemical illumination which does not harm the environment; movable houses and bridges and in the field of architecture; "aërial horses" and "aërial sledges" that float in the air; a grand network made of metal tubes that surrounds the sky used for communication; automatons as an early example of artificial intelligence in fiction; and above all, the coffee machine that roasts, grounds and pours the coffee with "boiling milk and sugar, all in ... five minutes" (Chapter 11, para. 50, Chapter 7, para. 2). Not only the technological inventions but new trends in fashion take place in the novel such as "loose trowsers" for women, hats with "fountains made of glass dust," and wearable fire named as "jets de feu" which is an elegant hair accessory (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 11, para. 2, 47). Moreover, it is seen that the novel embodies novum to a maximum degree with its futuristic setting, its main character the mummy of Cheops who is the first reanimated mummy in English literature, and its depiction of the social relationships which are the reversed version of Webb's time⁶. Additionally, it should be stated that, as Suvin underlines, novum is connected to historicity as what is considered new depends on the timeline one lives in.

The Mummy! is also a gothic novel as the conventions of this genre is as dominant in the novel as those of utopian and science fiction. From the onset of the story, the novel shows an affinity with the canonical tales of the Gothic tradition. In a letter to a friend, Horace Walpole (2014) writes that upon waking up from a dream in which he was in an ancient castle, he starts writing *The Castle of Otranto*, which is considered the first gothic novel (p. 28). In like manner, as she explains in her preface to *Frankenstein*, Shelley (2012b) is inspired to write her ghost story after she sees a nightmare about a "hideous phantasm" which is animated through an engine (p. 168). The introduction of *The Mummy!* falls in line with this tradition and the narrator is given the story in a dream-like state. Another significant intersection among these novels is that all three stories are *hybrids*. In the preface to the second edition of *The Castle of Otranto*, Walpole (2014) writes that his attempt in writing the novel was "to blend the two kinds of romance, the ancient and the modern" (p. 9). Therefore, transgressing the classical narrative boundaries, his novel becomes a hybrid genre, defining the grotesque

⁶ For further examination of *The Mummy!* as a work of science fiction, see Chapter Three, in which the novel's spatiotemporal layers are discussed in line with Darko Suvin's concept of *cognitive estrangement*.

nature of the Gothic. By the same token, Mary Shelley (2012b) calls her novel a “hideous progeny” suggesting a resemblance between the hybrid bodies of the monster and the novel (p. 169). *The Mummy!*, in the same manner, blends multiple genres in its narrative, making it a *monstrous assemble*. Furthermore, the story of Webb is abundant in gothic tropes such as the theme of transgression that serves as the basis for satire of the novel that criticizes greediness for more power including forbidden knowledge. It should be emphasized, however, while adopting the conventions and tropes of gothic, *The Mummy!* also creates a self-conscious parody of the genre: mad scientist become a ridiculous doctor, damsels in distress are replaced with brave heroines, and the gothic monster becomes a comic monster.

The heterogeneous narrative of the novel is further saturated with the elements of fantasy, romance, and adventure fiction. The main element of fantasy in the novel is the mummy of Cheops, a supernatural being. Although he is resuscitated by a galvanic device in the reanimation scene at the cave, it is disclosed by himself at the end of the novel that what revived him was not electricity but the same power that gave him life. With this fantastic turn, an element of science fiction is transformed into an element of fantasy in the novel. Another fantastic characteristic is the fairy-tale narration of the novel provided by a ‘spirit’, which leaves the reader with a happy resolution and a moral lesson at the end of the book. The fact that this moral lesson is voiced by the mummy of Cheops, the monster of the story, brings together the fairy-tale conventions with that of gothic parody. Moreover, romance in the novel is displayed through the romantic affairs between Edric and Pauline; Roderick and Elvira; and Ferdinand and Clara. Along with them, the novel stages unrequited love experienced by Edmund, Rosabella, and Zoe. Finally, the elements of adventure fiction can be seen in the odyssey of Edric and the doctor comprising several parts of the world. Starting with a journey to Anglo-Egypt from England, their adventures continue in the sea and later in Spain where they join the army of Roderick the Great. That being the case, the narrative of *The Mummy!* also unfolds multiple parallel storylines set in diverse places around the world.

Inspired by the novel’s grotesque nature that has been discussed, the present thesis will read Jane Webb’s *The Mummy!* as an epitome of the carnivalesque novel in the framework of Bakhtinian discourse. Prior to the reading, a brief outlook on the carnival spirit should be elucidated. Mikhail Bakhtin, acclaimed Russian literary

theorist and philosopher of the 20th century, unearths one of the most liberating and positive forces in the world, the medieval carnivals, in his masterwork *Rabelais and His World*, to explore the literary mode carnivalesque and its roots in the popular-folk humour of medieval carnivals. For Bakhtin (1984b), the medieval carnival is ‘a second world’ participated by all people who were “offered a completely different, nonofficial, extra ecclesiastical and extra political aspect of the world, of man, and of human relations” during a period of time every year (p. 6). In these carnivals, “all hierarchic distinctions and barriers among men and of certain norms” by which people abide during their official lives, are temporarily suspended, and subverted through carnivalistic acts such as the mock crowning and decrowning rituals in which fool takes the throne from the king (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 15). In that sense, as Bakhtin states, the medieval carnivals stage “a characteristic logic, the peculiar logic of the ‘inside out,’ of the ‘turnabout,’ of a continual shifting from top to bottom ... a ‘world inside out’” (p. 35). The 22nd century of *The Mummy!*, as it will be unfolded in the following chapters, presents such a world for the reader.

For Bakhtin, intrinsic to the spirit of the medieval carnivals, are laughter and grotesque body. As an indispensable element of carnivals, the festive laughter of carnivals is not directed to someone or something but it becomes universal as it belongs to all the people and is directed to everyone and anything. During these carnivals, there was no place for the terror which is turned into “comic monsters, who were defeated by laughter” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 39). Highlighted as *ambiguous* by Bakhtin, the festive laughter is both “gay” and “mocking,” therefore “it buries and revives” in a double sense (p. 11). Hence, the carnival laughter carries within itself the act of degrading, *bringing down to earth*, which is “an element that swallows up and gives birth at the same time” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 21). Blurring the lines between life and death, and young and old through the grotesque imagery of the earth, carnival laughter mocks the fear of death as if the old is young, and the young has always been old to begin with, and life has always meant death while death meant not an ending but a beginning for new life. The same ambiguity can be traced in the marketplace language of the carnival, which praises while it abuses and abuses while it praises, creating a *positive negation*. In the grotesque realism of carnivals, “all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract” is lowered to the level of earth, including the human body, which is celebrated with all its earthiness, incompleteness, and ever-changing and growing reality (Bakhtin, 1984, p.

20). According to Bakhtin, the spirit of the carnival is weakened throughout the centuries but transferred into the texts of literature, a metamorphosis which resulted in what he calls *carnivalesque*.

This thesis will appraise Jane Webb's *The Mummy!: Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century* as a carnivalesque novel in three main chapters. In the first chapter, the carnivalized text of the novel will be examined through Bakhtin's dialogic principle and theorization of the novel genre as a descendant of the carnivalesque lineage of literature. Revealing the *polyphonic* (dialogic) composition of *The Mummy!*, the chapter will further explore *polyglossia*, *heteroglossia*, and *parody* in the dialogic text of the novel. *The Mummy!*'s defiance of categorization and yearning for *novelty* will be unfolded in line with the anticanonical nature of the novel genre as argued by Bakhtin. Last but not least, the chapter will discuss intertextuality and metafiction as carnivalesque textual elements in *The Mummy!*. The second chapter will read the mummy of Cheops in the novel as a carnivalesque monster with the purpose of defining his place among the monsters of literature. It will trace the Faustian transgression as an intertextual connection between *Frankenstein* and Webb's novel and highlight the carnivalesque-Menippean motifs in the genesis of 'the Mummy'. Elucidating Cheops as an abject figure through Kristevan concept of abjection, the chapter will unveil how Cheops subverts the conventional depiction of the gothic monster as the other and turns into a carnivalesque monster. Cheop's carnivalesque figure will further be analysed in the grotesque body of the novel and the illustration of him as a 'laughing devil' in the novel. Focusing on the elements of utopian and science fiction in the novel, the last chapter will entail the satirical criticism of the socio-political, cultural, literary, and historical dimensions of Jane Webb's period in the novel, which is achieved by carnivalesque subversion.

CHAPTER 1

AMBIVALENT, DISRUPTIVE, AND BOUNDLESS: CARNIVALIZED TEXT OF *THE MUMMY!*

“I have long wished to write a novel,” confesses the narrator, whose ambiguous pen can be interpreted as belonging to either an implied author and/or to Jane Webb (2018) herself, in the opening line of *The Mummy!* (Introduction, para. 1). Intending to write something unconventional, apart from those stories with monotonous and dreary heroes who are much alike, she thinks to herself: “‘I must have something new, something quite out of the beaten path: —but what?’—ay, that was the question” (Introduction, para. 1). Not only does she seek to write a novel, placing the emphasis on the genre which is etymologically derived from the Latin word *novus* meaning ‘new’, but she also seems to anticipate what Alkon (1987) will describe as the “metafictional question of whether her story will achieve literary novelty” (p. 233). All the while these thoughts occupy her mind, she reaches an idyllic valley defined as fertile, recalling the notions of artistic creativity and production. There, a spirit gives her a scroll to write about and informs her that “a hero [who is] totally different from any hero that ever appeared before” can be found in it, responding to the author’s aspirations of novelty (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 6). Hence, it is set out in the introduction that ‘literary novelty’, and *novelness* in particular, lies at the genesis of *The Mummy!*.

Novelness, remarkably, is also a core element in Bakhtin’s discourse which binds together the carnivalesque and his theorisation of the novel genre inasmuch that “the novel – or rather ‘novelness’ – is carnivalesque” (Renfrew, 2015, p. 140). While novel means unusual, novelness can be defined as the quality of being unusual or non-ordinary. What is novel can also be strange, unfamiliar, different from what is considered conventional or normative, depending on respective social and cultural contexts. In this regard, the carnival spirit corresponds to ‘novelness’ intrinsically, since a sense of renewal resides at the heart of carnival; according to Bakhtin (1984b), the carnival spirit breaks down the conventions constituting the “usual official way of life” and inaugurates a “new order of things,” a novel mode of being. Through this new order, carnival time offers a period of diverse and unaccustomed ways of interaction among people who would otherwise contact each other abiding by the formal language and

official manners in their monotonous lives. As Bakhtin argues, in time, such idiosyncratic elements of carnival, the language of carnival, became integrated into literary texts through an event he describes as the *carnivalization* of literature, which plays a significant role in shaping the novel as a genre⁷ for Bakhtin. As a result, novelness becomes a carnivalesque root in the Bakhtinian reading of the evolution of the novel genre. Furthermore, it defines the novel itself, which Bakhtin portrays as “not [as] just another literary genre but a special kind of force, which he calls ‘novelness’” (Clark & Holquist, 1984, p. 296). By that means, from a Bakhtinian standpoint, both the novel genre and the carnivalesque intersect at the same ‘novelness’ which, as it will be argued further on elicited the birth of *The Mummy!*.

The present chapter will engage with the ‘carnivalized’ text of Jane Webb’s *The Mummy!*, which is ambivalent, disruptive, and boundless. The theoretical framework will be provided by Bakhtin’s studies on the dialogic nature and carnivalized lineage of the novel genre, from which his concept of carnivalesque originated. A brief survey of Bakhtin’s linguistic philosophy of *dialogism* will initiate my analysis, as a backbone for the later concepts in this chapter; the survey will elucidate how carnival(-esque) language adheres to the dialogic principle by subverting the *monologic* thought. Then, I will start analysing how the dialogic principle is embodied in the carnivalized text of *The Mummy!*. First, through Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoyevski’s Poetics* (PDP) in which he conceptualises polyphony (many-voicedness) as a manifestation of dialogism in the novel, the polyphonic composition of Loudon’s novel will be explored through characters, masks, and spatial and temporal layers. Secondly, the chapter will investigate polyglossia (multi-languagedness), heteroglossia (other-languagedness), and parody (double-voicedness) as the dialogic elements in the carnivalesque text of *The Mummy!* through the framework constituted by Bakhtin’s essays on the novelistic

⁷ In *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics* (PDP), Bakhtin (1984a) argues three lines of development for the novel, one of which is the carnivalistic line that leads to the formation of the dialogic (polyphonic) novel which is idealised by Bakhtin. Later, in *The Dialogic Imagination*, without a further elaboration on these lines, he focuses on a ‘novelistic discourse’ which prepared the ground for the birth of the novel genre. Again, one can observe the significance of the carnival in his analysis since one of the elements that shaped the novelistic discourse is ‘laughter’ i.e., parodic-travesty forms of literature. It should also be pointed out that even though the novelistic discourse analysed by Bakhtin (1981) dates back to “the oral tradition of folklore going back to prehistoric times,” he claims that only in Renaissance “the novelistic word ... revealed its full potential” (pp. xxix; 80). Bakhtin’s view that the novel actualized itself as a genre during Renaissance is criticized by Margaret A. Doody (1997) who disagrees with his refusal of “Greek and Roman novels of antiquity” as proper examples of the novel genre (p. 2). For her critique, and analysis of the novel genre, refer to *The True Story of the Novel* by Margaret A. Doody.

discourse and its prehistory with an emphasis on the anticanonical and disruptive nature shared by carnival and the novel. Finally, but not least importantly, *intertextuality* and *metafiction* will be incorporated into the discussion as carnivalizing elements of the textual fabric of *The Mummy!*.

1.1. The Dialogic Principle in Carnival(-esque) Language

Standing as a key philosophical concept in Bakhtinian discourse, *dialogism* describes the counter condition to *monologism*. Alluding to the literary device of monologue, a lengthy speech recited by a single actor, Bakhtin (1984a) describes his conceptualisation of monologism by writing that:

monologism, at its extreme, denies the existence outside itself of another consciousness, ... another I with equal rights (thou). With a monologic approach ... another person remains wholly and merely an object of consciousness, and not another consciousness. ... Monologue is finalized and deaf to the other's response [pretending] to be *the ultimate word* [emphasis added]. (pp. 292-293)

According to Bakhtin, monologism is the state of a central and one-sided “single truth” spoken by a single voice that excludes and objectifies whatever remains beyond its borders. Elaborating on Bakhtin’s viewpoint, Michael E. Gardiner (1992) argues that monologism “describes a condition wherein the matrix of ideological values [and] signifying practices ... which constitute the living reality of language are subordinated to the hegemony of a single, unified consciousness or perspective” (p. 26). Thus, *the monologic principle* of Bakhtin applies to all structures that are authoritative, normative, and notably ‘closed’. However, to define a ‘responding’ condition that unsettles the monologic thought, Bakhtin coins the term ‘dialogism’ by giving precedence to dialogue that is double, open-ended, and inclusive in its ability to embrace diversity.

To understand Bakhtin’s dialogism, one must go back to the linguistic background of the concept, to Valentin N. Vološinov’s⁸ linguistic theory representing the Bakhtinian Circle’s standpoint that language is dialogic in nature. In *Marxism and the Philosophy*

⁸ Although Vološinov is referred as the writer of *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, this work is one of the many texts that have been claimed to be written by Mikhail Bakhtin under the pseudonyms of his friends Vološinov and Pavel N. Medvedev, who were members of the Bakhtin Circle. See Renfrew (2015, p. 8) and Gardiner (1992, p. 2).

of *Language*, Vološinov claims that Saussurean linguistic theory, which he calls 'abstract objectivism', is a limited approach since it primarily concentrates on *langue* - the aspect of language that indicates the inflexible rules and conventions such as grammar, phonetics, and binary oppositions- and understates *parole* -the aspect of language that comprises of actually spoken or written utterances. For Vološinov (1973), Saussure's formulation fails to acknowledge "the living, dynamic reality of language and its social functions" by depicting language as a transcendental structure which would only be useful for "deciphering ... a dead, alien language" (p. 82). His critique suggests that a structuralist approach to language is nothing but performing an autopsy on words, anatomizing their units for scientific study. Instead, he enthrones *parole* and proposes a dialogic approach that would comprehend the reality of language alive in its all dimensions.

Indicating that to convey a meaning is the *raison d'être* of languages, Vološinov asserts that language cannot be examined by isolating utterances from their extra-verbal context that is shared by both speaker and listener within the respective social situation. Vološinov (1973) states that "the actual reality of language-speech is ... the social event of verbal interaction implemented in an utterance" (p. 94). Opposing the abstract characteristics of structuralist linguistics, he refers to his conceptualisation of utterance as 'concrete' utterance and argues that utterances are always generated within a social event comprising of a speaker, a listener whose presence is overlooked by abstract objectivists, and a social situation in which the interaction occurs. The meaning of the utterance depends on all these elements that compose the 'extra-verbal context' in which "both interlocutors occupy a precise location within wider social relations (kinship, social class, gender, and ethnicity) ... [and] tailor their utterances ... to conform to the demands of the immediate social situation" (Gardiner, 1992, p. 12). Vološinov's dialogic approach discloses the *double-sided* social reality of utterance emphasizing that not only verbal but also extra-verbal context essentially contributes to the meaning which is never fixed but open-ended and *ambivalent*.

Inasmuch as the meaning production is contingent on the social evaluations of the interlocutors, Vološinov emphasizes that every utterance is ideological. For him, to decipher an utterance, it is crucial to be aware of the ideological agenda that underlies it. In line with the stratified nature of the socio-political structure, Vološinov claims that the speech interactions are stratified into 'speech genres' as they disclose ideological

patterns differing among generations, historical periods, social groups etc. He does not provide a detailed explanation of these genres; however, what Voloshinov unfolds is that “meaning is context bound but that context is *boundless* [my emphasis],”; as it will be further explained in this chapter, “the name of this boundlessness is ‘heteroglossia’” (Clark & Holquist, 1984, pp. 218-219). Furthermore, Vološinov delineates the utterance as an ideological site that depicts the class struggle between the dominant and peripheral classes in which the latter *disrupts* the hegemony of the previous. Gardiner (1992) clarifies this struggle as follows:

the dominant class is motivated to ensure the fixity of meaning and arrest the flux of the sign, insofar as the establishment of a monolithic or ‘official’ language facilitates the sociopolitical unification of society [but] this Orwellian desire is continually thwarted by the irrepressible and decentralizing forces of popular speech and culture. (p. 17)

Herewith, all these aspects of language presented in Vološinov’s approach⁹, namely ambivalence, boundlessness, and disruptiveness, comprises the components of Bakhtin’s dialogism.

In the light of this evaluation, I argue that carnival language corresponds with Bakhtin’s dialogic principle by embodying ambivalence, boundlessness, and disruptiveness. Notably, the carnivalesque unsettling of the official law involves a dialogic subversion of monologism. The official law established by the dominant class of a given society reveals its monology in monitoring the social interaction by presenting conventions such as official language as the single truth. To preserve its hegemony, the dominant class endeavours to stabilize the bond between the signifier and signified in the official language designating diversions as unacceptable. However, the carnivals of popular-festive culture disintegrate this monologism by celebrating the dialogic nature of language. For example, marketplace speech of carnivals simultaneously degrades and praises bending and twisting the signification process. Moreover, in consonance with the ambivalence of dialogism, “the grotesque image” embodied by the carnival illustrates “... an as yet *unfinished* metamorphosis, of death

⁹ This critique also suggests that a broader approach in linguistics is required to encompass all these multiple and variable social dimensions of language. As a solution, Bakhtin proposes *metalinguistics*, which is also referred to as *translinguistics*. He defines metalinguistics as “the study of those aspects in the life of the word, not yet shaped into separate and specific disciplines, that exceed ... the boundaries of linguistics” (Bakhtin, 1984a, p. 181).

and birth, growth and becoming [emphasis added],” and “life is shown in its *two-fold* contradictory process [emphasis added]” (Bakhtin, 1984b, pp. 24, 26). Besides these, celebrating the plurality in an unconventional dialogue, the carnival laughter breaks down the one-sided monologism of the official language since it is not directed to an ‘other’ nor does it objectify ‘another’ but it is shared by all participants.

Along with the transposition of the language of carnival to the literary texts through the carnivalization of literature, the dialogic principle inherent in carnival(-esque) language begins to manifest itself in these *carnivalized texts*. Bakhtin starts to analyse dialogism in literature in the *polyphonic novels* which, according to him, are descendants of the line of novels that are mainly evolved through the carnivalization of literature. Thus, I will also start my analysis of the carnivalized text of *The Mummy!* with its polyphonic composition.

1.2. *The Mummy!*’s Polyphony of Voices, Time-Space, and Masks

In *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (PDP), Bakhtin scrutinises the manifestation of dialogism in the novel genre by coining the term *polyphony*, which defines a composition style in music in which multiple melodies harmonize with each other while preserving their individual sounds. Bakhtin separates the novels that embody a polyphonic composition — the *polyphonic novel* (or dialogic novel)— from the monologic novel. In PDP, the novels that picture “a monologically understood, objectified world ... corresponding to a single and unified authorial consciousness” are argued as monologic novels (Bakhtin et al., 1984a, p. 9). In these, regardless of the number or diversity of the characters, only a single voice, that is the author’s consciousness, is heard echoing in characters throughout the novel. The characters of monologic novels remain as subordinated objects and are reduced to senseless figures acting within the finite world of the author’s own discourse.

On the other hand, Bakhtin foregrounds that the polyphonic novel epitomised by the writings of Fyodor Dostoevsky transgress these boundaries. Bakhtin (1984a) acclaims Dostoevsky as the father of this “new novelistic genre” stating that the prominent characteristic of his novels is “a *plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices*” (p. 7; p. 6). In the polyphonic texture of Dostoevsky’s novels, the characters are put down on paper as “the author[s] of [their own] fullyweighted ideological conception[s]” (p. 5). Rather

than being merely images, Dostoevsky's characters are evaluated by Bakhtin as embodiments of "idea-forces" independent from the author's point of view which are not privileged but always in dialogue together with 'the other' voices in the novel under *equal terms* (Renfrew, 2015, p. 77). Within the polyphony of Bakhtin, the voices engage in a dialogue with one another, through the medium of the other, that is the language. Considering these, a polyphonic composition (many-voicedness) can be heard in *The Mummy!* through the characters' unfinalizability and distinct consciousnesses as idea-forces, spatial and temporal layers, and the masks in the novel.

To begin with the characterisation, in the polyphony of *The Mummy!*, the characters act as 'idea-forces' by presenting distinct ideological conceptions which juxtapose with each other throughout the novel. To illustrate, the brothers Edmund and Edric can be discussed as clashing idea-forces considering their characteristic features. While the heroic warrior of the story, Edmund, displays the virtues of heroism and ambition for glory, his brother Edric does not care about earthly pleasures and pursues the knowledge of the afterlife with a "romantic disposition and contemplative turn of mind" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, p. 12). Along with their life purposes, their approach to love also differs since Edmund is passionately in love with a girl, as opposed to Edric who is insensible to love. Recalling mind-body dualism, the clashing ideologies concretized in the brothers contribute to a great dialogue in *The Mummy!* since, according to Bakhtin, a 'great dialogue' is created in polyphonic novels through the coexistence of juxtaposed but interacting ideologies.

However, what makes them independent consciousnesses is not their juxtaposing characteristics but their transformation throughout the novel. As Renfrew (2015) points out, the characters' "dialogic representation in terms of their live 'eventness', their 'actually becoming being', is what guarantees the status (...) not as 'objects' (...) but as 'subjects'" (pp. 80-81). Correspondingly, instead of maintaining them as stabilized images, Webb unfolds the *renewal* of the characters through experience, and by doing so, highlights their unfinalizability. To give an example, when the passionate love of Edmund for Elvira remains unrequited, he marries Rosabella to take the throne from Elvira but in the end, he suffers and regrets his actions. On the other hand, Edric follows another path; he renounces his overreaching aspirations for the forbidden knowledge and finds himself capable of falling in love.

One can hear the polyphony also in the engagement of the voices in a dialogue with an ‘other’ under equal conditions in *The Mummy!*. Bakhtin (1984a) notes that indispensable for polyphony is “[t]o affirm someone else’s ‘I’ not as an object but as another subject” (p. 10). Webb’s novel actualises this by dismantling the monologic construction of the figure of the monster as an objectified other. Cohen (1996) argues that monsters, functioning as the Other, are “[associated with] the Outside, the Beyond—[with] all those loci that are ... distant and distinct” (p. 7). Demarcating self from other, “I” from “not I”, society secures its subjectivity by projecting what they do not want to see in themselves to a monster image. Breaking down this convention, Cheops is not presented as an objectified monster image in Webb’s novel. He acts as yet another consciousness with his own perceptions, another ‘I’ under equal terms with other characters. To illustrate, the reanimation scene of Cheops is reported twice in the novel: from the point of view of the doctor and Edric, and the point of Cheops. In the first one, he is depicted with a distance, as something unknown. Nevertheless, when the narrator rewinds the time, we experience the same moment through the eyes of Cheops, who becomes the subject this time. Therefore, the two-sided narration of the same event in the novel does not let the reader objectify the mummy; on the contrary, it creates a dialogue between the two experiences overlapping in the same moment in time.

Furthermore, Cheops’ voice can be read as ‘the other’ not only because of his role as a resurrected mummy, a monster, but also because he once was the pharaoh of the lands which are colonised by England in the novel’s future. Succeeding his arrival to England, Cheops holds conversations with instrumental personas who are steering socio-political affairs in England. Most characters undergo a change influenced by their conversations with Cheops who alters their mindsets and actions. Therefore, Cheops becomes the voice through which the colonised other speaks back so much so that he manipulates the elections of the queen of England through these dialogues, subverting the coloniser/colonized hierarchy. Bakhtin’s dialogism marks that “human consciousness is not a unified whole but always exists in a tensile, conflict-ridden relationship with other consciousnesses, in a constant alterity between self and other” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 28). Accordingly, the symbolical dialogue between the colonizer and the colonized in the novel presents this clashing interaction between the self and other enhancing the polyphony.

In the context of characterisation, the naming of Dr. Entwerfen can also be argued as a part of the polyphony of the novel for the word ‘entwerfen’ bears a sense of dialogism. Throughout Webb’s novel, Dr. Entwerfen carries out bizarre experiments and makes seemingly impossible and mostly unnecessary inventions. His unceasing enthusiasm for more discoveries and experiments is acutely symbolized in his name ‘entwerfen’ which is employed by Heidegger in his discussion on the nature of *understanding* in *Being and Time*. To explore the composition of understanding, Heidegger employs the word ‘entwerfen’ in a double-fold sense. In the first one, “entwerfen auf means ‘to project some thing in terms of something else’ (never ‘upon’ something else [which would be monologic]),” such as an umbrella in terms of rain; in the second meaning “[it] is not a matter of ‘projecting [something]’ but rather of ‘being projected’” (Sheehan, 2015, pp. 207, 208). Hence, the naming of Dr. Entwerfen manifests dialogism in the novel reflecting the dual nature of language.

As it is discussed, a ‘great dialogue’¹⁰ is created in polyphonic novels. However, this dialogue is not effectuated only through the voices of characters but “every element of the novel itself—plot, narration, style, imagery, or the portrayal of time and space (the chronotope)” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 24). Bakhtin (1984a) indicates that all of these elements are “structured to make dialogic opposition inescapable. Not a single element of the work is structured from the point of view of a nonparticipating ‘third person.’” (p. 18). Not even the reader, for whom the text can turn into an ‘other’ to objectify, is excluded from this great dialogue for Bakhtin; as in the case with the carnival, everyone becomes a participant in the polyphonic novel. Indeed, in the metafictional narration of *The Mummy!*, the narrator engages in a dialogue with the reader by addressing directly to them while interrupting the story. Anyone and everyone reading the story become included in the polyphony of the novel. Moreover, since it is ambiguous whether the narrator is Jane Webb herself or an implied author, this doubled voice in the narration partakes in the great dialogue of *The Mummy!*. As Bakhtin (1981) states, this ambiguity creates a “dialogic tension between two languages [that of the implied narrator and Webb]” through a possibility of “saying “I am me” in someone else’s language, and in my own language, “I am other” (315). Thus, the metafictional narration of Webb’s novel enables the reader and the writer herself to participate in the polyphony.

¹⁰ The last chapter of this thesis presents an in-depth analysis of the three main great dialogues of the novel.

‘Portrayal of time and space’ in *The Mummy!* further enriches the polyphonic structure since the temporal and spatial layers overlap in the novel’s utopian sci-fi space. The text of *The Mummy!* can be read as a space where four discrete time zones overlap: the status quo of the author who wrote the novel, the characters’ time zone in the fictional future, the ever-changing present of the reader, and the time of Ancient Egypt whose zeitgeist is felt through the mummy. Creating an effect of temporal estrangement, these layers that are clashing on text invite the reader to a comparison, and therefore, to ‘a great dialogue’ stretching among the past, present, and future. As a part of this great dialogue, the spatial dimension of these time zones cannot be separated from them since the appearance of the landscapes of the countries mentioned in the novel are quite unlike each other before century, in the early 19th century, in the 22nd century of the novel, and the reader’s present, which is early 21st century in this case. This polyphony of spatio-temporal layers is also accompanied by the diversity in the novel’s setting. Contributing to the polyphonic composition, the novel is abundant in places such as the palace, the ship, the cemetery, the air balloons, the prisons, the pyramid, the moving houses, a few countries (England, Spain, Anglo-Egypt, Ireland), etc. All these layers, and the spatio-temporal estrangement they produce, play a significant role in the critical utopian dialogues established in the novel, such as the dialogue between nature and technology, which will be taken up later in the third chapter.

In the second edition of PDP which is published later in 1963, a new section is added in which Bakhtin situates the historical development of polyphonic novel in the ‘carnivalistic line of the novel’ which is originated in the serio-comical genres of antiquity. Bakhtin (1984a) states that “the novelistic genre has three fundamental roots: the epic, the rhetorical, and the carnivalistic (with, of course, many transitional forms in between)” (p. 109). He argues that polyphonic novel is a descendent of this carnivalistic line of development of the novel that pioneered by the serio-comical genres:

[l]iterature that was influenced—directly (...) or indirectly, through a series of intermediate links—by one or another variant of carnivalistic folklore (...) we shall call carnivalized literature. The entire realm of the serio-comical constitutes the first example of such literature. (p. 107)

Among these genres, as Bakhtin (1984a) notes, two of them, the Socratic dialogue and Menippean satire, play a crucial part “[i]n shaping that [carnivalistic] variety in the development of the novel, and in shaping that artistic prose which we will provisionally call ‘dialogic’ [or polyphonic]” (p. 109). These two genres, which will be concentrated on in detail in later chapters, pass down the elements of the literary tradition of carnivalesque to the polyphonic novel.

The theme of masks in *The Mummy!* discloses this heritage of the carnival tradition while augmenting the voices in the polyphony. Plenty of characters wear figurative masks while pretending to be someone else in the novel. For example, the king of Ireland, Roderick II, disguises himself as a Spanish man named Henry Seymour at the beginning of the novel. Edgar, the Duke of Cornwall’s brother, presumed dead, actually lives under the name of Father Morris for years at the house of the duke’s best friend. Marianne, the attendant of Rosabella, hides the fact that she is Rosabella’s mother deceiving Edgar into thinking that Rosabella is his daughter from his dead wife. However, at the end of the novel, he learns that Marianne has given his biological daughter, Pauline, up for adoption. Edgar and Roderick accidentally meet Pauline in the war in Spain and she learns the truth later upon her arrival in England. Besides these, travesties contribute to this ‘theme of masks’ in the novel. Zoe dresses up as a soldier to be close to Roderick with whom she falls in love and both Cheops and Clara dress up as Greek peasants in order to sneak into the palace. All these masks and cross-dressings add another layer to the voices of the characters, a voice within a voice, a presence of a double consciousness that diversifies the novel’s polyphonic composition.

Although the theme of masks is a prominent carnivalesque element in the novel, most of the masks fall into the type of what Bakhtin writes as the Romantic mask. In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin (1984b) explains that “the theme of the mask” is an indispensable component of the folk carnival tradition (p. 39). Resembling the overthrowing and crowning rituals, this theme reflects the carnivalesque aspect of “‘unmasking’ and disclosing of the unvarnished truth under the veil of false claims and arbitrary ranks” (p. 10). This unmasking is performed so that masks are related to “the joy of change and reincarnation, (...) to mockery and familiar nick names” (pp. 39-40). As the ages pass, the gay spirit of carnival masks fades away and takes on new meanings in the gloomy atmosphere of Romanticism. Bakhtin writes that as opposed to the folk carnival masks’ festive and regenerating spirit, the Romantic mask “hides something,

keeps a secret, [and] deceives” (p. 40). In *The Mummy!*, inasmuch as the employment of the theme of the mask is a significant carnivalesque element, the exhilarating timbre of masks found in folk carnivals can only be traced in the travesties of Cheops and Clara while the other masks display a strong affinity with the Romantic variant. In consonance with the Gothic mode in *The Mummy!* which is created in the Romantic Age, the masks of Edgar, Marianne, and Roderick are there to deceive both the other characters and the reader to whom the mysteries are unfolded as late as at the end of the story.

1.3. Novelistic Discourse in *The Mummy!*: Polyglossia, Heteroglossia, and Parody

Pursuing polyphony, Bakhtin expands his studies on the dialogic nature of the novel and its historical roots in the carnival tradition studying the concepts of polyglossia (multi-languagedness), heteroglossia (other-languagedness), and parody (double-voicedness) in *The Dialogic Imagination*. Hence, I will continue my analysis of the carnivalized text of *The Mummy!* investigating these three components which are emphasized by Bakhtin as building blocks of the novelistic discourse. The first of these, *polyglossia* (*mnogojazyčie*, meaning multi-languagedness), describes the condition in which the languages of nations exist in a reciprocal relationship influencing and transforming each other in cultural and linguistic aspects. According to Bakhtin, it was unsuitable for the novel form to exist in the monoglot period in history when the societies were isolated from the world and “locked inside [their] own ‘national myth[s]’” which claim that their language as “unitary and self-sufficient” (Renfrew, 2015, p. 96). For Bakhtin, this myth is revised through polyglossia which led to the coexistence of “a plurality of different (and often contradictory) ideological worlds” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 35). Bakhtin asserts that the new dialogic consciousness created by polyglossia paved the path for the birth of the novel genre.

In *The Mummy!*, polyglossia is reflected in the diverse nationalities of the characters and the dispersed setting of the novel involving distant countries. To illustrate, a variety of nationalities can be found among the characters such as Irish, Swiss, Egyptian, British, Spanish, German, and if one also counts the cross-dressings, Greek. Also, the setting includes Britain, Ireland, Spain, and Anglo-Egypt. This plurality of the cultural consciousnesses enables different ideological worlds to interact in the novel’s text. For example, when Edric and Dr. Entwerfen arrive in Anglo-Egypt, the local people are amazed at their air balloon and laugh at the odd appearance of the

doctor claiming that "they must be come [sic] from the moon" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 18). In the face of their reaction, the doctor thinks that they are "the greatest brutes [he] had ever met with" until he meets an Egyptian man called Justice who is "a very civil, obliging, good-natured" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 19). Therefore, the encounter between these two disparate cultural worlds influences both sides. In another scene, the characters' discussion on the clashing socio-political conditions in other countries further contributes to the polyglossia. In this conversation, while Africa is mentioned as an "infant republic" with weak but liberal rulers, America is seen by the doctor as a dreadful "despotic government" quite unlike the milder one they have in England. The comparison of the regimes leads the speakers to reflect on their own, highlighting the polyglossia in the novel.

Inseparable from polyglossia, Bakhtin discusses another condition, *heteroglossia* (*raznorečie*, referred to as "varied-speechedness" or 'other-languagedness') which is not only a prerequisite for the development of the novel genre but constitutes the fabric itself of which the novelistic discourse is made (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 139). In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin observes that the dynamics of polyglossia also exists as an internal condition within a national language which, as he argues, encompass a variety of languages within itself. For Bakhtin (1981), each language is internally *stratified* into multiple other languages such as:

social dialects, characteristic group behavior, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day ... (pp. 262-263)

This state of "internal polyglossia" or "speech diversity" is called heteroglossia by Bakhtin. For him, heteroglossia in language finds its truest representation in the novel.

In *The Mummy!*, heteroglossia can be traced in the stratified language in the social groups of humans¹¹ and the employment of the punctuation marks to characterize the voices of the mummy and the automatons. In the novel, Cheops' lines are mostly attended by exclamation marks which enhance the depiction of his terrorising voice that

¹¹ See Chapter Three for how speech types of social classes are stratified in the examples of the languages of the aristocrats who are socially divided in themselves, and the reversal of the verbal etiquette of high and low classes.

echoes in the ears of those who heard it. For example, shortly after his resuscitation Cheops utters the words “Oh! Osiris! what horrid thoughts flash through my brain! ... Oh! Arsinoë! by the fell rites of Typhon, there's madness in the thought!” followed by an exclamation at the end of each sentence (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 26). One of the reasons for these marks is that Cheops frequently commands or curses others with “his deep hollow voice thrilling through the souls of his auditors” as in the cases of “Begone!” or “Weak, feeble worm! ... Degenerate wretches!” (Chapter 14, para. 13, Chapter 15, para. 82). Another notable instance in which punctuations are used in the novel is the speech of the wind-up automaton orator in the court scene. Because they are wind-up automatons when one of them is not turned enough in the novel, it starts to slow down and the intervals between the words get longer. Webb (2018) illustrates these intervals in the text with long lines: “But—unless—he—can—make—up—his—mind to—undergo—...” (Chapter 28, para. 149). Thus, the customized speeches of the automaton and Cheops become a part of the heteroglossia in the novel.

A notable aspect of heteroglossia is that it operates as a centrifugal force in Bakhtin's dynamic linguistic model. Rather than presuming “[a] gap between language's dream of order and parole's necessary deviance,” Bakhtin (1981) offers an in-betweenness to explain the fluctuation in language: “alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification [of centripetal forces], the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification [of centrifugal forces] go forward” (Clarke & Holquist, 1984, p. 14; p. 272). In this tension between the centre and the periphery, the official language designated by “the educated elites” act as a centripetal force by marginalising

the ‘low’ speech types found in the street, in the marketplace ... [and] attempts to stamp a fixed order on these heteroglot languages, to introduce a canonical style to which the latter must submit in order to ... solidify the boundary between ‘legitimate’ and ‘illegitimate’ language use (Gardiner, 1992, p. 34)

However, Bakhtin attests that the official language's pursuit for centralisation is always encountered by the disunifying force of heteroglossia. Exhibiting the speech diversity of people, popular folk culture, and particularly the carnival tradition, plays a significant role as centrifugal forces.

In that vein, one can observe heteroglossia's operation as a centrifugal force in *The Mummy!* through the variety of accents and dialects of the characters. Firstly, the fact that Webb chooses to not write the words in their grammatically correct form to express the accents of the characters transgress the legitimate 'official' use of the language. The "carnavalesque discourse" of Webb's novel "breaks through the laws of a language censored by grammar and semantics" (Kristeva, 1980, p. 36). To illustrate, Father Murphy speaks with an accent in which he pronounces 'reason' as 'rason' and 'speech' as "spach" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 56). Many of his lines start with the expression "och" which is an idiosyncratic trait of him. Secondly, in the novel, a local man named Samuel speaks in broken English while explaining the events to the court in Anglo-Egypt: "I sits me down i' the vault, to wait for 'em, and I'd just rolled myself up, and was dozed asleep, when I hears such a noise" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 37). Considering that Egypt is a colony of England and America in the future of *The Mummy!*, Samuel's incorrect use of English reflects the historical fact that the language of colonizers is commonly taught as a second language in the colonies. While this 'civilizing mission' aligns with the centripetal forces in Bakhtin's discussion, Samuel's language can be read as an undoing of the structure of the official language of the colonizer.

Also, as the truest reflection of heteroglossia, the novel genre performs in the role of centrifugal force. Rooted in the carnivalized forms of literature, the novelistic discourse, in a Bakhtinian viewpoint, become almost synonymous with the carnivalesque discourse since both "are characterized by the inversion and undoing of hierarchical or centripetal discourses" (Dentith, 1995, p. 82). Whereas carnivalesque discourse unsettles the official law and language, the novel genre challenges canonical literature. As a result of this defiance, Clarke and Holquist (1984) entitle the novel as "a Robin Hood of texts":

Bakhtin assigns the term 'novel' to whatever form of expression within a given literary system reveals the limits of that system as inadequate, imposed, or arbitrary. ... the novel is fundamentally anticanonical ... [because] [i]t insists on a dialogue between texts that a given system admits as literature and those texts that are excluded from such a definition. (pp. 276-277)

The heteroglossia of the novelistic discourse allows the coexistence of a variety of speeches, including different literary forms and genres, as opposed to the completed 'official genres' with an explicit generic frame. Therefore, Bakhtin sees the novel as a force of novelness that defies canonization and discrowns the high literature.

Highlighting the anticanonical feature of the novel, *The Mummy!* enriches its heteroglossia through 'incorporated genres'. In *The Dialogic Imagination*, it is stated by Bakhtin (1981) that "incorporated genres" are "one of the most basic and fundamental forms for incorporating and organizing heteroglossia in the novel" (p. 321). According to Bakhtin, the novel's form is eligible to allow the incorporation of multiple other genres which carry their distinct languages into the novel causing a linguistic stratification (p. 321). In line with that, Webb incorporates several genres in the verse form into the novel. To exemplify, in the scene when Cheops is dressed as a minstrel who can tell the destinies of people, he starts to sing:

Give then your hand, fair lady! give,

And let the wandering minstrel live:

So shall he tell the varied fate

That may that lovely form await. (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 30, para. 35)

Moreover, Dr. Entwerfen reads a few texts from his collection in the library including the passages from an ancient ballad while Abelard recites a poem written by himself in an acromonogrammatic style. All these genres in the verse form multiply the stratification in the novel's heteroglossia.

Along with these verse forms, a variety of prose genres, such as science fiction, adventure, fantasy, gothic, satire, and romance, serve as stratifications in the heteroglossia of *The Mummy!*, as they all integrate their own stylistic and contextual features to the novel. As it is disclosed in the introduction of the thesis, the novel can thus be considered as experimentation, a bricolage of many genres overlapping and clashing without any lines separating them from each other. In that sense, the composition of the text of *The Mummy!* strongly recalls the grotesque. Firstly, the novel is one of the significant examples of early utopian science fiction written by women and therefore incorporates the conventions of utopias and sci-fi. It is also regarded as a work of 'fantasy' since the revival of Cheops is not achieved by means of science

(Alkon, 1987, p. 240); moreover, it is “a self-conscious variation on gothic and romance conventions” and a blend of “heroic romance with farcical satire” (p. 238). Moreover, the odyssey of characters all around the globe, and particularly the journey of Dr. Entwerfen and Edric, bring the features of adventure novel into *The Mummy!*. The heteroglossia that occurred by the melting of these multiple genres into each other in the novel resists canonization and makes it challenging to categorise the work.

Moreover, as it is unfolded in the introduction of the novel, the narrator’s aspirations for novelty manifests the anticanonical stance of *The Mummy!*. Conveying her intention to write a novel unlike any other, the narrator tells:

I could not bear any thing common-place, and I did not know what to do for a hero. Heroes are generally so much alike, so monotonous, so dreadfully insipid—so completely brothers of one race, with the family likeness so amazingly strong—“This will not do for me,” thought I... (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 1)

She does not want to write another tale of heroism involving an archetypal hero, which can be associated with the ones in the epics. The fact that she does not know how to write about such a hero emphasizes the lack of a tradition of woman writers in literature which is dominated by the male-centred canon¹². Recalling the invocation of the muses situated at the beginning of the epics, she seeks for a muse to write her novel: “[I] called wit to my assistance, but the malignant deity was deaf to my entreaty” (Introduction, para. 2). The silence of the muses further accentuates the exclusion of the women writers from the canonical literature. Given these, the narrator’s refusal to write anything similar to canonical works and her desire to write a ‘novel’ emphasizes the anticanonical attitude of the novel as a centrifugal force, from a Bakhtinian standpoint.¹³

Laughter is the other component Bakhtin discusses which paved the path for the double-voiced prose of the novelistic discourse. Here, by employing the word ‘laughter’

¹² Refer to *A Room of One’s Own* by Virginia Woolf. She explains the lack of a tradition of women writers in the history of literature which is male-centred. She further notes that the novel genre is the most suitable for women writers since they can shape its form which has not framed yet.

¹³ In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin divides all the genres of literature into two genres: epic and novel. He argues that the novel breaks down the world of the epic which is monologic due its representation of an absolute, complete, and inaccessible past. In contrast to the epic time, the novel presents the incomplete present for Bakhtin.

Bakhtin fundamentally refers to *parody*. In his discussion, he underlines the significance of ‘the word of the other’ in Middle Ages when “the boundary lines between someone else's speech and one's own speech were flexible, ambiguous, often deliberately distorted and confused” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 69). It had a lot to do with the popularity of parodic-travesty forms —such as *parodia sacra* that mocks and ‘degrades’ the sacred texts— which Bakhtin considers as “one of the most ancient ... forms for representing the direct word of another” (p. 51). Bakhtin explains that each type of parody is an “intentional hybrid” because “parodic discourse” comprises two languages: “the language being parodied ... and the language that parodies” (p. 75). Given that in the parodic discourse “two languages are crossed with each other, as well as two styles, two linguistic points of view, and ... two speaking subjects,” he also claims that parody contain in itself a dialogue between these voices and identifies parody as “an intentional dialogized hybrid” (p. 76). In Bakhtinian discourse, these forms of parody in Middle Ages entail the genesis of a double-voiced and double-languaged consciousness in literature which prepares the soil for the novelistic word.

One of the popular types of parodic-travesty literature Bakhtin mentions is the parody of literary genres. Bakhtin (1981) stresses the homelessness of “parodied genres [which] do not belong to the genres that they parody,” because they “[lack] a firm or definite generic skeleton” (p. 59). For instance, a parody of a fairy-tale cannot be considered precisely as a fairy-tale. Nevertheless, these parodies gather under a “common purpose: to provide the corrective of laughter and criticism to all existing straightforward genres, languages, styles, [and] voices” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 59). In this regard, Bakhtin resembles this unified whole of parodic-travesty forms to “an immense novel” that is “multi-styled, mercilessly critical, soberly mocking, reflecting in all its fullness the heteroglossia” of the epoch they belong (p. 60). In tandem with its double-voiced texture, these anticanonical and subversive features of parodic-travesty literature are inherited by the novelistic discourse.

Staging a gothic parody, *The Mummy!* embodies the double-voicedness of the parodic discourse in its carnivalized text. In his reading of *The Mummy!*, Alkon (1987) notes that the novel’s “mode is gothic horror, melodramatic enough to verge on self-parody” (p. 238). Indeed, the novel demonstrates a self-conscious parody of the Gothic since the novel both employs the traditional Gothic tropes, as epitomized in the novels of Horace Walpole and Ann Radcliffe, and simultaneously parodies them. *The Mummy!*

portrays many Gothic tropes such as the figure of the monster, crypt, sublime, maze, damsel in distress, mystery, madness, nightmares and so forth. Significantly, the climax of the novel is written in the Gothic mode and set in the sublime edifice of Cheops' pyramid with a detailed narration of its maze-like corridors and the crypt at its heart creating a gloomy atmosphere.

Two of the gothic elements parodied by the novel are the gothic monster and the damsel in distress. Without a doubt, the most outstanding gothic element of Webb's novel is the figure of the mummy, Cheops, whose mere presence inspires the addition of the exclamation mark to the title. Although he strikes terror with his dreadful spectacle, flaring eyes like those of a rattlesnake, and an unearthly voice, we later learn in the novel that all his actions —some of which are not the acts one expects from a gothic monster— were carried with a moral purpose to help the good and punish the ill-hearted. In this way, the figure of Webb's mummy becomes a parody of the canonical image of the gothic monster¹⁴. Besides the figure of the monster, the gothic element of the 'damsel in distress' is subverted in that Elvira, the fair princess who is trapped in the palace by the evil queen Rosabella, is saved by not a man, but by a courageous young heroine, Clara, and Cheops who are disguised as minstrels. Through the parody of the gothic element damsel in distress, the novel suggests a feminist critique, reflecting the critical feature of the parodic word, and offers a revision of the conventional images of women in gothic literature¹⁵.

The parodic double-voiced discourse of *The Mummy!* can also be analysed in the carnivalesque element of the comic doubles. Bakhtin (1981) bases the foundation of the comic doubles in the literature on "the literary and artistic consciousness of the Romans [who] could not imagine a serious form without its comic equivalent" (p. 58). Referring to the festivities of Saturnalia, which is one of the origins of the carnival tradition, he states that in the time of the Romans, "[e]verything serious had to have ... its comic double ... [a]s in the Saturnalia [during which] the clown [becomes] the double of the ruler and the slave the double of the master" (p. 58). We see the same element of the double transposed to the carnivals of the Middle Age in the elections of mock kings and queens.

¹⁴ See Chapter Two for a detailed analysis of Cheops and the parody of the normative monster.

¹⁵ See Chapter Three for the discussion on the feminist critique presented in *The Mummy!*.

Analogous to the comic doubles of the carnival, some of the character pairs in *The Mummy!* reflect their counterpart as if a carnival mirror is placed in between them; they stand as the inverted and distorted reflection of the other double. Edmund and Edric, as previously mentioned, have their own individual characteristics which are juxtaposed in the novel. These doubles can be argued to symbolise the mind-body dualism, as Edmund aspires for heroic achievements while Edric is interested in the condition of the soul in the afterlife. Another pair of doubles are Elvira and Rosabella; Elvira's angelic disposition, fairness, and the inability for passionate feelings contradict Rosabella's intense desire for Edmund, excessive arrogance, and grotesque portrayal. Likewise, the attendants of Elvira and Rosabella and the confessors in their houses, Father Morris and Father Murphy, exemplify the comic doubles which are the reversed images of each other. Not only characters but also places also contribute to the comic doubles in the novel such as the court scenes in England and in Anglo-Egypt, which are analysed in the third chapter.

1.4. Intertextuality and Metafiction in *The Mummy!*

Thus far, I employed a terminology peculiar to Bakhtinian discourse, such as dialogism, polyphony, polyglossia, heteroglossia, and parody—to unravel the double, myriad, disruptive, and anticanonical nature of the carnivalized text of *The Mummy!*. In this last part, I will concentrate on *intertextuality* and *metafiction* as further carnivalizing elements of the textual fabric of *The Mummy!* by weaving a thread from the previously mentioned Bakhtinian concepts. To start with intertextuality, it can be read as a postmodern variation of Bakhtin's dialogism. Building on Bakhtin's dialogism, which accentuates that meaning is always dependent on the extra-verbal *context* and embedded with socio-cultural *subtexts*, Kristeva (1980) underlines,

[Bakhtin's] conception of the 'literary word' as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context. (p. 65)

She concludes that "Bakhtinian dialogism identifies writing as ... intertextuality." (p. 68). In the same vein that the words are always bounded to the other words to acquire

meaning, i.e., *différance*¹⁶, Kristevan intertextuality indicates that the literary texts are always intertwined with the other texts in literature and the socio-cultural textuality within which they are produced. For Kristeva (1980), the author produces the text by the means of a pre-existing discourse¹⁷, through another's word: "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (p. 66). That being the case, intertextuality defines the texture of the language of the carnival, which is seen by Kristeva as "as a space where texts meet, contradict, and relativize each other through extensive use of repetition, illogical constructions and non-exclusive opposition" (Moi, 1986, p. 34).

Beyond a doubt, the primary intertextual reference of *The Mummy!* is Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* which serves as its hypotext. Starting with the epigraphs, *The Mummy!* involves a constant engagement with Shelley's novel. In the title page of *Frankenstein*, Shelley (2011) quotes from John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, from the scene after the fall when Adam ponders on his own creation: "Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay / To mould me man, Did I solicit thee / From darkness to promote me?" (p. 17). Drawing an analogy, in the title page of *The Mummy!* we read these lines taken from the Old Testament: "Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" (Webb-Loudon, 2018). Pointing out the fact that epigraphs add another layer to the intertextuality between the novels, the same theme can be observed in both. It is also possible to identify *The Mummy!* as a response to the statement in *Frankenstein* that "[a] mummy again endued with animation could not be so hideous as that wretch [Frankenstein's monster]" (Shelley, 2011, p. 42). Partially proving this allegation, the mummy of Cheops stands as a parody of normative monster as it will be further discussed along with Shelley's *Frankenstein*.

Inspiring the readers to recall the past literary works, the narrator's 'writing about writing' in the introduction of *The Mummy!* brings about a self-conscious

¹⁶ The concept of *différance* is coined by Jacques Derrida, Algerian-born French philosopher who was among the thinkers that contributed to the poststructuralist wave in France together with Kristeva, Barthes, Foucault, and Althusser. Derrida defines the endless process of referral and deferral of the signifier as *différance*. In this respect, he shares the same train of thought with Bakhtin since both rejects the existence of an "ultimate word," a transcendental signified. Although his writings on *différance* had not been published yet when Kristeva wrote her essay, in line with intertextuality, his concept reveals the inter-woven condition of the words in the web of signifiers.

¹⁷ In this regard, intertextuality is closely related to the concept of *bricolage* which is formulated by Claude Levi Strauss in *The Savage Mind* (1962) within the context of structuralism, and criticized by Derrida later in "Structure, Sign, and Play" (1970). In the simplest terms, *bricolage* refers to constructing something new by using the means at hand.

intertextuality. As it is unfolded at the beginning of the present chapter, the narrator of *The Mummy!* starts her narration by telling how she came to write this novel and the novelness she longs to achieve by not creating yet another monotonous heroic story. “She challenges readers to applaud her artistry as a teller of tales,” as Alkon (1987) puts it (p. 233). By doing so, she invites the reader to an involuntary comparison between her novel and the literary works of the past highlighting the concept of intertextuality. The readers find themselves pondering upon the heroes they encountered in the other works of literature and weaving threads between the texts. Remarkably, as an answer to her call, a spirit gives her “the Chronicle of a future age” and tells: “Weave it into a story” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 6). The fact that the present novel is weaved out of the threads that belong to the chronicle, another text, greatly enhances the novel’s intertextuality.

Furthermore, when the spirit gives the narrator the scroll of the future, he says that no matter how peculiar the future may seem, there is still so much to connect to the present because human nature remains the same through the ages:

the same passions were delineated, the same weaknesses ridiculed [for ages], by Aristophanes, Plautus, and Terence, as in after-times were described by Shakspeare [sic] and Moliere; and as they will be in the times of which you are to write,—by authors yet unknown. (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Introduction, para. 7)

His words recall to Cassius’ lines in Shakespeare’s (2009) *Julius Caesar*, uttered after they stabbed Caesar to death together with other plotters: “How / many ages hence / Shall this our lofty scene be acted over / In states unborn and accents yet unknown!” (3.1.112-115). Envisioning their deed’s enactment on stage in the future, the lines self-consciously refer to Shakespeare’s play itself and lead to an intertextual awareness. Also, the intertextual link between the historical event and its enactment in theatre is stressed. Along with that, while being an example of intertextuality itself as explained, the words of the spirit in Webb’s novel illustrate the intertextuality in literature by weaving an everlasting thread among the literary works of the past, the present, and the future. Significantly, through these references, Webb legitimizes her novel by placing it beside the acclaimed playwrights of comedy in history who are all well-known by their universal portrayals of the human condition.

Foreshadowed in the introduction, we can come across literary allusions to Shakespeare spread throughout the novel. To give an example, the character names Duke of Cornwall, Edmund, and Edgar allude to Shakespeare's *Lear* followed with the duke's madness and the contest between the two princesses for the throne. By the same token, Dr. Entwerfen's statement that they will make the mummies "reveal the secrets of their prison-house" recall the lines of the ghost in Shakespeare's (2012) *Hamlet*: "I am forbid / To tell the secrets of my prison house" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 43; 1.5.18-19). Moreover, one can trace the same allusion to Lethe in terms of forgetfulness and memory both in the words of Abelard and the ghost in *Hamlet*. As aforementioned, Abelard promises his master that even the whole Lethe cannot wash away what his master told him from his memory. Likewise, the ghost tells Hamlet that "... duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed / That roots itself in ease on Lethe wharf, / Wouldst thou not stir in this" implying that he would not be different than a weed growing in Lethe if he does not take action to revenge (1.5.39-41). Finally, the cross-dressings of Zoe, Cheops, and Clara allude to Shakespeare's comedy plays that stages this motif, such as *Twelfth Night*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *As You Like It*.

Along with the literary allusions, historical allusions and parody multiply the intersecting texts in *The Mummy!*. To illustrate, in the line "the French princess, who, hearing that some persons had died of hunger, wondered at their folly, and said that for her part, rather than be famished, she would eat bread and cheese" the novel parodically alludes to Marie Antoinette, a famous figure of French Revolution which set the atmosphere for Romanticism in England and consequently had a decisive role in the social and cultural ideological fabric of Webb's era (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 5, para. 41). Moreover, the fictional disappearance of Cheops from his tomb in the novel overlaps with the historical text of the news announcing that the "sarcophagus in the great pyramid of Cheops ... [is found] empty" during the explorations of his pyramid (Rauch, 2001, p. 64). Besides, performing in the function of an intertextual device, the parodic stance of the novel intensifies the intertextuality through its double-language, the one that is parodied and the one that parodies. For instance, gothic parody incorporates the texts of the preceding gothic novels into *The Mummy!*, as Alkon (1987) stresses, "invit[ing] [a] comparison between Webb's book and the works of Ann Radcliffe and other Gothic novelists" (p. 239).

Lastly, metafiction can be proposed as a carnivalizing form in literature. Hutcheon (1980) defines metafiction as “fiction about fiction-that is, fiction that includes within itself a commentary on its own narrative and/or linguistic identity” (p. 1). In a metafictional narration, the boundaries between life and art, reality and fiction, and writer and reader are questioned and blurred as in the case with the carnival. In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin (1984b) elucidates that carnival “belongs to the borderline between art and life” because although it is a spectacle, a drama acted out by everyone, it does not have a stage nor an audience (p. 7). The carnival square ambivalently becomes both a stage and the life itself. In other words, “carnival does not know footlights, ... [or] any distinction between actors and spectators” (p. 7). Weaving an analogy between carnival and metafiction, Linda Hutcheon (1983) explains: “metafiction exists - as does the carnival - on the boundary between art and life, denying frames and footlights, making ... little or no formal distinction between actor and spectator, that is, between writer and reader” (p. 85). Hence, the metafictional narration of *The Mummy!* can be read as a carnivalizing element of the novel’s text.

In *The Mummy!: A Tale of the Twenty-Second Century*, the instances of metafiction can be observed from the title onwards. Informing that what they are about to read is first and foremost a ‘tale’, the fictionality of the novel is emphasized for the readers in the title. Immediately afterwards, in the introduction, the equivocal voice of the narrator-author establishes the metafictional frame of *The Mummy!* by conveying her aspirations of literary novelty and unfolding the creation of her present novel. When the narrator starts telling the novel, she adopts the role of the ‘intrusive author’ which “transforms the act of writing into a kind of speaking, a direct yet intimate address to the reader, inviting us ‘over the threshold’ of the novel” (Lodge, 1993, p. 10). For instance, the narrator comments on Sir Ambrose’s foible by saying “for alas! where shall we find character without one” influencing the reader to think about the traits of the characters both in the present story and the others (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 5). Moreover, after indicating Elvira’s insensibility to love, the narrator writes “why she was so, we leave to philosophers to explain; we merely state facts and leave others to draw conclusions” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 3, para. 35). Similarly, the narrator hopes that the reader of her novel will have good intentions and interpret the characters’ actions in the best way possible (p. 78). Besides evoking a metafictional awareness, her statements also pose critical questions on the nature of writing: ‘What

is the role of the author, the reader, and the critic?’ and ‘what kind of a relationship do they have?’.

Metafictional self-awareness of the novel is manifested also in the library scene through references to the literary past. Browsing his collection of ancient books, Dr. Entwerfen names a few ballads such as “‘Tragical end of poor Miss Bailey’” which refers to the early 19th-century ballad “‘Unfortunate Miss Bailey’” and “‘The loves of Captain Wattle and Miss Roe’” referring to the original 1828 ballad (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 6, para. 77). He also finds “a tailor's bill of the immortal Byron” and a paper on which “half the word ‘Waverley’” is written alluding to Sir Walter Scott (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 6, para. 102). Along with the temporal estrangement that is created due to the use of the adjective ‘ancient’ for the literary works published in Webb’s time, the references to these literary works and personas in real life strengthen the metafictional form, and consequently the carnivalesque text of the novel.

As a final remark, it should be pointed out that most of the elements of metafiction in the novel also reveal a parodic attitude. To give an example, in a manner that is unexpected from a narrator, the narrator does not tell the journey of Sir Ambrose and the duke because there is nothing significant to tell: “The journey ... had nothing in it to distinguish it from hundreds of other journeys, and they did not meet with a single adventure worthy of being recorded” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 1). Following that, when the duke’s house in the city turns out to be next to his friend Sir Ambrose’s brother’s house, the narrator explains, “[i]t happened by one of those singular coincidences in real life, which would be called improbable in a novel” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 2). Here, one can elicit the parodical stance which satirizes the trait of novels narrating coincidences that are likely impossible in real life, reversing the fact that in fiction everything is possible.

In conclusion, the present chapter explored the ambivalent, boundless, and disruptive nature of the carnivalized text of *The Mummy!* through a Bakhtinian reading, from the theoretical framework provided by concepts, such as dialogism, polyphony, polyglossia, and heteroglossia. *The Mummy!*’s polyphonic composition is revealed in the representation of the characters in the novel as unfinalizable consciousnesses, in the spatial and temporal layers, and in the theme of masks which is also emphasised as a component of carnivalesque folklore. The chapter also touched upon the connection

between the carnival and the novelistic discourse through explaining the carnivalesque roots of the development of the novel genre and unfolding Bakhtin's synonymous employment of the carnival and 'novelness' as disruptive and anticanonical centrifugal forces of language. In Bakhtin's discussion on the novelistic discourse, one of the two main factors that paved the way for the emergence of the novel, heteroglossia, is analysed through the diversity of speeches and incorporated genres in the novel. Parody, the other factor, is explored in *The Mummy!* through the instruments of genre parody and comic doubles. Finally, intertextuality and metafiction are discussed as carnivalesque elements of *The Mummy!*'s text.



CHAPTER 2

A GOTHIC MONSTER IN THE CARNIVAL: THE MUMMY OF CHEOPS

This chapter will discuss the mummy of Cheops as a carnivalesque monster. By doing so, this chapter also aims to contribute to defining the place of Jane Webb's Cheops among the monsters of literature. The discussion will take place in three different sections: the genesis of the Mummy, the grotesque-abject body of the monster, and the laughing devil of the romantic grotesque. Starting *ab ovo*, the first section concentrates on Cheop's genesis story that bears the theme of Faustian transgression, which reveals a *double-voiced*¹⁸ text between *The Mummy!* and *Frankenstein*, and carnivalesque-menippean motifs in the philosophical questionings which leads to the Mummy's resurrection. Employing Kristeva's theory of abjection, the second chapter will investigate how Cheops, as an abject figure, subverts the conventional image of the gothic monster as the abject other. Weaving a thread between the abject and Bakhtinian grotesque as a celebratory manifestation of the abject, the chapter will examine the grotesque body of the mummy of Cheops. Finally, the devil figure and the laughter of Cheops will be unravelled in relation to the Romantic grotesque.

2.1. The Genesis of the Mummy

Precedent to the apparition of the Mummy as a transgression of natural laws, another transgression takes place in the novel: the one between 'human' and 'god'. Edric Montagu, who has been dreaming of communicating with the dead, decides to reanimate a corpse to test his hypotheses about the condition of the soul in the afterlife. Together with Dr Entwerfen, he concludes that a mummy that is long entombed and well-preserved would be an ideal subject to perform this experiment and brings Cheops back to life. His transgressive actions violate the natural order, in which the dead must remain dead, and the human limits, which do not include the ability to give life. By doing so, Edric exhibits Faustian overreaching which is personified by Doctor Faustus who desires to obtain godlike knowledge and practice necromancy, the black magic that is particularly used for reanimating dead people. The trope of Faustian overreaching serves as the main intertextual confluence between *The Mummy!* and Mary Shelley's

¹⁸ In Bakhtinian discourse, a double-voiced text refer to the interplay of different voices within a single text, a concept that is closely related to what Kristeva argues as intertextuality from which it differs as Bakhtin uses the term 'double-voiced' also to refer parody. See Chapter One for double-voicedness, parody, and intertextuality.

*Frankenstein*¹⁹. Edric Montagu mirrors Victor Frankenstein creating a double-voiced text underneath the origins of the mummy of Cheops.

In the expressions about his yearning for divine knowledge, it can be seen that Edric follows a train of thought which is analogous to that of Victor in *Frankenstein*. He is described in the novel as the ‘romantic’ brother who is interested in nature rather than glory of war. In Webb’s (2018) novel, Edric states that “[n]ature is the goddess I adore” and he would be the happiest man on earth if he were to “explore her secrets” (Chapter 4, para. 30). Instead of exploring something anew in nature, Edric constantly refers to nature as something with secrets that are kept hidden from his view and that inflames his curiosity about the nature. His words echoes the words of Victor who, as Shelley (2012a) writes, expresses that discovering “the hidden laws of nature ... are among the earliest sensations [he] can remember” (p. 320). Thereby, a pastiche on a minor scale can be seen both in their perception of nature as something with secrets that are to be discovered and in their attribution of their passion for nature as a defining trait of who they are.

The analogy can be further seen in Edric’s aspirations to be god-like and in his Edenic references. In Webb’s (2018) novel, Edric thinks to himself that when nature reveals “her treasures to his view ... he would become great, omniscient, and god-like” (Chapter 4, para. 76). Echoing the longings of Edric, Victor Frankenstein hopes that “a new species would bless [him] as its creator and source” (Shelley, 2012a, p. 80). Both of them desire to displace god and exceed their human condition by re-ordering the hierarchy between the creator and the creature. Their defiance of the laws of God is further suggested in biblical allusions. To illustrate, when Edric leaves the house of his father, he finds himself ready to engage in his desires without any obstacles and take a bite from the “fruit of the tree of knowledge” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 4, para. 76). Along with the reference to the forbidden fruit on the tree of knowledge in Eden, Edric utters these words at the moment he is free from the restraints of his ‘father’, the title given to God. The same allusion to the forbidden fruit also comes forth in Shelley’s (2012a) novel; after the creation of the monster, Victor realizes that his “paradisiacal dreams” are now lost since “the apple was already eaten” (p. 192). The stress on the

¹⁹ The quotes from Mary Shelley’s (2012a) *Frankenstein* in this chapter are taken from Broadview Press’ version of *Frankenstein* which is based on the 1818 first edition of the novel as the copytext.

lost paradise recalls the fall from Eden after eating the forbidden fruit and weaves an intertextual link to the biblical allusions in *The Mummy!*.

Edric's nightmare in *The Mummy!* further enhances the double-voiced text as his visions present another version of the scenes in which Victor examines corpses in the churchyard in *Frankenstein*. To inspect the transformation of the body following death, Victor says that he spends days in charnel houses witnessing how "death succeed to the blooming cheek of life" and the invasion of the brains and eyes of bodies by the worms (Shelley, 2012a, p. 78). The scenes present the grotesque imagery of the corruption of the bodies and the transition between life and death as the lifeless bodies now become a source of life for other creatures. Victor says that his examination is interrupted when "a sudden light [breaks] in upon [him]" (Shelley, 2012a, p. 79). The same appearance marks the dream of Edric, which presents an analogous yet fantastic -considering the nature of dreams- version of Victor's experience: "Suddenly, a fearful light flashed upon me, and I saw at my feet a horrid charnel house, where the dying mingled terrifically with the dead. ... I saw their eye-balls roll in agony" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 30). Hence, both scenes display the same aspects that are the setting, the sudden apparition of light, and the grotesque imagery which pictures the transition from life to death and the distorted parts of the body with an emphasis on eyes.

Inasmuch as Edric and Victor seem like literary doppelgangers until this point, two main points distinguish them from each other: their contrastive storylines after the creation/reanimation of the monsters and their ultimate purposes. To expand upon the former one, after the monsters come alive, Edric and Victor continue on dissimilar paths in their novels. In Shelley's story, the existence of Frankenstein's monster transforms Victor's life into a nightmare in which he is haunted by the monster wherever he goes as if they are tied to each other by invisible threads. His loved ones die at the hands of his creature. Given this tragical sequence of events in *Frankenstein*, the second thoughts that Edric Montagu has at the entrance of the pyramid in *The Mummy!* can be read as a reminder of the fate of Victor to Webb's contemporary audience. "[T]rembled at the consequences ... of his desires," Edric doubts the possible outcomes of his intentions: "May I not revive a creature whose wickedness may involve mankind in misery?" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 35). Yet, this does not stop him. After the reanimation, Edric Montagu is put into a prison in Anglo-Egypt to be tried for

blasphemy, and shortly after, he escapes. His relationship with Cheops, on the other hand, is quite different since they both go on separate ways. Not until their dialogue at the very end of the novel, Edric mentions or sees the Mummy. In their dialogue, in discordance with Victor's conversation with the monster who utters threats, Cheops preaches about life and offers life advice to Edric. Therefore, both the journey of the monsters and their relationships with their creators/animations evolve in contrasting patterns.

The latter point of divergence between Victor Frankenstein and Edric Montagu lies in their ultimate purposes in the novels. In Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, it can be observed that the original concern of Victor was contributing to the progress of science by discovering the secrets of life and death at the beginning. However, his purpose to serve humankind is diverted into a desire to create species that would praise him as their creator. Redefined by his hubris, his ultimate goal becomes to be godlike by conceiving artificial life. It takes long 'midnight labours' for Victor to find out how to animate matter, a method that is not explicitly told by Victor in the novel in case it can be attempted by another. On the other hand, animating a corpse is not a concern for Edric in the 22nd century of Webb's (2018) novel since Dr Entwerfen's "galvanic battery of fifty surgeon power ... is surely enough to re-animate the dead" as the narrator informs the reader (Chapter 2, para. 27). Reviving a mummy is a tool for Edric, not his ultimate goal that is to learn the state of the soul after death.

Having noted these differences, Edric's fundamental purpose requires to be examined in more detail as it incorporates key philosophical issues within the genesis narrative of the Mummy. Prior to the idea of resuscitation of a mummy, Edric and the doctor hold conversations on the nature of the soul and its connection with the body. One of Edric's hypotheses is that there are two kinds of souls: "The one ... which gives it life and motion, and which we share in common with brutes, and even vegetables; and the other, the divine ethereal spirit, ... which is a direct emanation from God himself, only bestowed upon man" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 32). His hypothesis resonates with the arguments in ancient philosophy about the nature of the human soul. To refer to the related discussions in ancient philosophy, some of the philosophers of Ancient Greece such as Empedocles and Pythagoras thought that plants can possess souls, as in the first kind of soul in Edric's hypothesis (Lorenz, 2020). Also, Edric's division between different kinds of the soul can be traced in the writings of Plato

who proposes a tripartite soul theory in *Republic*, and Aristotle, who in *On the Soul* comes up with three types of souls: at the lowest, the one which belongs to all living things including plants, the second one which belongs to animals and humans, and finally the one which is exclusive to humans (Peters and Mace, 2006). Therefore, similar patterns can be found in the proposals of Edric Montagu in the novel and Aristotle, since both argue a type of soul exists both in animals and plants and an exclusive type of soul that exists only in humans.

In addition, Edric concerns himself with the particular condition of the soul in the case of death. He wonders whether the soul is “chained after death to its earthly covering of clay ... till the day of final resurrection” or freed from the body to float in the air (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 24). Through this query of Edric, the novel brings out another issue of ancient philosophy, that is the afterlife of the soul, which can be traced back to Plato. In the dialogues in *Plato: Meno and Phaedo* about the persistency of the soul after death, Socrates, i.e., the character, concludes that “is immortal and has been born many times, and has seen both what is here and what is in Hades” (Plato, 2011). Furthermore, to guide Edric, Father Morris explains to Edric that Ancient Egyptians practised the tradition of burying the dead through mummification because they believed that “the souls of their dead [do not remain] in the bodies, but [nevertheless] ... would return to them” years later (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 6, para. 21). Hence, it should also be highlighted that the inclusion of the traditions and beliefs of distant cultures contributes to the polyphony of the philosophical discussion on the soul.

All these philosophical discussions and the quest of Edric Montagu in search for an answer incorporate carnivalesque-menippean characteristics into *The Mummy!*. As mentioned in the former chapter, according to Bakhtin (1984a), the carnivalesque novel emerged from the realm of the serio-comical in which Menippean satire, or the *menippea* in short, comes to the forefront as a carnivalised genre (p. 109). In *Problems of Dostoyevski's Poetics*, Bakhtin (1984a) underlines that Menippean satire's “[t]he most important characteristic ... is the fact that its bold and unrestrained use of the fantastic and adventure is ... devoted to a purely ideational and philosophical end: the creation of extraordinary situations for ... testing of a philosophical idea ... embodied in the image of a wise man, the seeker of this truth” (p. 115). In *The Mummy!*, the extreme use of fantastic can be exemplified in Cheop's revival, which turns out as a

supernatural event. Adventure, on the other hand, takes place on a global scale in the novel by various means such as the transcontinental journey on a balloon. Its diverse setting emphasizes menippea's "capacity to contemplate the world on the broadest possible scale" (Bakhtin, 1984a, p. 116). Identical to Menippean satire, this fantastic and adventurous narrative of Webb's novel aims to 'test a philosophical idea', i.e., to investigate the nature of the soul as explained above, through reviving a mummy, therefore by creating an 'extraordinary situation'. Hence, Webb's novel portrays all of the characteristics stated in Bakhtin's definition of the menippea, strengthening the carnivalesque narrative.

When it comes to the result of the experiment, the novel does not present a clear answer but a warning. In their first and last conversation, Cheops warns Edric not to seek the mysteries that must remain unknown to humans (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 115). Through the advice of Cheops, the novel condemns Faustian transgression and poses a moral lesson. In response to Edric's question that whether it was "a human power" that brought him back to life, the Mummy lets him know that "[t]he power that gave [him] life could alone restore it" without further detail on what is that power (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 117). In *The Mummy!*, the resolution yields to the unexplained supernatural. With that context, the novel continues to display carnivalistic-menippean characteristics. According to Bakhtin (1984a), "[c]arnivalistic thought ... gives [the posed questions] no abstractly philosophical or religiously dogmatic resolution; it plays them out in the concretely sensuous form of carnivalistic acts and images" (p. 134). In the same vein, Webb does not present a clear resolution but plays with the idea of resuscitating a mummy in the 22nd century by turning it into a framework for the the carnivalesque narrative. Instead of providing a definite answer, an ultimate word which would be *monologic*, the novel enacts a series of *dialogues* held with the Mummy and therefore presents a dialogic resolution. These conversations can also be argued to reflect the heritage of the menippea since Bakhtin (1984a) records that from the menippea "was born that special genre of 'dialogues of the dead'," one of the variants under which menippea continues to develop (p. 116). Hence, carnivalesque-menippean elements play a significant role in the characterisation of the Mummy.

2.2. The Grotesque-Object Body of the Monster

Monsters are creatures of transgression, and the mummy of Cheops in Jane Webb's novel is first and foremost an embodiment of transgression. Being a walking dead, the mummy of Cheops transgresses the natural laws and denies a definition neither as dead nor alive in the strictest sense of the word, rather, he is simultaneously both. The ambiguity that comes along with the violation of binary thinking that assigns the boundaries of language, makes it challenging to comprehend a monster, which leads to a crisis in categorisation (Cohen, 1996, p. 6). Timothy Beal (2002) explains that due to this liminality of monsters, we find ourselves giving a mixed response towards them: "monsters bring on a limit experience ... drawn toward and repulsed by a monstrum tremendum. The monstrous is an embodiment of overwhelming and chaotic excess, a too-muchness that brings on a vertigo-like sense of fear and desire" (p. 195). While the monsters evoke repulsion as we fear the unknown, they are also appealing to us since their exemption from borders feeds our "escapist fantasies" by offering "a temporary egress from constraint" (Cohen, 1996, p. 17). We find ourselves in awe, reflecting the duality of monsters in the responses given towards them.

In *The Mummy!*, the mixed response arising fear and appeal towards monsters can be observed in the responses projected towards Cheops. Early in the novel, Edric refers to his mixed feelings towards the idea of reviving a dead body: "Is it not strange," he says, "that the mind should crave so earnestly what the body shudders at" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 2, para. 32). What he describes perfectly resonates with what Beal refers to as monstrum tremendum, the sense of awe one feels upon encountering a monster. The same equivocal feeling gets hold of Edric again in the pyramid, as he gets closer to the tomb of the Mummy. He finds himself in "a strange, mysterious thrilling of anxiety, mingled with a wild, undefinable delight" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 49). Moreover, it can be seen that the fear of the unknown dominates the country when the Mummy arrives to England since "all dreaded they knew not what" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 9). However, those who fear also are attracted by the Mummy who "excite[s] a deep and powerful interest in the minds of all who conversed with him, whilst his appalling laugh struck terror to the firmest breast" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 20).

While Beal studies the double-edged reaction to monsters' liminality under monster tremendum, Julia Kristeva elucidates this simultaneous attraction and repulsion to the breakdown in meaning by what she terms abjection. In *Powers of Horror*, she explains that we tend to cast out whatever threatens to disrupt our linguistic boundaries by registering it as abject since the language fails to protect the distinctions between self-other, and subject-object. Kristeva (1982) writes that abject is not "a definable object ... not an ob-ject facing me, which I name or imagine" (p. 1). Given the co-dependence of binaries to define themselves, she questions how can the other side of the binary, subject, exist in an encounter with abject that is non-object: "How can I be without border?" (Kristeva, 1982, p. 4). In that way, an encounter with abject poses a threat to the integrity of the symbolic realm, in which our sense of a coherent identity and perception of reality are structured by the borders of language. Due to its noncompliance with the symbolic laws, abject is associated with what Kristeva names semiotic chora, the archaic and primal space that we are separated from after the acquisition of language. She explains that abject resurfaces all the feelings experienced in the semiotic chora. This is why we are also tempted by abject because it "both threaten[s] to reengulf us and promise[s] to return us to our primal origins," to the pre-lingual era in which we were not monitored by the symbolic law (Hogel, 2002, p. 7).

Being creatures of liminality, monsters have been delineated by many scholars as abject figures in literature²⁰. In "The Gothic Ghost of the Counterfeit", Hogle (2012) focuses on the gothic monsters as 'monstrous abject figures' and writes that "[t]he Gothic ... depicts and enacts [the] very processes of abjection, where fundamental interactions of contrary states and categories are cast off into antiquated and 'othered' beings, particularly in *Frankenstein*, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, *Dracula*, and *The Phantom of the Opera*" (p. 499). Inasmuch as Jane Webb's novel employs the traditional Gothic tropes, it is a parody of the Gothic, which makes it different from the novels mentioned by Hogle and ultimately influences the role of Cheops as a gothic monster. Hence, an examination of the process of abjection for Cheops in *The Mummy!* would be instrumental in defining Cheops' as a monster and also reveal how Webb's gothic parody alters the conventional role of the gothic monster in comparison to the canonical monsters of the Gothic.

²⁰ Refer to J. E. Hogle (2012), J. J. Cohen (1996), and Weinstock (2014).

To begin with the abject qualities of the mummy of Cheops, it can be seen that he is an example of what Kristeva names ‘utmost abject’ which is the cadaver. In *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva (1982) writes that “[t]he corpse, seen without God and outside of science, is the utmost of abjection. It is death infecting life. Abject” (p. 4). While the corpse unsettles the distinction between subject and object, the mummy of Cheops further causes a collapse in the meaning as a cadaver that is brought back to life by exceeding the boundary between dead and alive, and between animate and inanimate. In that sense, he shares a similarity with Frankenstein’s monster, which is made of several corpses who are reanimated, and Dracula who is an undead corpse.

Another abject aspect of Cheops is his grotesque appearance which blurs the limit between humans and animals. He is described as “a tall majestic figure ... [whose] strongly marked features, aided by the fearful lustre of his piercing eyes, gave to his figure ... a supernatural grandeur” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 24). The size of his body is described as inhuman similar to Frankenstein’s monster that has a “gigantic stature” (Shelley, 2012a, p. 99). Also, the contrast in the face of Cheops, namely “dark eyebrows, the thick raven hair which hung upon the forehead, and the snow-white teeth” generates a grotesque combination (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 61). Enhancing the grotesque, some of his features such as the ‘raven hair’ and the blazing eyes which looks like “those of the rattle-snake” are likened to animals (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 61). Notably, Cheops’ seemingly red eyes which are likened to flames, and his snow-white teeth can be regarded as vampire-like features that can be observed in Stoker’s (1983) vampire Dracula who is also pictured with “a pair of very bright eyes, which seemed red in the lamplight” and teeth “as white as ivory” (p. 10). In addition, similar to Frankenstein and Dracula who are considered as sublime creatures, all of these features in the Mummy’s appearance that transcends the limits of the natural boundries disclose the Gothic trope of *sublime*²¹ in the

²¹ Sublime is a limit experience in which feelings of fear and fascination simultaneously arise in confronting something that transcends the ordinary or natural boundaries of human comprehension. Longinus (1971) defines the sublime as “an elevation of the mind arising from the contemplation of what is great, whether in art, nature, or literature” (p. 176). This sublime greatness is interpreted by Burke (1990) with regard to the feeling of “astonishment ... with some degree of horror” (p. 53). In a similar way, Kant argues that the sublime is not “an unalloyed pleasure,” which is risen in the judgement of beauty, but a kind of complex pleasure mixed with “respect,” which is felt in the face of something immeasurable and beyond our limits of comprehension (Kant & Guyer, 2000, p. xxxi). Finally, Lyotard (1994) points out the crisis in judgement in the face of the sublime “for what is felt in the sublime is not the proper proportion in the free play of the two faculties [imagination and reason] ...” but an “abyss” in between them (p. 24). As it can be seen, all of these explanations demonstrate an

characterisation of the Mummy. The sense of awe that is discussed as a result of double-sided edged reaction to the Mummy also strengthens this trope in the novel. Furthermore, it enhances the abject quality of Cheops since Kristeva argues that “[t]he abject and the sublime are two sides of the same coin” since both evoke the feeling of awe.

The crimes committed by the mummy of Cheops in his past life constitute him as an abject figure as well. On the sarcophagus of Cheops, it is revealed that there are carved figures: “A youthful warrior is bearing off a beautiful woman in his arms, whilst an old man laments bitterly in the distance” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 106). When he is asked to tell the story behind it, he says that he was the warrior who was in love with the woman whose name was Arsinoë, and he “tore her from the arms of her father by force,” which leads to her death (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 107). Then, he confesses that the woman was his sister, and the old man was his father. In other words, Cheops committed parricide by killing his own father and attempting an incest relationship with his sister. According to Kristeva (1982), “[a]ny crime, because it draws attention to the fragility of the law, is abject,” and incest prohibition, which the infant accepts by abjecting the mother’s body, is a fundamental law to be a member of the symbolic (p. 4). Therefore, Cheops turns himself into an abject figure by violating these laws, echoing the criminal cases²² of Frankenstein’s monster, Dracula, and Mr Hyde in gothic literature.

The Mummy’s infectious laughter further delineates him as the abject in *The Mummy!*. In the novel, those who are exposed to the laughter of Cheops continue to hear it long after he is gone out of sight. To give an example, it is told that “[n]othing ... had terrified Mrs. Montagu so much as the laugh of Cheops; ... it still seemed to ring in her ears, like the yell of a demon” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 43). The same terror is experienced by Father Morris who tells Marianne how his “blood froze in [his] veins at his horrid laugh, which seemed to ring in [his] ears like the mockery of fiends...” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 13, para. 95). In that sense, it can

affinity with the pre-mentioned reactions given by the people that confront the Mummy, who defies the boundaries of human comprehension by being an otherworldly and supernatural monster figure.

²² In Shelley *Frankenstein*, the monster kills the younger brother of Victor Frankenstein, Henry Clerval, and Elizabeth Lavenza. In Stoker’s novel, Dracula kills his victims by draining their blood, an act which might lead to the transformation to a vampire after death as in the case of Lucy Westenra. In *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, the evil Mr Hyde murders an old man named Sir Danvers Carew on the street.

be observed that his laughter causes a kind of mental disturbance once people are contaminated by it. Infections and diseases, states Kristeva (1982), “stand for the danger to identity that comes from without: ... society threatened by its outside, life by death,” therefore, they invoke abjection (p. 71). By the same token, leading to a mental disturbance, the laughter of Cheops represents Kristevan abject.

Whereas the mummy of Cheops possesses the abject attributes of a gothic monster, he is neither abjected by society nor becomes an outcast as in the cases of canonical gothic monsters. In line with the process of abjection, monsters are kept outside the symbolic order to protect the social/linguistic codes. Societies cast away the monsters as the ‘other’ in order to reclaim their position as ‘self’ and turn them into ‘objects’ to which they can project what they do not want to accept as a part of themselves as ‘subjects’. This process can be observed in the novels mentioned by Hogle who observes how the monsters are ‘othered beings’ in *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *Dr Jekyll ve Mr Hyde*, and *The Phantom of the Opera*²³. Yet, in *The Mummy!*, Cheops is not excluded from the community, on the contrary, he is positioned at the centre of the social circle of the novel by being in contact with almost everyone in the novel playing different social roles, as a friend or as an enemy. Cheops is always accompanied by an other member of society, so he can exist as a subject, as yet another member of society. In consequence, the mummy of Cheops emerges as a subject-abject figure that brings another ‘double’ in the novel to light by accentuating the dialogic narrative.

In Kristevan psychoanalysis, a subject-abject, a subject that internalises its abject self, is considered a deject. As it is mentioned previously, Kristeva delineates the term semiotic chora in her version of psychosexual development to define the pre-lingual state which precedes the symbolic realm. She takes the word chora from Plato’s *Timaeus* in which it is associated with the meanings of “receptacle” and “nourishing and maternal” (Kristeva & Waller, 1984, p. 26). Another common translation of chora that can be found is ‘womb’ which is correlated with Kristeva’s use of chora as a maternal space containing within itself the sense of oneness that is perceived by the mother and infant. In this stage, the infant does not identify their self as separate from

²³ In all of these, the monsters/monstrous characters are outcasts who cannot make it as social members of a community: Frankenstein’s monster cannot find a place in society after failing in his attempts to communicate with others, as in his interaction with DeLacey family; Dracula lives in an isolated castle and is hunted down by other characters; the evil Mr. Hyde is a secret of Dr. Jekyll to be kept hidden from the public eye; and Erik spends his life in the shadows as the phantom of the opera.

the mother. For subject formation, the infant abjects the mother's body, which becomes the first abject, the other, on which they build their subjectivity (Kristeva, 1982, p. 32). This separation is completed with the acquisition of language and acceptance of the law of the father, the boundaries of social norms and linguistic rules, and the child continues to abject whatever is reminiscent of the semiotic which continues its presence as a disruptive²⁴ threat to the symbolic. Nevertheless, when the subject fails to fully abject the mother's body -because it desires the "lost mother," with all that it symbolises- and cannot belong to a place -due to its lack of ability to constitute boundaries through abjection- the subject internalises the abject and dwells in the purgatorial space of the Imagery, a condition Kristeva terms as 'deject'.

On the grounds of these, Cheops' condition as both abject and subject can be read through Kristevan deject. In the manner of a "tireless builder," deject exists in a ceaseless circle of dislocating and relocating the self (Kristeva, 1982, p. 8). According to Kristeva (1982), the deject is basically "a *stray*" who never questions "*Who* am I?" by the virtue of "sounding himself as to his 'being,' [but] he does so concerning his place: '*Where* am I?'" (p. 8). The crisis of the deject on locating his self can be figuratively seen in the first words spoken by Cheops. When he gets out of the pyramid, the Mummy asks himself "Where am I? what place is this?" in a confused state, and he goes on by asking "Have I entered Hades, or am I still on earth?" reflecting the purgatorial state of mind of the deject that is trapped in the Imagery (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 76). The Mummy cannot separate whether it is all real or just a dream, the language fails him as he struggles to *define* himself and the world around him.

In the midst of his disorientation, Cheops finds the solution in finding an 'other' to re-grasp his sense of self. He demands someone to speak to him: "'Speak! speak!' ... 'speak! let me hear the sound of another's voice, before my brain is lost in madness'" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 76). The demanding voice of the Mummy also can be read as an indicator of the primary emotion of 'demand' which marks the stage

²⁴ Considering the Bakhtinian influence on the work of Kristeva, the disruptive role of the semiotic is explained as a carnivalesque force by Moi (1986) who writes that "Working from Bakhtinian terms such as 'dialogism' and 'carnivalism', Kristeva turns them into allusions to the kind of textual play she was later to analyse through concepts such as 'the semiotic', 'the symbolic' and the 'chora'" (p. 34). While the symbolic tends to be monologic and the law of the father corresponds to 'the official order' in Bakhtin's studies on the carnival, the semiotic is related with the dialogic force that distracts this monologism.

of the Imagery. Finally, he analyses his look and finds that he wears the garments of a mummy: "Am I then dead?" he asks before he "[breaks] into a wild laugh of derision:—'Poor, feeble wretch!' [cries] he; 'what do I fear?'" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 76). When he recognizes himself as an abject, a self in a dead body, he cannot help but abject himself by directing the words 'poor, feeble wretch'. Kristeva clarifies that to cope with the ambiguity of subject-object, the deject both acknowledges its abjection but also separates it from himself by displacing abjection, i.e. abjecting the others. In accordance with that, Cheops uses such words as poor, feeble, and wretch for others in the rest of the novel. Besides, whether it is directed to himself or others, Cheops always degrades with *laughter*, as Kristeva (1982) underlines, the situation of the deject is "not without laughter since laughing is a way of placing or displacing abjection²⁵" (p. 8).

Nonetheless, reading the Mummy only as a deject would be a limited reading since his is not merely an internalisation of abjection, but a celebratory, playful, and subversive manifestation of abject within the novel, which finds its appropriate spirit in Bakhtin's carnivalesque. The dual response of attraction/repulsion given in the face of the monsters can also be traced in the Bakhtinian and Kristevan approaches: while it is repulsive for Kristeva, it is appealing for Bakhtin. The breakdown of the symbolic boundaries is interpreted as a liberating and celebratory act from a Bakhtinian standpoint since the disruption of the official order during carnival is favoured. In that sense, monsters share an affinity with the carnival spirit since both refuse the existing order of things and allow temporary freedom from the forbidden. Cohen argues that monsters can be seen as a "Bakhtinian ally of the popular," as they demand "a 'system' allowing polyphony" (pp. 12, 7). The inclusion of the Mummy in the social dialogues in the novel highlights this polyphony, *The Mummy!* dismantles the monologic construction of the gothic monster as 'the other' by treating the monster as another 'I' among the many voices in the story. Furthermore, in carnival time, monsters become celebratory figures who take a central role; as Robert Stam (1989) notes, "all that is marginalized and excluded- the mad, the scandalous, the aleatory- takes over the center

²⁵ It should be pointed out that the term "displaced abjection" is employed by Peter Stallybrass and Allon White (1986) to refer how "carnival often violently abuses and demonizes weaker, not stronger, social groups – women, ethnic and religious minorities, those who 'don't belong'" (p. 19). Their study is written after *Powers of Horror*, therefore, the term does not necessarily refer to the same progress of the carnival. Since this meaning meets with neither Bakhtin's positive outlook of carnival nor the plot of *The Mummy!*, this thesis does not employ this term in this context.

in a liberating explosion of otherness” (p. 86). Hence, all that is considered abject by the official norms are included in the celebrations of carnival, as no one is left outside. Accordingly, Cheops stands at the heart of social relations in the novel and steers the wheel of the ruling class of future England by tricking people into his will.

The celebratory manifestation of the abject in the figure of the Mummy can be further analysed through the *grotesque* in Bakhtinian discourse. In *Introducing Bakhtin*, Sue Vice (1997) underlines that “[Kristevan] concept of abjection could be seen as a psychoanalytically inflected development of Bakhtin’s grotesque” (p. 163). As explained by Bakhtin (1984b), “the term grotesque” stems from “a certain type of Roman ornament [which is] called grottesca,” and the defining feature of these ornaments is “the extremely fanciful, free, and playful treatment of plant, animal, and human forms [that] seemed to be interwoven as if giving birth to each other” (pp. 31, 32). The unfinished forms and blurring of the natural boundaries emphasized in the grotesque are deemed to be abject for Kristeva, something that causes disturbance in the order. However, Bakhtin (1984b) celebrates the unfinished borders of the grotesque imagery in a carnival spirit; he writes that “the grotesque body is not separated from the rest of the world. It is not a closed, completed unit; it is unfinished, outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits” (p. 26). The open-endedness of the grotesque ornaments falls in line with his concept of dialogism in contrast to the monologism of classical aesthetics that abjects whatever is beyond the conventional limits.

To illustrate in *The Mummy!*, the cave inside the pyramid of Cheops represents the grotesque imagery in the novel, considering that the etymological root of grotesque leads to Italian grotto which means “picturesque cavern or cave” (Douglas, n.d.). In the room of the tomb of Cheops, which is “dedicated to Typhon, the evil spirit, ... his fierce and savage types [covers] the walls; and images of his symbols, the crocodile and the dragon ... [are] seemed starting into life” to cross the path of the unwanted visitors (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 54). Moreover, in the same room, the creator god of ancient Egyptians, Phtah, is pictured with wide wings and claws in which he holds a ring, “the emblem of eternity” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 56). The conflation of the pictures of animals, mythological creatures, and deities together with the fact that these deities possess animalistic parts in their bodies create a grotesque combination that defies the limits of their forms as they belong to different spheres. Their seemingly alive condition violates the borders between animate and inanimate.

Also, the ring, which is introduced in the novel as a symbol of eternity, highlights the grotesque notion of the never-ending cycle of life.

Bakhtin (1984b) analyses the grotesque body in the literature under the heading of grotesque realism which is, for him, “created by the medieval culture of folk humor” and therefore inseparable from the carnival tradition (p. 32). Grotesque realism is explained by Bakhtin with two principles: The material bodily principle and degradation. The first one refers to the positive exaggeration of the images referring to the materiality of the body with its earthiness and transformation in such themes as eating, birth, growth, and fertility, which cannot be limited to an individual but all people. The latter one, *degradation* is associated by Bakhtin (1984b) with “the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract ... to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body” (p. 19). By embodying these principles of the grotesque, the mummy of Cheops becomes a manifestation of the grotesque body in Jane Webb’s *The Mummy!*.

The cave of the tomb of Cheops, which is illustrated as the grotesque imagery in the novel, also can be read as a metaphor for the ‘womb’ in the novel. After a long walk inside a passage in the pyramid, the characters, Edric, the doctor, and the guide Samuel, reach “a deep, dark, gloomy-looking cavity, like a well” and start descending into that shaft until they arrive at “a vaulted apartment where long vistas of ponderous arches stretched on every side, till their termination was lost in darkness, and gave a feeling of immensity and obscurity to the scene” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 47, 50). While the description of the cave contributes to the womb metaphor, and at this stage of the story, the feeling of obliquity as a result of the disappearance of the lines of the structures inside recalls the Kristevan abjection, in which the maternal body becomes the primary abject, a site where meaning collapses. The cave becomes a horrifying place for the characters, something that their body wants to abject like the maternal body which is, for Kristeva, a threat to our symbolic world.

However, with the resurrection of the Mummy, the cave is transformed into a carnivalesque-grotesque spectacle. At the moment Edric Montagu starts the galvanic battery, “a demoniac laugh of derision [appears] to ring in his ears, and the surrounding mummies [seem] starting from their places and dancing in unearthly merriment”²⁶

²⁶ The atmosphere created by the dancing mummies in the cave can be argued to have an intertextual link with the ball scenes in *The Master and Margarita* (1967) written by Mikhail Bulgakov. In the novel, Satan hosts a grand ball to which various supernatural beings and people from both the world of

(Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 63). The feeling of dread is encompassed by a festive atmosphere as if the mummies are almost celebrating the re-birth of Cheops. As Kristeva (1982) writes, “abjection is resorbed in the grotesque: a way of living it from the inside” (p. 165). In the grotesque images of the carnival, “death itself is pregnant and gives birth, and the mother's womb giving birth becomes a grave” (Bakhtin, 1984a, p. 164). Therefore, this scene epitomises carnivalesque through the grotesque conflation of the motifs of birth and death within the setting of a cave which is both a grave under the earth and a figurative womb. At the same time, it exemplifies degradation both in the real sense that they are descending into the grave under the earth which figuratively swallows them and in the grotesque sense that degradation is “coming down to earth” that gives birth to new life (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 21).

The cave in the pyramid can also be read as a manifestation of the *threshold chronotope* in the novel. In “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel,” Bakhtin (1981) coins the literary concept of chronotope which means ‘time space’ in the literal meaning and refers to “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature” (p. 84). One of the variations of chronotopes he discusses is the threshold chronotope that is related to “the breaking point of a life, the moment of crisis” whose figurative representation in the literary texts can be found in “the staircase, the front hall and corridor, as well as the ... places where crisis events occur, the falls, resurrections, renewals...” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 248). Given these, the cave of Cheops’ tomb can be argued as a manifestation of the threshold chronotope as Edric and the doctor move through corridors, stairs, and tunnels, the places that Bakhtin exemplifies for the threshold chronotope. Furthermore, the cave becomes the threshold of the two worlds, the worlds of the dead and the living, a place where the mummy of Cheops is *resurrected*. In addition to that, not only that his animation is a transgression of the boundaries of nature, that is, a natural *crisis*, but it is also a climactic moment that transforms the course of events in the novel. Considering that the story ends in the cave with Cheops’ returning to his tomb, the cave becomes a liminal space where both the beginning and end of the novel take place.

the living and the world of the dead are invited. Picturing a grotesque scenery, these characters dance and have fun together in an ecstatic frenzy which can also be seen in the dancing of the laughing mummies in the cave in *The Mummy!*.

The second connotation of the word 'mummy', that is mother, adds another layer to the motif of the maternal body in the novel. Building on the discussion of the mummy of Cheops as an abject figure, the double meaning of its name allows an interpretation of Cheops as a symbol for the abject mother in the novel. In the same manner that the conventional image of the gothic monster as "the other" is reversed, by giving the Mummy a central role in the social relations, the abjection of the maternal body is subverted by positioning the 'mother' into the centre of the symbolic realm that is monitored by the law of the father. This act highlights the grotesque element of the maternal body in the novel through a carnivalesque inversion of the official order which prerequisites the mother's body to be a castaway. Significantly, the fact that Cheops controls the course of events in the novel's symbolic/social realm, discloses that the law of the father is not only defied but overthrown by the law of the Mummy as a carnivalesque act. Furthermore, the symbolisation of 'mother' in the monstrous figure of the Mummy reflects the carnival imagery of the 'pregnant monster' since Bakhtin (1984b) argues the imagery of 'pregnant death' is an important motif in carnival in which "the monster, death, becomes pregnant" (p. 91).

The approach to the concept of death of Ancient Egyptians in the novel depicts an affinity with the Bakhtinian grotesque as well. Gazing upon the majestic structure of the pyramids, Dr Entwerfen thinks that the pyramids must have been built to become temples instead of burying places and he continues by informing that Ancient Egyptians "call the houses of the living only inns, whilst they considered tombs as everlasting habitations" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 43). The belief of the Ancient Egyptians as stated in the novel corresponds to the Bakhtinian grotesque for which the death is always understood in relation birth and birth to death. After their burial, another life waits for the dead in the religion of Ancient Egyptians, echoing the grotesque notion of the grave which transforms into a womb as the earth procreates life. Hence, as the pharaoh of Ancient Egypt, Cheops personifies this grotesque concept of death.

Furthermore, Bakhtin enunciates the grotesque relation between food and death in the banquet images of the carnival. Mentioning "the special relation of food to death and to the underworld," he elaborates on this by writing "[t]he word 'to die' had among its various connotations the meaning of 'being swallowed' or being 'eaten up'" (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 301). Food signifies the unfinished body of humans since the act of eating disrupts the borders of the body, being one of the images that are emphasized in

the material bodily principle of grotesque materialism. In *The Mummy!*, the etymological connection that is built by Bakhtin between eating and dying can be observed in the word “sarcophagus” in *The Mummy!*. In the dictionary of Merriam-Webster, the literal translation of sarcophagus is stated as “flesh-eating stone” which merges the idea of death with that of food (“Sarcophagus”, n.d.-b).

The last element that should be underlined as a grotesque feature of Cheops is the curses. In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin (1984b) writes that “abuses, oaths, and curses” are manifestations of the grotesque body in speech as they are forms of degradation (p. 27). They are also a significant part of the marketplace language in carnivals as they do not obey the official etiquette of verbal communication (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 187). In *The Mummy!*, Cheops constantly makes use of curses in the expressions such as “Poor weak offspring of clay!”, “Weak, feeble worm!”, and “Degenerate wretches!” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 14;15, para. 15;82). The downward motion of the degradation which ‘lowers down’ and ‘brings down to the level of the earth’ can be observed in Cheops’ emphasis on the word “clay” which draws attention to the materiality of the body. As Bakhtin (1984b) points out, the curses and abusive language “dig a grave, but this is a bodily, creative grave” and it can be seen in Cheops’ choice of the word “worm” to describe the human body because it is associated with the idea that all bodies will be eaten under the earth (p. 370). Also, Cheops’ mocking of the weakness of human beings as works of clay, ‘offsprings’ made by God, reflects the carnival tradition of *parodia sacra*, parodying the cult of the Church.

2.3. The Laughing Devil of Romantic Grotesque

To speak of the devil, the mummy of Cheops appears as the least expected thing to see in the sky of London in the 22nd century of Webb’s tale. Not long after the resuscitation, the mummy of Cheops finds the balloon of Edric and Dr Entwefen and jumps into it thinking he is embarking for hell. Yet, Cheops’ balloon arrives in London where a grand ceremony is being held and the air is filled with spectators who want to watch the event in their balloons, aerial sledges, or even with artificial wings. When Cheops joins them, “a dreadful tumult [ensues], the balloons [are] entangled with the winged heroes and each other in inextricable confusion” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 11, para. 79). The crowd starts to fall including the Mummy and the whole event turns into pandemonium accompanied by the “piercing screams that demons were in the air”

(Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 11, para. 84). On the ground, some of them claim that they saw a demon. Considering the referrals to Cheops as a demon and his fall to London which he thinks is hell, the scene parodies the fall of Lucifer from heaven as another portrayal of parody of the *parodia sacra* Church in the novel. The same biblical allusion repeats itself when Cheops is likened to “a fallen angel ... expelled from heaven” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 13, para. 95). Starting with this incident, Cheops continues to be called a “fiend”, “demon”, or “devil” many times in the novel.

In *Ashgate Encyclopedia*, the literary appearance of the devil is described “as a deceiver, tempter, and adversary, one bent on bringing about the ruin of specific individuals” (Weinstock & Wandless, 2014, p. 156). In *The Mummy!*, Cheops deceives Father Morris by appearing to counsel him to make Rosabella the queen. Father Morris agrees on the terms of Cheops and they shake hands to seal the alliance, an act which makes him feel “as though he had entered into a compact with a fiend ... whose eyes seemed as though they were still looking into his very soul” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 13, para. 129). Their alliance alludes to the motif of the Faustian bargain, named after the legendary pact in which Faust sells his soul to the Devil. The father does not bargain his soul explicitly, but it is implied. Overwhelmed by greed, both Faust and Father Morris seek more power, whether it is divine knowledge or the throne. The scene also weaves an intertextual threat between *The Mummy!* and Matthew Lewis’s *The Monk* (1796) in which the monk Ambrosio pacts with Matilda who is sent by the Devil.

Proceeding with his deception, the Mummy heartens Rosabella by playing on her conceit. Cheops stalks Rosabella while she watches her reflection in the mirror of her room. The reflection pleases Rosabella who starts to daydream of the future glory that is waiting for her. Standing in distance, Cheops starts to call her “Rosabella! Queen of England! hail!” and repeats “Hail to the Queen of England!” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 18, para. 2). Recalling Eve’s deception scene in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Cheops acts in the role of the devil in disguise who persuades Eve into eating the forbidden fruit after observing her delight in her own reflection. However, Cheops does not deceive Father Morris and Rosabella out of evil but to punish the evil and protect the good by preventing their harm. His role as the devil who helps the good emphasizes the tradition of *parodia sacra* of medieval carnivals and elucidates him as a carnivalesque version of the devil.

The devil assumes myriad disguises in literature but the disguise of the mummy of Cheops comes with a carnivalesque twist. With the aim of sneaking into the palace to save Elvira, Cheops and Clara are dressed as “Greek peasant boy[s], numbers of whom ... were rambling over England singing wild romances to their harps or lutes, and telling fortunes in a kind of doggerel rhyme” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 24, para. 28). Their disguise represents the carnivalesque element of ‘travesty’ which is “the renewal of clothes and of the social image” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 82). When they come into the presence of Rosabella, Cheops sings a few songs with his lute and then offers to tell her fortune. Cheops acts as a court jester, and therefore a carnivalesque figure, since “clown and fools,” as Bakhtin (1984) asserts, “belong to one culture of folk carnival humor” (p. 4). Furthermore, “travestied prophecies” and fortune-telling are considered carnival elements by Bakhtin (1984b) who interprets them as “a grotesque debasement of higher-level soothsaying” that is applied by kings to learn the future of their rule (pp. 235, 244). Reflecting this parodical nature of fortune telling in carnivals, the queen Rosabella wants to learn her destiny not from a soothsayer but from a mummy who is dressed as a page. This spectacle is called a “mummery” by Father Morris (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 24, para. 48). In relation to that scene, Hopkins (2003) draws attention to the “a twice-repeated pun on ‘mummery’” which adds another layer to the polyphonic structure of the name ‘the Mummy’ while highlighting the parody (p. 10).

The carnivalesque devil figure of the Mummy can be argued as a combination of both the devils of the medieval carnivals and the Romantic grotesque. In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin (1984b) writes that “[t]he diableries were legalized and the devils were allowed to run about freely in the streets” before the carnivals for the purpose of setting up a demoniac ambience (p. 90). Indeed, Cheops wanders on the streets of future London as he pleases and visits the houses without any permission. Also, he embodies many carnivalesque elements in his devil figure as unfolded above. Nevertheless, he is not a complete representation of the devil in the popular grotesque of the medieval carnivals in which the devil is a gay and comic monster, as argued by Bakhtin (1984b, p. 39). It is because as much as there are scenes in which Cheops plays a comic role, as in the scenes of the fall from the balloon and the fortune-telling, he also continues to strike terror, something that Bakhtin observes in the representation of the devil in the Romantic grotesque.

Bakhtin (1984b) argues that the grotesque is revived in the period of Romanticism, in the forms of the gothic and black novel, but went through a transformation in which some of the carnival elements, such as the devil and laughter, have loosened its ties with the medieval folk culture (pp. 36, 37). The devil figure is treated by Romantics “as terrifying, melancholy, and tragic” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 41). Along with being a terrifying figure, Cheops is observed as a melancholic character in the novel because he always reminisces about the world in the times of Ancient Egypt, which he praises as opposed to the current condition of the world that he finds corrupted. His longing for the past can be seen in the first time he watched the Thames River as he thinks of the old state of the Nile, “how different were the feelings that then throbbed in my breast,” Cheops says, “to the corroding fire that now consumes me! ... what horrid thoughts ... come like overwhelming floods pouring from heaven ... sweeping all before them in one mighty ruin ... there's madness in the thought!”. In his words, it is seen that his mind is in a troubled state, and thus quite different from the gay and festive devils of the medieval carnivals. Along with that, the mummy of Cheops has a tragic past filled with misdeeds for which he is re-sent to the world to do the penance.

Last but not least, the laughter of the Mummy should be unravelled as his signature carnivalesque feature. For Bakhtin, laughter is an indispensable component of the carnival tradition. Carnival laughter belongs to all people; “universal in scope; it is directed at all and everyone, including the carnival's participants” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 11). Rather than dividing the one who laughs from the one who is laughed at, carnival laughter is shared by everyone. All that is feared, that are death, monsters, and the Church, are defeated with laughter. In *The Mummy!*, besides the laughter in the carnivalesque text of the novel in such forms of parody, the principle of laughter in action is individually possessed by the Mummy and directed to the others. As opposed to the carnival laughter that is shared by everyone, the Mummy is the one who laughs and terrorizes people with his laughter to the degree that they are haunted by it. His laughter displays a harmony with the Romantic grotesque devil figure whose “infernal laughter [is] somber and sarcastic” (Bakhtin, 1984b, pp. 41, 38). With Romantic grotesque, Bakhtin (1984b) indicates that carnival laughter “ceased to be a joyful and triumphant hilarity,” and likewise, the laughter of Cheops neither brings joy nor carries

a festive spirit (p. 38). His sarcastic laughter is directed at the people of 22nd century to degrade them.

Yet, one can find in this degradation a grotesque burial that renews. Bakhtin (1984b) writes, “festive folk laughter presents an element of victory not only over supernatural awe, over the sacred, over death; it also means the defeat of power, of earthly kings, of the earthly upper classes, of all that oppresses and restricts” (p. 92). In like manner, the mummy of Cheops laughs at the corrupted moral state of future England in social and political affairs. He laughs at the members of the ruling class, at the conceit of people who always want more. Cheops becomes the medium through *The Mummy!* laughs at the social and political status quo of 19th-century England in the carnivalesque setting of the 22nd century, which will be the subject of the next chapter.

In conclusion, the aim of this chapter was to discuss the mummy of Cheops as a carnivalesque monster. The first section revealed the intertextuality and the carnivalesque-menippean elements in the genesis story of the Mummy along with the theme of Faustian transgression in the novel. The second section established the Mummy as an abject figure who subverts the abjection process of the canonical gothic monsters in a carnivalesque reversion which takes ‘the other’ into the centre of the carnival. This also allowed a comparison between Cheops and other canonical monsters, which highlighted Cheops’ role as the carnivalesque monster. The celebration of the abject in the carnivals further discusses through the Bakhtinian grotesque, and the grotesque body in the characterisation of the Mummy is examined through the motifs of the maternal body, death, food, and the degradation in the curses of Cheops. Finally, Cheops is discussed as a combination of the devil figures in the medieval carnivals and the Romantic grotesque. Parodia sacra, travesty, clowns and fools, and fortune-telling are argued as carnivalesque elements of the character Cheops. All things considered; this chapter has defined the mummy of Cheops as a carnivalesque monster.

CHAPTER 3

THROUGH THE MAGIC GLASS: THE CARNIVALESQUE DISCOURSE

Science fiction is not prescriptive; it is descriptive.

— Ursula K. Le Guin. *The Left Hand of Darkness*

Pray for us, who once, too, thought we could fly.

— Margaret Atwood. “Time capsule found on the dead planet”

Why does the tale of Jane Webb have a monster? Why do monsters appear in storytelling for centuries? The etymological roots of the word monster are traced back to “the verbs *monstrare* (to show or reveal) and *monere* (to warn or portend)” and in line with the derivatives of the word, monsters are argued to be “a type of omen that indicates something unsettling or threatening about the universe we inhabit” (Weinstock, 2014, p. 1). Monsters can act as a warning sign, a disruptive agent revealing there is an error within the system in which they appear. Beal (2002) argues that monsters are *demonized* to protect the sacred order of ours, he writes that “[b]y demonizing our monsters, we keep God on our side” (p. 7). Serving as a scapegoat for the errors in society, monsters are turned into abject that is encoded with all that is unwanted in the order of the symbolic. Yet, Beal (2002) also discusses that the monster is *deified*; he argues that monsters can appear as “a figure of divine revelation or an envoy of the sacred ... that reveals the will or judgment of God or the gods” (p. 6). According to him, the case is not one or the other but monsters are “both demonized and deified” in accordance with their ambivalent nature (Beal, 2002, p. 6). In line with all, it can be observed in *The Mummy!* that Cheops is both demonized, as explained in the previous chapter, and deified, as he reveals that he is sent back to earth by the same power who gave him life in order to do penance, protect the good and punish the evil. Given these, how can the appearance of the Mummy of Cheops be read within the novel? What is it that he warns about or intervenes as a divine messenger? What is it that the Mummy laughs at?

With the aim of addressing these questions, one must first examine the time-place and the course of events that gave rise to the appearance of the monster. Cohen (1996) proposes that as “a construct and a projection”, the monster can be read “within the intricate matrix of relations (social, cultural, and literary-historical) that generate

them” (pp. 6, 5). That being the case, the appearance of the Mummy can be unravelled within the novel’s relative dimensions which will be considered in this chapter as a reflection of the zeitgeist of the author, Jane Webb, as her novel has been appraised as a satire of her times, a “political and moral allegory of Regency England” (Rauch, 2001, p. 75). The Regency period in the history of England is known as the transition period which starts with the appointment of the eldest son of King George III as a regent of the throne in 1811 and lasts until the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837. It was an era of social and political instability which is not only caused by a regent prince but also influenced by the revolutions in France and the industrial areas.

To give a brief outlook of the era, the regenerative force of the French Revolution that started in 1789 had already kindled the debates about a social reform for equality which challenged the existing social hierarchy in Regency England. The upheaval against the aristocrats and monarchy in France was a threat to both domestic affairs and the imperial interests of the British Empire that was the preeminent global force of the era, which continued to expand the territory of its colonies in the 19th century. This revolutionary spirit also gave birth to Romanticism which was a staple literary and cultural movement in Webb’s era; the resistance to the *ancien régime* in France brought about criticism of Enlightenment reason and neoclassicism in England’s intellectual atmosphere. In the following years after the revolution, the conquests of France under the leadership of Napoleon, among which the Egyptian campaign leaves a significant mark on Webb’s novel, continued to be a concern of the British Empire. Finally, the Industrial Revolution, which is set in motion by rapid scientific and technological advancements, is another factor whose influences can be traced in *The Mummy!*. As a result of the Industrial Revolution, the landscape of the country is transformed with new areas of commerce and settlements, which is followed by a change in the social classes. While the rise of the middle class is empowered by this transformation, the working class ended up facing economic struggle and strenuous living conditions. In this cauldron of events in the Regency Era, *The Mummy!* is moulded by Jane Webb.

All these social, political, cultural, and literary dimensions of Webb’s period are reflected in *The Mummy!* through a carnival mirror in a utopian future, which poses a satirical critique of her times. Bakhtin (1984a) likens the parodies of carnival to “an entire system of crooked mirrors, elongating, diminishing, distorting in various

directions and to various degrees” (p. 127). In the manner of a carnival mirror, as it will be elucidated in this chapter, Jane Webb parodies the status quo of Regency England through carnivalesque subversion which inverts and alters the matrix of relations of her period. The narrator itself tells the events through a mirror: When the spirit gives her the chronicle of the future, she sees the future “as is a *magic glass* [emphasis added]” (Webb, 2018, Introduction, para. 9). Set in the fictional 22nd century, this alternative world in the novel can be associated with the sense of a “second world” that is experienced by the participants of the medieval carnivals which “build a second world and a second life outside officialdom” according to Bakhtin (1984b, pp. 6). Carrying the universal aspect of these carnivals, Webb’s novel does not narrate only the future condition of England but the whole world, all the people participate in this second life in *The Mummy!*.

Bakhtin (1984b) points out the utopian vision of the second world of the carnivals by calling them a “utopian realm of community” (p. 9). From a Bakhtinian standpoint, utopias²⁷ can be argued to have a monologic tendency in creating a perfect world which would present an *ultimate-word*, a finalised state of things. Nevertheless, instead of this monologic endeavour, Bakhtin’s emphasis on utopia lies in its critical and dialogical potential since both utopias and carnivals challenge the established order and open up to a space of unlimited imagination. In the utopian space, the present – that of the author and the reader – and the alternative world overlaps creating a ‘dialogue’ through which it posits a critique of the status quo. In the polyphonic text of *The Mummy!*, this dialogue can be analysed through what Bakhtin calls *great dialogue*²⁸ which means the existence of two clashing ideas in interaction with each other. In Webb’s carnivalesque discourse, “the new mode of man's relation to man is elaborated” through the great dialogues between social classes; humans and nature – which is in conjunction with the relationship between scientific progress and nature; and finally, the coloniser and the colonised (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 10). By embodying a utopian setting only to subvert it, *The Mummy!* parodies the utopian aspiration of achieving a perfect order. The monster of the novel laughs at this utopia; the appearance of the mummy of Cheops reveals that there is something rotten in the state of 22nd-century England.

²⁷ See Chapter One for the definition of utopia and its employment in the narrative of *The Mummy!*

²⁸ See Chapter One for the analysis of the polyphonic text of the novel and the Bakhtinian concept of a *great dialogue*.

This chapter will unravel how Jane Webb's novel presents a critique of the socio-political, cultural, literary, and historical dimensions of her period through carnivalesque subversion. To discuss the critique presented in the novel, the chapter will focus on three *great dialogues* all of which are affected by the moral corruption that lies at the heart of the novel, that is, the greed and conceit of humans who always desire for more. In the first part, focusing on the *utopian* setting of the novel, the chapter will analyse the dialogue among social classes emphasizing the *reversal* of the social roles, *renewal* of political regimes, the *unmasking* of the pretentious titles of the ruling class, and subversion of the social and literary gender norms. In the second part, the chapter will elaborate on the relationship among nature, humans, and scientific progress, which displays the carnivalesque act of mock crowning and decrowning in the novel. The 'monstrous' advancement of science which dethrones nature in the future of the novel will be examined through the uncanny elements in the novel's grotesque body referring to Suvin's *cognitive estrangement*, which is created in the overlapping spatiotemporal layers in the novel. In line with these, the novel's ecocriticism which recrowns nature will be discussed in connection with its critique of imperialism and colonialism. Finally, the chapter will elucidate how *The Mummy!* unsettles the hierarchical roles between the civilised coloniser and barbarous colonised in an analysis of the judicial systems in England and Anglo-Egypt.

3.1. A World Upside-Down: A Dialogue between Socio-Political Classes

The quest for a utopian society in *The Mummy!* starts with the incessant shifts in the political regime of England. The narrator informs us that until the 22nd century, England goes through countless forms of government which are established only to be overthrown by yet another "violent revolution" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 1). Overthrowing monarchy, the people of England establish an aristocracy and later a democracy, however, neither does please them as all people begin considering themselves as compatible as their current leaders: "'We are free,' said they; '... we will be slaves no longer; we will all be masters'" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 5). Subsequently, the state of England lapses into anarchy only for people to realize that "there was little pleasure in being masters when there were no subjects" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 6). As no one wants to work for another, the burdens of people multiply to a degree that they cannot continue their daily lives, and chaos prevails in society due to the abolishment of the laws. To save their civilization after countless

overturnings of government, the people of England decide to bring back the absolute monarchy.

These revolutions that took place at the start of the novel enhance the intertextuality of the novel through an allusion to French Revolution and invoke a carnival-grotesque spirit. In these revolutions, the historical influence of the French Revolution can be observed since revolutionary ideas were spreading political and social anxiety globally in Webb's period. Alluding to the violent events that took place during the Reign of Terror, the revolutions in the novel are also called violent. In addition, by completing the circle of revolutions with a re-establishment of a monarchy, which is strengthened by people's fear to re-experience the times of anarchy, *The Mummy!* parodies the succession of Napoleon Bonaparte as a dictator in the outcome of the French Revolution. All of these consecutive overturnings of government resonate with the carnivalesque notion of renewal and portray the ritual of 'crowning and de-crowning' of a carnival king during mediaeval carnivals. Bakhtin argues that both crowning and de-crowning carry an ambiguous meaning for both contain within themselves the idea of the other. Just as the mock king of the carnival, who is usually referred to as a clown or fool, receives the throne only to give it back at the end of the carnival, the revolutions that started to overthrow the monarchy end up bringing it back. Nevertheless, the acts of crowning and decrowning continue between Elvira and Rosabella, the two rivals of the throne. Furthermore, these revolutions enhance the carnivalesque discourse of the novel because the carnival spirit subverts and parodies all the authoritarian structures and hierarchal positions. These cycles of historical events also emphasize the grotesque body in the text since the grotesque is entwined "with the social, utopian, and historic theme, and above all with the theme of the change of epochs and the renewal of culture" (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 325). In these moments of de-crowning and re-crowning, one can find the representation of "all-annihilating and all-renewing time," which is celebrated in the carnivalesque perception of the world (Bakhtin, 1984a, p. 124).

At the basis of these revolutions, as stated by the narrator, lies the conceit of people who long for more although they live prosperous lives. Not being contented with the riches they have, the people of England are still displeased in *The Mummy!* only because there are no obstacles to overcome, which ignites the uprisings. In the midst of telling about these failed revolutions that aim to satisfy the longings of people,

the narrator delivers the moral corruption that lies in the heart of the novel: conceit and discontent of humans who always desire more. “It is not in the nature of the human mind ... to be contented” says the narrator:

things at a distance appear so much more beautiful than they do when we approach them, that we always fancy what we have not, ... and neglect enjoyments within our reach, to pursue others, which, like *ignes fatui*, elude our grasp at the very moment when we hope we have attained them (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 1)

By pointing out that this moral defect is inherent to all humans without regard to the passing centuries, the novel emphasizes that the moral corruption existing in the 22nd century of the novel is a continuation of the one in Webb’s contemporary period, i.e., 19th century. A significant aspect to note is that this desire for more in the novel can be construed as ‘hunger for power’, which is metaphorically connected with the grotesque motifs of eating, food, and mouth that are pictured in an exaggerated way in the material body principle (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 18). Moreover, the narrator employs in their words the imagery of *ignis fatui* which means “roaming souls” in Latin while its plural form *ignes fatuus*²⁹ means “foolish fire” referring to the flickering light occurring in a chemical reaction caused by swamp gas at night (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). This natural phenomenon is known as making a fool of people who thought that the lights are souls or mysterious men carrying lights. In the novel, the never-ending desire of people can be regarded as the error that leads to the appearance of the Mummy who laughs at the foolishness of humans.

Although the monarchy is re-established to compensate for the need for order, what is actually established is completely a new order which reflects an upside-down version of the monarchy that precedes the chain of reforms. This renewed version of the old monarchy does not bring back the conventional social structure, rather, England’s socio-political sphere is altered in a way that the social norms and hierarchies are inverted. In this way, *The Mummy!* embraces a carnivalesque discourse since carnivals, for Bakhtin (1984b), “offers the chance to have a new outlook on the world [and] to enter a completely new order of things” which is characterized by “the peculiar

²⁹ *Ignes fatuus* is also known in the names of “jack-o’-lantern” and “will-o’-the-wisp” that relate to folk stories about two mysterious men who are called Jack and Will and believed to carry lights with them at night (Merriam-Webster, n.d.-a).

logic of the ‘inside out’” (p. 34). The carnivalesque subversion of the social classes is achieved through the “suspension of all hierarchic distinctions and barriers among men and of certain norms and prohibitions” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 15). In the novel, whereas class distinctions exist between the members of the ruling class - such as dukes, lords, and other noble personas - and the working class - such as doctors and servants - the titles exist only to provide a sense of order. Staging the carnivalesque reversal of roles between the mock king and the fool, all those “privileges, norms, and prohibitions” that are intrinsic to each class are switched between upper and lower classes portraying a “world inside out” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 11). By doing so, *The Mummy!* presents a critical outlook on the hierarchal construction of the social structure and norms in the 19th century establishing a great dialogue between the socio-political dimensions in the novel and the present of Jane Webb.

One of the carnivalesque reversals among the social classes in *The Mummy!* is the lack of education of aristocrats in contrast to their highly educated servants. In 22nd century England, the education level in the country reaches its peak becoming available for everyone. As a result, all people in England become universal linguists who are able to understand and speak every language³⁰. However, education starts “going out of fashion with persons of rank” as it becomes a “common’ thing available for everyone” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 14). To give an example, Sir Ambrose adopts the old customs of educating the children in Webb’s (2018) novel while raising his sons and it is parodically told that Edric is “almost as learned ... as a servant or a labourer” (Chapter 22, para. 8). In the novel, whereas the servants, the members of the low class, speak with an elegant tone in elaborate sentences that are rich with allusions to literature and scientific facts, the aristocrats of the upper class, make an extra effort to speak as plainly as possible to abstain from “the expressions of the vulgar” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 3, para. 23). For example, when his master tells Abelard, the butler of the house, something he should not forget, Abelard answers:

not all the waters of Lethe could wash such somnifugous tidings from my memory ... [the] words are imprinted upon the mnemonic organ of my brain;

³⁰ Given that English language is known as lingua-franca, a global language, in the 21st century, portraying English people as universal linguists in the 22nd century of the novel can be considered as a prophetic criticism of cultural imperialism.

and my sensorium must be divided from my cerebellum ere they can be effaced.
(Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 3, para. 20)

In his speech, he both refers to the river of Lethe, the river of forgetfulness in Greek mythology and utilizes the scientific terms ‘sensorium’ and ‘cerebellum’ which cannot be expected from a servant in the socio-cultural norms in the 19th century. The transformed speech types³¹ also can be argued in line with the abolition of the verbal etiquette in the carnival which “refuse[s] to conform to conventions, to etiquette, civility, respectability” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 187). Thus, the language and the education of the classes in the novel contrast and parody the socio-cultural condition of classes in the 19th century, creating an upside-down picture of England in Jane Webb’s time.

Another point of carnivalesque inversion in *The Mummy!* is that sophisticated dishes and drinks go out of fashion among the higher classes while the ‘learned people’ of lower classes are described as gourmets. In the novel, since it is the trend among the noble people to eat as plain food as possible, Mrs Montagu, who expects guests for dinner, orders the cook Angelina to prepare a meal that is as modest as possible since “nothing can be too plain for great people” and that “[f]ricassee and ragouts are only devoured by the canaille ...” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 31). She further warns the butler not to bring any kind of wine to the table, instead, she advises him to stock strong ale which is “the most elegant liquors for the ladies.” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 37). The same simplicity can be seen in the dinners of royalty. In her instructions to Angelina, Mrs Montagu exemplifies the dinner that the Queen held recently, in which the tables were empty except for “a huge round of boiled beef” and “smoking potatoes” that are cooked without their skins peeled (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 33). In response to these suggestions, Angelina complains about the lack of interest of people in gastronomy. Therefore, the dishes that are popular with higher and lower classes are inverted and the common people have a feast in the similar style of the high-class people in the 19th century.

In this inside-out world, servants are shown as intellectual people who spend their leisure time being involved in artistic hobbies, such as painting and sculpture, which were possible mainly for the elite in the 19th century. To illustrate, when Mrs

³¹ The inversion of the speech types of classes discloses the “ideologically saturated” nature of the language, its heteroglossia, which transforms with the political and social reforms (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 271). For speech types and heteroglossia, see Chapter One.

Montagu warns Alphonso about a painting that seems to be faded due to the use of improper cleaning materials, Alphonso begins commenting on the art piece explaining that the problem is not caused by the cleaning but by the mixture of the paint whose composition does not have the right amounts of carbon and hydrogen (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 36). To point out another instance, Celestina, the cook, burns the meal while she is busy “copying a cast from the Apollo Belvedere” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 86). As a learned servant, instead of simply saying that the meat is burnt, she describes it in a scientific way by parodically explaining the evaporation of the water when it is heated. Upon hearing her excuse, the doctor comments on how awful it is to be “cursed with learned servants” which is an example of the carnivalesque act of “positive negation” as the positive connotation of being educated paradoxically clashes with the negative connotations of “curse” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 87). Hence, one can also observe the comic aspect of the carnival in these instances of the subversion of the norms that are attached to the individual social classes.

In contrast to the learnt servants, the aristocratic members and the counsellors of the state lack the intelligence and competence to be in the ruling class. When the founding Queen of the new monarchy takes on her title, the nobility of the old monarchy gathers around her and she chooses “amongst them the wisest and most experienced for her counsellors,” as told by the narrator (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 12). However, it parodically turns out later in the novel that they are not the wisest. For instance, Lord Gustavus, one of the aristocrats that are counselled for his ideas upon important matters of the state, is, in fact, a verbose yet vacuous man who always repeats the same phrase of “[t]hinking as I think, and as I am positive everyone who hears me must think, or at least ought to think” every time he starts talking without contributing anything to the discussion (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 49). His self-confident verbalism can be seen merely as a mask that is used for hiding his ignorance. It is also ironic that he imposes his thoughts on everyone else while he does not have a thought of his own.

Lord Gustavus is accompanied by two men in the novel, Lord Noodle and Lord Doodle, who are introduced by the narrator as noble lords and counsellors of the Queen. The narrator says that they attain their position through succeeding their fathers, like Lord Gustavus, and belong to the “honourable and numerous fraternity, [whose

members] never take the trouble of judging for themselves, but contentedly swim with the stream” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 60). Indeed, the only thing that they do in the novel is agreeing Lord Gustavus by shaking their heads while trying to look wise and uttering the phrases “‘Exactly so!’ ‘Certainly!’ ‘Nobody can doubt it!’” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 60). Drawing an analogy between these lords and the celestial bodies, the narrator tells that “Lord Gustavus [is] ... their leading star, and they might very appropriately be termed his satellites” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 8, para. 60). By employing the terminology which is related to space while satirizing their extreme characteristics, the narrator performs the language of the marketplace that “abuses while praising and praises while abusing” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 416). Bakhtin (1984b) explains this feature of the language of the marketplace through positive negation, in which two things are re-located in time and space so that the top is replaced by the bottom or vice versa (1984b, pp. 403, 410). In the novel, seemingly praising words ‘star’ and ‘satellites’, which can be related to being ‘high’ in status, degrades the actions of the lords. By exposing the fact that the norms that are encoded in the social titles, such as the expectation from the ruling members of the state to be wise and educated, do not reflect the truth, *The Mummy!* stages the carnivalesque tradition of unmasking that is “disclosing of the unvarnished truth under the veil of false claims and arbitrary ranks” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 10).

The theme of masks in the novel further highlights the change in the social image in the carnivalesque discourse of *The Mummy!*. For Bakhtin (1984b), an essential element of the carnival is “travesty, that is, the renewal of clothes and of the social image” (p. 81). In *The Mummy!*, travesty can be seen in the theme of masks which is discussed as a part of the polyphonic text of the novel in which many characters are disguised as somebody else: Roderick II who disguises himself as Henry Seymour; the Duke of Cornwall’s brother, Edgar, who lives under the name of Father Morris; the attendant of Rosabella, Marianne, who hides from everyone that she is the mother of Rosabella; Pauline who lives another life without knowing that she is actually the biological daughter of Edgar. All of these masks also incorporate the carnivalesque element of mystification, which is solved at the end of the novel through unmasking.

Apart from these masks, the carnival spectacle of travesty is presented in the novel’s cross-dressings in which genders are figuratively reversed inside-out. One of these cross-dressings takes place in the scene when Cheops takes Clara with him on a

mission to save Queen Elvira. In the previous chapter, it is pointed out that the Mummy performs a travesty by wearing the clothes of a “Greek peasant boy” who is known for their songs and fortune-telling. Together with him, Clara also wears the same clothes; she “stain[s] her face and hands” and plays with her appearance inasmuch as she cannot recognise herself in the mirror (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 30, para. 28). The second cross-dressing in the novel is performed by Princess Zoe, who falls in love with Roderick the Great, the King of Ireland. In order to follow him wherever he goes, she dresses like a Greek page boy and becomes a soldier fighting next to him in the battles. Zoe’s disguise in the novel alludes to the historical figure Jeanne d’Arc³² who is a French folk heroine and an infamous wartime cross-dresser. In addition to these, in the inside-out world of the novel, wearing “loose trowsers” become a fashion trend among women, a trend that is quite unfamiliar for 19th century women (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 11, para. 2).

Through these cross-dressings, *The Mummy!* posits a critique of patriarchal norms that asserts a hierarchy between genders. In *The Second Sex*, Simone de Beauvoir (2011) argues the patriarchal norms which situate women in the subsidiary position demarcating a hierarchy between genders: “[a woman is] determined and differentiated in relation to man ... she is the inessential in front of the essential” (p. 31). According to Beauvoir, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman”; gender identity is not natural, is not inherited by birth, but developed through the norms that are encoded in the cultural mechanisms. In the novel, ‘the myth of woman’ as a second sex is displayed in the speeches of the Duke of Cornwall and Dr. Coleman. To illustrate, planning to marry Edric to Rosabella, who is not willing to marry him, the Duke of Cornwall says that “I’ll defy any woman in the world to have a will of her own whilst she is in my custody” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 5, para. 60). His thoughts reflect the patriarchal social dynamics in 19th century England during which it was common for women to be matched with someone to be married by their male family members. Dr. Coleman’s words in the novel further demonstrate the position of women as the subordinate gender in the patriarchal society of 19th century England: “[Woman] is to man, what the clinging ivy is to the majestic oak,—its loveliest ornament; but take away the standard

³² In disguise of a man, St. Joan of Arc (Sainte Jeanne d’Arc) led French forces to the victories during Hundred Years’ War. 500 years after being executed as a punishment for joining the war as a woman, she is named as a saint by Catholic Church (Lanhers and Vale, 2022).

tree, and she falls forlorn and unsupported to the dust” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 15, para. 16).

Both Princess Zoe and Clara break down these patriarchal norms through cross-dressings and carnivalesque reversal of the roles given to women in both society and the works of fiction. Princess Zoe is depicted as a strong and fearless female character in the novel as she fights along with men in the battle in order to be with the man with whom she falls in love. In like manner, Clara bravely frees Elvira from the prison where she is locked up by Rosabella. By doing so, her actions unsettle the Gothic trope of *damsel in distress*, the stock female character in gothic novels who is in danger and needs to be rescued by a hero. However, although both are brave young ‘heroines,’ they both have to dress as a boy to act in the courageous way they did. Thus, the cross-dressings are both elements of carnivalesque but also a significant feminist critique about patriarchal gender roles and the representation of the female and male characters in the literary canon.

3.2. A Brave, New, Unhomely World: A Dialogue of Human, Science, and Nature

The 22nd century of Webb’s novel holds a carnival mirror also to scientific progress, including the developments in technology and industry, which was a significant factor in shaping the zeitgeist of the Regency Period. Before examining this carnivalesque reflection, as it is stated in the introduction of the thesis, it should be underlined that *The Mummy!* is not only utopian but also a sci-fi novel³³, which of the two kinds of speculative fiction are closely related since Suvin (1988) considers utopian fiction as “one of the roots of SF ... it is social-science-fiction or SF restricted to the field of socio-political relationships” (p. 38). In the narrative of *The Mummy!*, it can be seen that the novel does not limit itself to the socio-political relations; countless inventions in the field of technology and science are presented in the novel’s future together with the critical outlook on the impacts of this progress on ecology. In that way, *The Mummy!* can be argued to demonstrate a cognitive estrangement which is argued by Suvin as the basis of SF interconnected with novum. Taking the words ‘cognition’ and ‘estrangement’ in the place of “science” and “fiction,” Suvin (1979) explains that cognitive estrangement “implies a creative approach tending toward a

³³ It is disclosed in the introduction that the grotesque text of *The Mummy!* is an incorporation of several genres.

dynamic transformation rather than toward a static mirroring of the author's environment" through a "critical" and "satirical" language (p. 10). Similarly, *The Mummy!* does not merely mirror the writer's status quo but transforms it through carnivalesque subversion with a satirical tone.

The estrangement in *The Mummy!* is generated by the overlapping spatial and temporal layers that produce an uncanny effect on the reader. In the first chapter, it is discussed that spatio-temporal zones in the novel clash in the novel's polyphonic text and establish a 'great dialogue' among the present of the reader whose period is bound to change, the present of the writer, the fictional time-space of the characters in the novel, and the period of Ancient Egypt that is manifested in the figure of the Mummy. These interlacing layers³⁴ create an estrangement, a representation "which allows us to recognize its subject, but at the same time makes it seem unfamiliar;" an unfamiliarity protests itself within the familiar (Suvin, 1979, p. 6). In his psychoanalysis, Freud explains this unfamiliar familiarity through uncanny which originally means "unheimlich" in German. He refers to the paradoxical etymology of the words "heimlich" which means familiar and homely together with hidden and secret, and "unheimlich" which means revealed, unhomely and not concealed. Nicholas Royle (2003) explains this discordance of these words as "a peculiar commingling of the familiar and unfamiliar"; according to him, this paradoxical sense of 'uncanny' is found in the threshold between 'known' and 'unknown' and arises from the "strangeness of framing and borders, [it is] an experience of liminality" (pp. 1-2). Liminal in nature, grotesque carries this sense of uncanny within it. Bakhtin (1984b) notes Kayser's thoughts on 'unheimlich' to elaborate on the grotesque body by writing that "[the essential trait of grotesque is 'something hostile, alien, and inhuman' (das Unheimliche...) ... In the grotesque ... , all that was for us familiar and friendly

³⁴ The overlapping of these spatiotemporal layers can also be argued in relation to Bakhtin's threshold chronotope which is discussed in the previous chapter. Bakhtin (1981) argues that the chronotope is the fusion of "spatial and temporal indicators" into "a carefully thought-out, concrete whole [so that] Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh" (p. 85). By the same token, four distinct time zones that are mentioned merge as one on the space of the text and the places in the novel. To give an example, the places London and Anglo-Egypt become the spaces where the change of time is felt in the novel as they are described in a state that is unfamiliar to other spatiotemporal layers such as that of the 19th century readers. Time takes a concrete form, in a figurative sense, in the spatial transformations at these places. Significantly, the threshold chronotope manifests itself again in these time-spaces of the novel as they brought about 'a moment of crisis' for the reader, a threshold experience, which can be analysed with the sense of uncanny, as it interprets the liminal feeling of familiarly unfamiliar. It should also be underlined that both Suvin's cognitive estrangement and Bakhtin's chronotope can be traced back to Einstein's theory of relativity which influenced the shaping of these concepts.

suddenly becomes hostile. It is our own world that undergoes this change” (pp. 47-48). Given these, a carnivalesque estrangement – i.e. carnivalesque mirroring of the condition of science in the writer’s present – can be observed in *The Mummy!* through the manifestations of the uncanny as a part of the grotesque body in the novel.

The futuristic landscape of England in *The Mummy!* is an uncanny space for the 19th century reader as a familiar setting for them is altered into an alien one. As it is mentioned, Industrial Revolution led to profound changes in the landscape of England with the formation of new industrial and urban areas to which many people from the rural areas moved for job opportunities. Therefore, it can be elicited that people in the early 19th century are affected by these rapid environmental changes which creates an uncanny disturbance. In the novel’s future, this transformation of the landscape is further augmented by not only reflecting the estrangement that is felt in the 19th century but also engendering an uncanny feeling for the reader. To illustrate, instead of the ancient way of sending posts, an extensive metal structure is built for communication throughout the country:

the letters were put into balls and discharged by steam-cannon, from place to place; every town and district having a piece of toile metallique, or woven wire, suspended in the air, so as to form a kind of net to arrest the progress of the ball (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 4, para. 10)

Given that the uncanny is a result of “something strange and unfamiliar unexpectedly arising in a familiar context,” this metal structure that covers the sky immediately projects an uncanny world when compared to the landscape of the 19th century (Royle, 2003, p. 1). Thus, the description also pictures an alien world as a part of the grotesque body of the novel. Another grotesque aspect of this construction is that the boundaries between natural/artificial are blurred since ‘weaving a net’ is an action that involves ‘threads’ made of natural materials such as cotton, instead of ‘metal wires’. This invention in the novel also can be deemed as a foreshadowing of the Internet, which is notably a combination of the words “inter” and “net” reflecting the features of the invention in the novel. Although they are situated underground, similar to Webb’s vision, the 21st century world is surrounded on a wide scale by wires through which information is carried.

Another grotesque-uncanny aspect of the setting in the novel is the city of London which is delineated as monstrous. In the novel, Lord Gustavus de Montfort offers a tour of the city to Edric upon learning that it is his first time being in London. He wants to show Edric the

immense metropolis, which then, spreading enormously in every direction, seemed like the fabled monster of the Indians, to stretch its enormous arms on every side and swallow up all the hapless villages which were so unfortunate as to fall within its reach (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 51)

The resemblance of the city to a monster immediately creates an uncanny disturbance for the reader since the city, which is home to many people, becomes unhomely; it turns into an “other,” a monster whose otherness is further accentuated by its origins in the East. The disproportioned and massive body parts of the monster heighten the effect of the grotesque along with the act of “swallowing” which is argued by Bakhtin (1984b) as having a grotesque relation with the concept of ‘death’ since “to die” has the connotation of “being swallowed”³⁵ (p. 301). The act of swallowing of the rural areas by the monstrous cities mirrors the growth of the cities and the impacts of the Industrial Revolution in 19th century as the revolution metamorphoses all that is familiar to the people. Significantly, this manifestation of the uncanny becomes an overlapping point of science fiction and the gothic, as the scientific progress and the growth of the city are likened to a monster.

The other inventions in the novel which create uncanniness are moveable and foldable houses. In the novel, the townhouses in London are placed on railways and can be moved on demand by a steam-powered engine. Dr Entwefen explains the convenience of this system by pointing out how it eliminates the “trouble in packing” while travelling to the countryside (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 7, para. 46). As an alternative, one can also have a pocket-size foldable “elastic summer-house” which reflects the carnivalesque logic of the inside-out (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 26, para. 22). The portrayal of moving and foldable houses in the story indeed defies the concept of a house and consequently set an ‘unhomely’ atmosphere. In line with the portrayal of the cities as monstrous, these portable houses in *The Mummy!* mirrors the

³⁵ This connection has been highlighted in detail in Chapter Two with regard to the ‘sarcophagus’ of Cheops.

sense of ‘unhomeliness’ which is risen from the rural-urban migration during the Industrial Revolution. One can also observe that through the absurdity of these inventions, the novel parodies the conceit of people who move the entire house instead of having the minor inconvenience of packing up to travel.

Webb’s story further presents artificial replicas of plants and automatons which are imitations of animals and humans. To begin with the prior ones, the carpet at the English Court is “an imitation of green moss” which is decorated with artificial flowers and cannot be separated from its lifelike counterpart insomuch as that one can mistake them for the real ones and attempt to pick them up (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 11, para. 1). Besides, in Webb’s (2018) story, the dancing room of the court is an “imitation grove” in which the music is played from the leaves of the trees “or from automaton birds” on their branches (Chapter 11, para. 1). Considering these, it can be argued that the artificial scenery provided by the imitations of the natural elements trespass the limits between natural and artificial, enhancing the grotesque imagery in the novel. Secondly, in addition to the automaton birds, 22nd century of the novel comprises other grotesque inventions such as ‘kitchen automatons’, ‘automaton surgeons’ and ‘automaton judges’ which blur the lines between the animate/inanimate. All these objects that seem real, can be considered as uncanny since it is a response to “lifelike or mechanical objects” (Royle, 2003, p. 2). Notably, the visionary fiction of Webb can also be observed in these automatons since in the present of 21st century, robots are a part of the equipment in surgeries while artificial intelligence is argued to be used in legal fields³⁶.

Carl Jung (1975) writes that “It is really the mistake of our age. We think it is enough to discover new things, but we [do not] realize that knowing more demands a corresponding development of our morality” (p. 212). Reflecting upon that, it can be seen that although Jane Webb’s 22nd century achieves great progress in science, *The Mummy!* discloses that people of this world fail to acknowledge the moral responsibility that comes with it. As it is previously mentioned, moral corruption lies at the heart of the novel: the conceit and discontent of people who always wants more. In accordance with that, it can be seen that the progress of science is steered by the same corrupt morality in the novel leading to a disastrous invasion of nature: “[with] the

³⁶ See footnote 41.

improvement of the arts and sciences; and so many new inventions ... [and] discoveries made ... poor nature seemed degraded from her throne, and usurping man to have stepped up to supply her place” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 14). The relation between the progress of science and nature is bounded by the relationship between humans and nature which is characterised by the carnivalesque ritual of crowning and decrowning in the novel as it is highlighted with the words *throne* and *degradation* in the given excerpt. Hence, by posing a warning sign that progress in science without followed by progress in morality leads to destruction, Jane Webb’s novel presents ecological concerns at the beginning of the *Anthropocene*³⁷.

The Mummy!’s ecocriticism cannot be separated from its critique of imperialism and colonialism, which are both empowered by the progress of science and influenced by moral decline. In the novel, “[w]ild schemes and gigantic speculations” enable a group of industrial entrepreneurs, who turn out to be colonisers, to gain a substantial sum of money which excites others to follow the same path even though they all already have a great amount of wealth (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 3). As a result of their wild contrivances,

New countries [are] discovered and civilized; the whole earth was brought to the highest pitch of cultivation; every corner of it was explored; mountains were levelled, mines were excavated, and the globe racked to its centre ... all nature was compelled to submit to the overwhelming supremacy of Man. (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 3)

It is revealed that their ‘wild schemes’ are colonising lands by making use of the progression of science and their wealth. It should be underlined that the word choice of the *scheme* is critical here as it means a plan that is *malicious* in nature and synonymous with conspiracy and scam. Their malevolent designs are also pictured as ‘monstrous,’ which is signified in the words wild and gigantic. All that is natural is manipulated by

³⁷ Anthropocene is defined “the most recent period in the earth's history, when human activities have a very important effect on the earth's environment and climate” (Cambridge University Press, n.d.). Although there is a debate about the start date of anthropocene, one of the main arguments is that antropocene has begun sometime around at the end of 18th century and the beginning of 19th century, a time period that involves the invention of the steam engine and the rise of the Industrial Revolution (Crutzen, 2002).

the hand of men insomuch as if the whole globe is wrecked by a monster. The resemblance becomes more clear when the narrator compares the present state of Anglo-Egypt with the one before its colonisation by the British and Americans, who put their imperialist agendas into action under the banner of a *civilizing mission*³⁸ which seemingly aims to improve the state of the less-developed countries. In the comparison, it is said that “[i]mprovement had turned her gigantic steps towards its once desert plains; ... manufactories and canals, spread in all directions” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 1). Despite the fact that the concept of improvement has positive connotations, the tone of the narrator is negative since the ‘gigantic steps’ ascribes a monstrous quality to these improvements whose ‘spreading’ also connotes contamination and diseases. Therefore, it can be seen that through grotesque imagery and positive negation, the novel criticises the ecological disruption brought on by the greed of imperialists and colonisers.

The mask of the civilising mission is thrown off by the mummy of Cheops in his description of Anglo-Egypt. In the novel, the narrator tells that British and American colonies “[swarm] like bees,” utilising a grotesque simile between human actions and animal behaviour (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 1). From their point of view, they convert the “barren plains” of Egypt “into fertile kingdoms” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 1). However, the illusion of improvement is dismissed with the animation of the mummy of Cheops who cannot recognize his hometown which he mistakes for Hades rather than a fertile kingdom:

What a dark, smoky mass of buildings now surrounds me!—Can this be the once proud Queen of Cities? ... is this the Nile? ... It is the fatal river of the dead. No papyrine boats glide smoothly on its surface; but strange, infernal vessels, vomiting forth volumes of fire and smoke. (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 76)

³⁸ The term civilising mission refers to the imperialist project that legitimizes the conquest and colonisation of non-European countries through the false claims of advancing the state of these countries to the level of European civilisation. Not only that the colonised people are degraded as they are redeemed as ‘barbarous’ and ‘primitive’ but also the alleged improvements are designed to benefit the coloniser. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon (1963) explains this project as follows: “[Colonialism] contents itself with bringing to light the natural resources, which it extracts, and exports to meet the needs of the mother country's industries ... But the rest of the colony follows its path of underdevelopment and poverty...” (p. 159).

Upon seeing his once mighty city, his homeland, catastrophically altered, this “revelation of something unhomely at the heart of hearth and home” creates an uncanny dislocation³⁹ for Cheops (Royle, 2003, p. 1). Instead of a developed city, what he describes is an environment that is polluted by the industrial transformation. In contrast to the papyrine boats of his time, steamboats float on the Nile polluting the water and air. Furthermore, it can be seen from his words that the river Nile is so disfigured that Cheops thinks it is the ‘river of the dead’. By revealing the improvements in Anglo-Egypt serve imperialist interests while destroying the lands, Cheops performs a carnivalesque unmasking in the novel and strengthens his role as a carnivalesque figure.

The Mummy! further displays the hypocrisy of scientific progress through the contrasting images between the improvements in Anglo-Egypt, which is unrevealed by Cheops, and its mother country Britain. Later in the novel when Cheops travels to England by mistake, he is presented with a different type of improvement in London. Beside the window in the mansion of Montagu, he realises the Thames River which reminds Cheops of his memories of the Nile: “Thus have I watched the Nile” says Cheops, the Thames River looks more similar to the Nile he remembers while he cannot recognise the real Nile in its current state (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 26). It is told by the narrator that “no house [is] permitted to approach within a certain distance of the Thames”, which keeps the gardens on its banks “beautiful in the extreme” in contrast to the appearance of the Nile (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 16, para. 77). Improvements in the city of London are quite different than those in Anglo-Egypt: London’s air is described as “pure and bright” thanks to the “abolition of coal and wood fires” and since they invented a new chemical substance for heat and light, “smoke was unknown” for English people (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 16, para. 77). Thus, the novel presents two contrasting images of scientific progress: the one in England which aims to improve the quality of life and protect the environment, and the one in Anglo-Egypt which aims to control the lands and get the highest yield for imperial interests on the expense of destroying the environment. This hypocrisy is subverted in the novel by creating a dialogue between these two countries.

Another carnivalesque aspect that should be emphasised is the reversal of the roles of coloniser and colonised in the novel. As Cheops watches the Nile, he laments

³⁹ The uncanniness of this scene, feeling ‘not at home’ at home, is also connected to Cheop’s analysis as a Kristevan deject in Chapter Two since both comprise a sense of *dislocation*.

the times when the Nile's waters rise and flood "to pour joy and plenty over the land" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 26). He further recites how when "all-bounteous Nature" completes its task, the water of the Nile returns back to "its natural bed" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 26). It can be seen in Cheops' reveries of the Nile that Ancient Egyptians embrace the river's cyclical nature to which they adapted themselves instead of controlling it. In contrast to their culture, Anglo-American colonisers exploit the Nile by building countless canals which ceases its natural cycles. In the novel, the tables are turned when the mummy of Cheops goes to England because while the colonisers control the lands of Anglo-Egypt, Cheops becomes in control of the fate of England by manipulating the course of events among the heirs to the throne. In fact, his arrival scene to England becomes a decrowning act since his fall from the balloon leads to the death of Queen Claudia, which starts the sequences of crowning and decrowning between Elvira and Rosabella. Inverting the hierarchy between the colonised and the coloniser, the mummy of Cheops, the renowned pharaoh of the lands that were once called Ancient Egypt, becomes the voice through which the colonies speak back in the novel. Not only he decrowns the coloniser from his position as the one in power, but also he takes control of the whole crowning and decrowning actions in England. Significantly, considering the pun on the word 'mummy', the mummy of Cheops can also be argued as a symbolical figure standing for 'mother nature' which figuratively reclaims its throne through this reversal of the roles.

In the dialogue between humans and nature in *The Mummy!*, the carnivalesque act of crowning and decrowning ends with the supremacy of humans being dethroned by nature. In the novel, Dr Entwerfen explains that Ancient Egyptians are known for worshipping "Nature" as their deity and "it was Nature that was typified in the Pyramids" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 6). The pyramids are described as sublime and majestic symbols of nature; they remain unchangeable through generations after generations, "seeming to look down with contempt upon the ephemeral structures with which they were surrounded" just as if they were granted to articulate words they would announce: "Avaunt, ye nothings of the day. Respect our dignity and sink into your original obscurity; for know, that we alone are monarchs of the plains" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 2). Therefore, the industrial settlement that is constructed by the imperialists is degraded by the everlasting masterworks of Ancient

Egyptians. As the doctor further notes, the pyramids stand as if they are “mocking the feeble efforts of man to divine their origin,” and degrade the humans whose scientific progress is not capable to discover how the pyramids are made (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 3). To illustrate in another scene, the novel pictures how nature reclaims her throne from the humans, who are pictured as transient creatures. The narrator describes a “funereal urn” that is called an “emblem of decay” which belongs to a former owner of the place; the urn’s then “white marble [is] stained with a dirty green” and intertwined by blooming “wild-flowers ... as though to mock the feeble efforts of man to perpetuate his name, and assert triumphantly the supremacy of Nature” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 15, para. 68). In this grotesque scenery where the juxtaposing images of life and death are portrayed as intermingled, it is highlighted that humans are not able to defy time as nature.

3.3. A (Un)civilised World: A Dialogue between Coloniser and Colonised

In this final part, building on the preceding discourse, the focus will be the carnivalesque subversion of western ethnocentrism which is expressed by the people of England in the novel who considers their country as superior in civilisation to Anglo-Egypt whom they see as barbarous. As it is highlighted, Bakhtin (1984b) discusses how carnival “liberate[s] from the prevailing point of view of the world, from conventions and established truths” (p. 34). In like manner, *The Mummy!* unsettles the binary of civilised and barbaric by disclosing that the two are not different but closely related to each other. When the mummy of Cheops appears in the scene in England, strange rumours start to circulate among the people as the narrator tells:

The extremes of ignorance and civilization tend alike to produce credulity, and the wildest ... stories were as greedily swallowed by the most enlightened people in the world, as they could have been even by a horde of uncultivated barbarians (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 12, para. 44).

Therefore, *The Mummy!* challenges the conventions about the concepts of “civilised” and “barbarous” by stating that there is a thin line between them. The novel breaks down these ethnocentric conceptions by a reversal of the norms of the civilised coloniser and the barbarous colonised, which can be seen in an analysis of England and

Anglo-Egypt's juristical systems staged in the court scenes, which are one of the comic doubles of the carnival⁴⁰ in Webb's story.

Altered by scientific advancements, the judicial system in England is run by automaton judges. In the novel, Prince Fredinand is tried for falling in love with the Queen and drawing swords with Lord Edmund in the Royal Garden, both of which are regarded as acts of treason. In the court, a wise-looking "automaton judge [sits] with great dignity upon a magnificent throne" accompanied by "a real jury," which is comprised of human members, and an "automaton counsel" which needs to be winded up by clerks in order to speak (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 133). It is said that the timing of the wind-up is important so that automaton counsel does not break the court's silence. Besides, they need to be winded up again in the case of malfunction. Therefore, although the judiciary is presented as improved with the involvement of the automatons, the novel satirises their need for humans to function properly and their errors which often interrupt the cases. This situation is further parodied in the scene when the automaton judge starts to criticise itself by stating its regret of being an 'insufficient' judge⁴¹. Standing among the audience in the court, Hans questions: "if thou art so unfit for the task, I wonder why the deuce they employed thee!" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 137). Through Hans, the novel satirizes the portrayal of automatons as a contribution to the judicial system.

The Mummy! further satirises "the excellent code of laws" of 22nd century England (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 1, para. 12). The automaton judge starts explaining the case to the court and wants the audience to picture in their minds the worst horrors they can think of such as the cry of the mothers whose children are murdered, "horrors of famine, fire, and carnage," misery of people who "[gnaw] the flesh from their own withering bones" out of starvation, desperate families who are surrounded by flames of fire, "witches celebrating their detested sabaoth," and "demons

⁴⁰ Refer to Chapter One for how comic doubles are used as a part of the double-voicedness (parody) of the carnivalesque text of the novel.

⁴¹ The large language model ChatGPT which is created by OpenAI (2023a) using artificial intelligence technology, generates the same answer of "I'm sorry, but as an AI language model, I cannot ..." to the questions which it cannot produce an answer, highlighting its own inefficiency. Significantly, in the novel, the automaton judge exhibits a similar attitude as it points out its inefficiency: "Sensible—oh! how deeply sensible, of my insufficiency! and of the much greater competency of any one of my learned brethren at the bar" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 36). The automaton emphasizes that human judges who studied law are more capable than itself, and ironically, as of March 2023, the new language model of OpenAI (2023b) called GPT-4 passes the bar exam.

indulging in their infernal revels” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 144). Then, the judge tells them the accusation is more horrifying than all of those as the prisoner is accused of daring “to fall in love with the Queen!” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 144). The whole speech in which the automaton judge lists the horrors abundant in grotesque imagery with the references such as death, starvation, witches, and demons. Webb’s novel again questions how “civilised” is a country whose law considers falling in love with the Queen more horrible than starvation or murder.

The corruption in the judicial system can be also observed in the unrealistic speech of the judge, the pleas of the witnesses, and the final decision. A factual train of thought cannot be observed during the litigation as the automaton judge includes the mythological deities in the case to defend his point: “Pluto rushed shivering from his nether throne, and Neptune waved in vain his tranquillizing trident” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 148). The plea of the defendant of Prince Ferdinand, Lord Maysworth, criticises the judge’s involvement of the deities in the trial, albeit his plea that is read by an automaton recites poems about falling in love to a great extent, which makes the scene absurd. Finally, at the end of the trial, the queen breaks in and exercises her right to set the prince free, a right that is granted to Elvira by the people who make her the absolute power in the country by abolishing all the laws and saying that “we own no law but her will” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 28, para. 57). Therefore, the novel parodies that the people who claim to be among the most civilised countries in the world are also the same people who accept to not have any rights but obey one person.

In the other part of the world in the novel, there is another trial which is in Anglo-Egypt, yet, the litigation in the court of the Anglo-Egyptians shows a fair and factual trial as opposed to the one in England. Edric and the doctor are tried because of their evil deed of profanation, which is re-animating the mummy. When compared to the crime of ‘falling in love with the Queen’, their “sacrilegious offence” can be considered more sensible as a crime since they do not respect the tradition and religion of the country and make an experiment on their sacred belongings without any permissions (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 4). Instead of an automaton judge, there is a human judge named Justice Freemantle in this court. The name that Webb gives to the judge can be interpreted as a symbolisation of justice in the court of Anglo-Egypt, while ‘Freemantle’ does have carnivalesque connotations as carnival frees the

people from all those normative constructions by dismantling them. When Freemantle starts to talk, he says that “you stand convicted,” after which he immediately corrects himself by saying “no, I mean accused”, therefore it can be seen that without any facts stated, he abstains from passing a judgement (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 4). Besides, the witnesses tell the chain of events without any mythological references or poetry in contrast to the speeches of in the court of England.

At one point in the trial, Edric claims that they are the victims because their balloon is stolen and the story of its abduction by Cheops is not believable. In response, Lycurgus of Anglo-Egypt says that “your observation is premature, young man; when the case has been proved against you, it will be time enough for you to think of your defence” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 26). His sagacious response indeed matches his name Lycurgus which is the name of “the lawgiver who founded most of the institutions of ancient Sparta” (Britannica, 2021). Furthermore, when Edric requests Freemantle to grant him privilege because he is a member of the Montagu family, a noble person, and the brother of England’s famous commander, Freemantle says to him: “only assure me upon your honour that you did not touch the mummy, and that you know nothing of what is become of it at present, and I will instantly order you to be set at liberty” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 10, para. 41). Hence, the trial in Anglo-Egypt can be considered as a fair trial as the judge does not give anyone privilege and states that the suspects will not be released until they are found innocent. At the end of the trial, the doctor confesses their experiment, and they are taken to prison.

Given these, it can be argued that the judicial system in Anglo-Egypt demonstrates the characteristics of a Socratic Dialogue which is, for Bakhtin, one of the main roots of carnivalesque together with Menippea. In the court of Anglo-Egypt, one can observe the essence of Socratic dialogue which is “the dialogic nature of truth, and the dialogic nature of human thinking about truth,” as explained by Bakhtin (1984a, p. 110). The litigation in Anglo-Egypt aims to find the truth by asking questions and evaluating the factual information while in England, there are exaggerated speeches about mythological beings and imaginary horrors without any contribution to the trial. The Socratic dialogue, as it is mentioned, is also the root of carnivalesque discourse because in the Socratic Dialogue, “The dialogic means of seeking truth is counterposed to official monologism, which pretends to possess a ready-made truth, and the naive self-confidence of those people who think ... they possess certain truths” (Bakhtin,

1984a, p. 110). In the same vein, not only that the litigation in Anglo-Egypt presents the characteristics of the Socratic Dialogue but by contrasting the courts, the novel itself presents a Socratic irony and dismantles the 'ready-made truth' that England is civilised while Anglo-Egypt is barbarous. Therefore, the carnivalesque discourse of the novel illustrates features of Socratic Dialogue and disrupts the discriminatory norms of western ethnocentrism.

Yet another carnivalesque subversion of the binary of civilised and barbarous can be observed in the novel through the character Dr Entwerfen. When they first arrive Anglo-Egypt and meet Justice Freemantle who welcomes them to the country, Dr Entwerfen says that "[w]hat a very civil, obliging, good-natured old gentleman" who surprises him as he was waiting to encounter "the greatest brutes [he] had ever met with" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 29). The doctor also tells Edric that he does not believe that the Ancient Egyptians were the ones who built the pyramids whom he calls "ignorant, Goth-like race of shepherds" because he thinks that building such structure requires "highly cultivated minds" which does not exist in them (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 9). However, the western ethnocentrism, through which he builds the idea of himself as superior as a civilized man and a scientist, is undermined through laughter in the novel. Although the novel presents many inventions that display the progress of science, as the character who symbolises science in the novel, Dr Entwerfen remains a comical figure⁴² who frequently finds himself in ridiculously unfortunate situations. To exemplify a such farcical scene, his steam valet explodes while brushing the collars of the doctor causing all the hot water to be sprayed on the doctor who gets furious while looking in a very ridiculous appearance. Moreover, in his arrival to Anglo-Egypt his "odd figure" becomes an object of entertainment for the Egyptians as he "[tries] to assume an air of majesty" while wearing "an asbestos cloak," and a "bob-wig" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 14). In the face of such appearance, the Egyptians "burst into immoderate fits of laughter" resonating with the laughter of the people in the carnival which liberates from all the norms through degradation (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 9, para. 14). Hence, the position of Dr

⁴² The farcical character of the doctor also parodies the gothic trope of the mad scientist, which is epitomized in Shelley's *Frankenstein*. Although Dr. Enwerfen displays the characteristics of the trope by pursuing the forbidden knowledge and trespassing the boundaries of nature, his comical features juxtapose with the elements of isolation and madness that are found in the trope of the mad scientist.

Entwerfen as a civilised man and a man of science is unsettled through carnivalesque laughter in *The Mummy!*.

All things considered, this chapter aimed to examine carnivalesque discourse in the matrix of socio-political, cultural, literary, and historical dimensions of the novel by focusing on the three great dialogues: the one among the social classes, the one among nature, human, and the progress of science, and the one between the coloniser and the colonised. In the analysis, the chapter revealed that the satirical criticism of *The Mummy!* is achieved through a multitude of carnivalesque elements: reversals, irony, satire, disruption of the hierarchal norms, laughter (parody), crowning and decrowning, positive negation of marketplace language, uncanny in the grotesque body, abolition of the verbal etiquette, the notion of renewal in the socio-political changes, the unmasking of the false claims, mystifications, travesties, and Socratic Dialogue. This chapter also investigated the question that is posed at the beginning: What is it that Mummy laughs at? As it is discussed, the mummy of Cheops laughs at the greed of humans who creates a world out-of-joint in the 22nd century where the learned members of society work as servants while the country is ruled by people who do not have a thought of their own, where the ecology of the whole globe and the homes of colonised people are destructured to acquire more power and wealth. It is unfolded in Webb's tale that progress in science without being followed by moral obligations results in an upside-down world. In such a world, by the power that he does not reveal, Cheops is "permitted for a time to revisit earth" with a task "to assist the good and punish the malevolent" (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 115). Completing his task, the Mummy returns to his tomb where he gives a moral lesson⁴³ to Edric about how to live happily, strengthening his role as a comic monster one last time. Thus, in the carnival of *The Mummy!*, monsters undertake the moral responsibility of intervening in the moral decline of human beings. Jane Webb's tale leaves the reader with one last reversal: Monsters can be heroes, and humans can be scarier than monsters.

⁴³ The last words of the Mummy are intertextually connected with Victor Frankenstein's last words to Walton in Mary Shelley's (2012a) *Frankenstein* as he says "Farewell, Walton! Seek happiness in tranquility, and avoid ambition..." (p. 239).

CONCLUSION

As the narrator of *The Mummy!* writes, “My tale is nearly closed, for dull must be the mind that cannot picture all the rest” (Webb-Loudon, 2018, Chapter 32, para. 70). At the end of the novel, the carnival ends. Carnival throws off all the masks, exposing the characters’ true identities. The last dethronement takes place when the army of Elvira and Roderick, who are now happily married, reclaims the throne from Rosabella. At the moment they arrive, everyone learns that Father Morris is actually Duke Edgar who is known to be dead. While he tries to protect his daughter Rosabella, his real daughter, Pauline, enters the room and it is disclosed that Marienne sold Pauline to a Spanish couple years ago, and gave Rosabella, her own daughter, to Duke Edgar. In the carnival of the novel, Rosabella, the daughter of the servant, becomes the Queen and when the carnival ends with the novel, she is dethroned by the true heir to the throne, Elvira. The mummy of Cheops returns to his tomb in the pyramid and continues his sleep for the dead must remain dead, and the natural laws are reset when the carnival ends.

This thesis aimed to read Jane Webb’s *The Mummy!: Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century* as an epitome of the carnivalesque novel to address the lack of critical attention given to her novel and to reclaim its place in speculative fiction as one of the pioneers of modern science fiction. With these objectives, the present thesis also aimed to contribute to the foundation of a critical discourse on the novel in order to inspire future studies. The reading is carried through three main chapters focusing on three significant carnivalesque aspects of the novel, which are, its text, monster, and critique.

The first chapter investigated the carnivalesque text of the novel through the concept of dialogism and the theory of the novel in Bakhtinian discourse. Weaving a thread between the polyphonic (dialogic) novel and the carnivalesque lineage in its history of development, the polyphonic composition of *The Mummy!* is analysed as an element of its carnivalesque text. Underlining that polyphony is created through a dialogical interaction of distinct voices with the other under equal terms, polyphony in the novel is discussed through the clash of idea-forces of Edric and Edmund which reflects mind-body dualism, and through the dialogues of English characters with Cheops who symbolises ‘the other’ as a monster and the pharaoh of Anglo-Egypt. It is also revealed that the metafictional dialogue between the writer and the reader enriches

polyphony in the novel along with the theme of masks, the cross-dressings, and the portrayal of multilayered time and space. In the second part, the chapter focused on the novelistic discourse in *The Mummy!* through polyglossia, heteroglossia, and parody. Polyglossia is analysed in the characters who have various nationalities and in the setting which comprises distant countries. Heteroglossia is exemplified in the stratified languages of the social groups in the novel, the idiosyncratic use of punctuation in the speeches of the automatons and the Mummy, and the representation of diverse accents and dialects in the novel. Furthermore, explaining Bakhtin's emphasis on the novel genre as an embodiment of heteroglossia, as a centrifugal force that disunifies the monologic construction of the canonical works of literature such as epic, the chapter evaluated *The Mummy's* incorporation of the multiple genres as heteroglossia, as a defiance to be put into a generic frame, and as an anticanonical. Parody which Bakhtin also refers to as 'laughter', is also discussed as a part of the carnivalesque text of the novel and analysed through the novel's self-parody of the gothic genre, and comic doubles. The final section of the chapter concentrated on intertextuality and metafiction in the novel as carnivalesque elements. Establishing a link between Bakhtin's dialogism and Kristeva's intertextuality, the intertextuality in *The Mummy!* is argued through its hypotext *Frankenstein*; its self-conscious intertextuality created by the narrator's pursuit for novelty that suggests a comparison between the novel with the ones preceding it, and the literary and historical allusions. Metafiction, on the other hand, is argued as a carnivalesque element since both break down the barriers between the stage and life, and it is illustrated in the novel's narrator who acts like an 'intrusive author' in her comments about the characters, events, and readers.

With the purpose of acclaiming its place among the canonical monsters of literature, the second chapter defined the mummy of Cheops as a carnivalesque monster in three sections which concentrated on its genesis story, its abject-grotesque body, and its role as a laughing devil of Romantic grotesque. Firstly, the intertextual motif of Faustian transgression and the carnivalesque-menippean elements are disclosed in the genesis narrative of the Mummy. Faustian overreaching is exemplified in the Edenic allusions and biblical references in the speeches of Edric, who mirrors *Frankenstein* in his desire for the forbidden knowledge. However, it is pointed out that their storylines after the resuscitation of the monsters and their ultimate purposes differ from each other. Edric's ultimate purpose in animating the mummy, his philosophical quest of finding

out the state of the soul after death, is argued as an element of menippea in the novel. In the second section, the chapter analysed the abject-grotesque body of the monster. Establishing the mummy of Cheops as an abject figure through a comparison with the canonical gothic monsters in *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *Dr Jekyll ve Mr Hyde*, and *The Phantom of the Opera*, the chapter discussed that although the Mummy is an abject figure, he does not follow the same process of abjection that is observed in these monsters. It is highlighted that, as a monster of gothic parody, the mummy of Cheops subverts the conventional representation of the gothic monsters as the abject other through a carnivalesque inversion in which the abject other becomes the central figure in the carnival. Hence, it is asserted that he is a celebratory and subversive manifestation of abject, which is analysed in the grotesque body of the Mummy. Explaining that the grotesque in medieval carnivals are manifested through the material body principle and degradation, the chapter explored the grotesque body of the Mummy through the cave of his tomb, which is read as a metaphor for the womb and a projection of the threshold chronotope in the novel. The reanimation scene with its dancing and laughing mummies is also exemplified as a part of the Mummy's grotesque body since the concepts of death and birth clash in the grotesque imagery of the scene. Furthermore, the double meaning in the 'mummy' is read as another grotesque element since Bakhtin considers the images of 'pregnant death' or 'pregnant monster' as significant grotesque elements of medieval carnivals. In the final section, the chapter evaluated the mummy of Cheops as a devil figure in the novel referring to the scenes where he acts as a deceiver or tempter. The chapter concluded that the Mummy is a combination of the comic devil of the mediaeval carnivals and the melancholic devil of the Romantic grotesque. Lastly, the chapter unveiled his laughter as a quintessential carnivalesque characteristic of the Mummy, whose laughter shows a tendency with the infernal and sarcastic laughter of the Romantic devil as he mocks the people of England in the 22nd-century novel.

The purpose of the third and final chapter was to scrutinize the carnivalesque discourse in the novel's critique of the socio-political, cultural, literary, and historical dimensions of Jane Webb's period. Focusing on the three great dialogues in the novel – the dialogue between the social classes, the dialogue among nature, humans, and the progress of science, and the dialogue between the coloniser and the colonised – the chapter revealed that in the core of all of them stands the deterioration of moral principles which is caused by greed and conceit. In the first section of the chapter, the

utopian nature of the novel is analysed through the revolutions that took place in the novel, which are elucidated as a reflection of the carnivalesque notion of renewal and a projection of the act of mock crowning and decrowning. Later on, the chapter analysed the reversal of the social roles in 22nd century England, in which the high classes are not educated since it is out of trend while the low classes are learned members of society. In addition to these reversals, it is revealed that the novel stages a carnivalesque unmasking of the false titles of the members of the ruling class who hide their ignorance behind their verbose yet vacuous speeches. Furthermore, the inversion of gender roles in the cross-dressing scenes is emphasized as a feminist critique of the gender norms both in society and fiction. In the second part, the chapter investigated the dialogue among nature, humans, and the progress of science, whose relationship is argued to be reflecting the carnivalesque ritual of crowning and decrowning. It is remarked that the improvement in science is pictured as monstrous in the novel while nature is presented as dethroned by scientific progress. Employing Darko Suvin's cognitive estrangement, which is analysed in the novel through the spatiotemporal layers in the narration, the chapter examined the advancement of science in the uncanny elements of *The Mummy!*'s grotesque body. Furthermore, it is claimed that the novel poses an ecocriticism through the portrayal of scientific progress as destructive and monstrous. The ecocritical stand of the novel is also explained in relation to its criticism of imperialism and colonialism as the lands of the colonised country are manipulated by industrial constructions to benefit imperial interests. As the last point, through a comparison between the judicial systems in England and Anglo-Egypt, the chapter demonstrated that *The Mummy!* breaks down the hierarchy between the coloniser and colonised by reversing the dichotomy of the civilized coloniser and the barbarous colonised. In the end, the chapter revealed that the novel presents a moral lesson about greed and conceit and, through the agency of the Mummy, advises the reader to be content and not seek what transgresses the limits of moral boundaries.

Since all the endings are beginnings in the carnival, an accurate conclusion of this reading of Jane Webb's *The Mummy!: Or a Tale of the Twenty-Second Century* as a carnivalesque novel can be unveiled through a revisit to the beginning of the tale. To write about Jane Webb and her novel is also to write about women and fiction. In 1928, when she is asked to give a speech about women and fiction, Virginia Woolf (2015) imagines a woman narrator, who lost in thought, finds herself "walking with extreme

rapidity across a grass plot” (p. 5). In a similar way, at the beginning of Webb’s (2018) novel, the narrator, who is lost in thought, find[s] herself in a “fertile valley richly wooded ... [and] recline[s] languidly on [her] grassy couch” and thinks to herself, “Why should I seek to wander in the regions of fiction?” (Introduction, para. 3). The narrator of Woolf (2015), now walking on the grass, recognizes a man and cannot make sense of his expression, then she remembers: “he was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars [which happen to be men] are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me” (p. 5). She is not allowed to walk on the grass which is secluded for the male fellows of the university. In her book, *A Room of Ones Own*, which is based on her two lectures about women and fiction, Woolf (2015) writes that when the “early nineteenth-century novelists” wanted to put the pen to paper, “they had no tradition behind them ... no common sentence ready for [their] use” (p. 56). She argues the lack of tradition behind the fiction written by women in contrast to the male writers who have a centuries-old tradition of literature behind them. Reflecting the concerns of Woolf, the narrator of Jane Webb (2018), an early 19th-century novelist, cannot find how to write about a hero: “I could not bear any thing common-place, and I did not know what to do for a hero ... Heroes are generally so much alike, ... so completely brothers of one race, with the family likeness so amazingly strong” (Introduction, para. 1). Therefore, in line with the Woolf observation about the novel genre, which she thinks was the most appropriate form for women’s writing in early 19th century as it was a comparatively new genre at that time, the narrator of Jane Webb or rather Jane Webb herself, decides to write something new, something that has never been written, with an uncommon hero, in an unknown world. A hundred years before the speech of Virginia Woolf, Jane Webb (2018) does trespass the gravel and writes a story that she describes as “out of the beaten path” (Introduction, para. 1).

The mummy of King Cheops, as of 2023, has not yet been found.

REFERENCES

- Aldiss, B. W. (1973). *Billion Year Spree: The True History of Science Fiction*. Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Alkon, P. K. (1987). *Origins of Futuristic Fiction*. The University of Georgia Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984a). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984b). *Rabelais and His World*. (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans., M. Holquist, Ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Barta, P. I., Miller, P. A., Platter, C., & Shepherd, D. (2001). Beginning the Dialogue: Bakhtin and Others. In P. I. Barta, P. A. Miller, C. Platter, & D. Shepherd (Eds.). *Carnivalizing Difference: Bakhtin and the Other* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.
- Beal, T. K. (2002). *Religion and Its Monsters*. Routledge.
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). *The Second Sex*. (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2021). Lycurgus. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lycurgus-Spartan-lawgiver>
- Burke, E. (1990). *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. (A. Phillips, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Anthropocene. In *Cambridge dictionary*. Retrieved April 5, 2023, from
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/anthropocene>
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, J. J. (1996). Monster Culture (Seven Theses). In J. J. Cohen (Ed.). *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (pp. 3–25). University of Minnesota Press.

- Crutzen, P. J. (2002). Geology of mankind. *Nature*, 415(23).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/415023a>
- Dentith, S. (1995). *Bakhtinian Thought*. Routledge.
- Doody, M. A. (1997). *The True Story of the Novel*. Rutgers University Press.
- Douglas, H. (n.d.). grotto. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/grotto>
- Gardiner, M. (1992). *The Dialogics of Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*. Routledge.
- Gardiner, M., & Bell, M. M. (1998). Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: A Brief Introduction. In M. Gardiner & M. M. Bell (Eds.). *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words* (pp. 1–12). SAGE Publications.
- Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of utopia. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved March 10, 2023, from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/utopia>
- Hogle, J. E. (2002). Introduction: the Gothic in western culture. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 1–20). Cambridge University Press.
- Hogle, J. E. (2012). The Gothic Ghost of the Counterfeit and the Progress of Abjection. In D. Punter (Ed.), *A New Companion to the Gothic* (pp. 496–509). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Hutcheon, L. (1980). *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Hutcheon, L. (1983). The Carnavalesque and Contemporary Narrative: Popular Culture and the Erotic. *Revue De L'Universite D'Ottawa/University of Ottawa Quarterly*, 53(1), 83–94.
- Jameson, F. (2005). *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. Verso.

- Jung, C. G. (1975). *Letters, vol. 2: 1951-1961* (R. F. Hull, Trans., G. Adler & A. Jaffe, Eds.). NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kant, I., & Guyer, P. (2000). Editor's introduction. In P. Guyer (Ed.), P. Guyer & E. Matthews (Trans.). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (pp. xii–lii). Cambridge University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. (T. Gora, A. Jardine, & L. S. Roudiez, Trans., L. S. Roudiez, Ed.). Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of Horror: An Essay of Abjection*. New York: Columbia
- Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language*. (M. Waller, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J., & Moi, T. (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. (T. Moi, Ed.). Columbia University Press.
- Lanthers, Y. and Vale, Malcolm G.A. (2022, November 9). St. Joan of Arc. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Saint-Joan-of-Arc>
- Lodge, D. (1993). *The Art of Fiction*. Viking Penguin.
- Longinus, C., & Roberts, W. R. (2005). On the Sublime. In H. Adams & L. Searle (Eds.), *Critical Theory Since Plato* (3rd ed., pp. 95–118). Wadsworth Publishing.
- Lorenz, H. (2020). Ancient Theories of Soul. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2009 ed.). Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2009/entries/ancient-soul/>
- Loudon, J. W., & Loudon, J. C. (1845). An Account of the Life and Writings of John Claudius Loudon. In *Self-instruction for Young Gardeners* (pp. ix–lii). Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1994). *Lessons on the Analytic of the Sublime*. Stanford University Press.

- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.-a). Ignis fatuus. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved March 10, 2023, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ignis%20fatuus>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.-a). Sarcophagus. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved March 10, 2023, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sarcophagus>
- Mir, C. (2014). Mummy. In J. A. Weinstock (Ed.). *The Ashgate Encyclopedia of Literary and Cinematic Monsters* (pp. 425–430). Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics Literature*. Stanford University Press.
- OpenAI. (2023a). *ChatGPT* (Mar 14 version) [Large language model]. <https://chat.openai.com/chat>
- OpenAI. (2023b) GPT-4 Technical Report. Retrieved March 15, 2023, from <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf>
- Peters, R. S., & Mace, C. A. (2006). Psychology. In D. M. Borchert (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2nd ed., Vol. 8, pp. 117–150). Macmillan Reference USA.
- Plato (2011). *Plato: Meno and Phaedo* (A. Long, Trans., D. Sedley, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Rauch, A. (2001). *Useful Knowledge: The Victorians, Morality, and the March of Intellect*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Renfrew, A. (2015). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Routledge.
- Royle, N. (2003). *The Uncanny*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (2012). *The Tragedy of Hamlet*. (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Sheehan, T. (2015). *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*. Rowman & Littlefield.

- Shelley, M. (2012a). *Frankenstein*. (K. Scherf & D. L. Macdonald, Eds.). Broadview Press.
- Shelley, M. (2012b). Introduction to *Frankenstein*, Third Edition (1831). In J. P. Hunter (Ed.). *Frankenstein* (3rd ed., Ser. Norton Critical Edition, pp. 165–169). essay, W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stallybrass, P., & White, A. (1986). *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca Cornell University Press.
- Stam, R. (1989). *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stoker, B. (1983). *Dracula*. Oxford University Press.
- Suvin, D. (1979). *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. Yale University Press.
- Suvin, D. (1988). *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*. Kent State University Press.
- Utopia. (n.d.). In *Oxford Reference*. Retrieved March 10, 2023, from <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803115009560>.
- Vice, S. (1997). *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester University Press
- Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Seminar Press.
- Walpole, H. (2014). *The Castle of Otranto*. (N. Nick Groom, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Wandless, W. H. (2014). Devil, The. In J. A. Weinstock (Ed.). *The Ashgate Encyclopedia of Literary and Cinematic Monsters* (pp. 155–160). essay, Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Webb-Loudon, J. (2018). *The Mummy! A Tale of the Twenty-Second Century*. Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/56426/56426-h/56426-h.htm>

Weinstock, J. A. (2014). Introduction: Monsters are the Most Interesting People. In J. A. Weinstock (Ed.). *The Ashgate Encyclopedia of Literary and Cinematic Monsters* (pp. 1–7). essay, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Woolf, V. (2015). *A Room of One's Own*. (D. Bradshaw & S. N. Clarke, Eds.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

