

The Portrayal of Count Dracula in Kostova's *The Historian*, Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt's *Dracula: The Un-Dead* and Newman's *Anno Dracula*

Kirsty ten Bos

Abstract

Dracula is sinds zijn eerste verschijning in Bram Stoker's gelijknamige boek uitgegroeid tot een bijna legendarisch personage. De vampierschurk heeft als inspiratie gediend voor verscheidene adaptaties. Deze adaptaties beperken zich niet tot slechts een enkel medium, maar verschijnen in verschillende media. De meest prominente voorbeelden zijn verschenen in de vorm van een film of boek. Hoewel deze scriptie zich focust op drie boekadaptaties van Dracula, wordt ook de connectie met filmadaptaties besproken, vanwege de onmiskenbare invloed van de films op de boeken. De boekadaptaties die onderzocht worden zijn Elizabeth Kostova's *The Historian*, Dacre Stoker en Ian Holt's *Dracula: The Un-Dead* en Kim Newman's *Anno Dracula*. Het is noemenswaardig dat de drie boeken er allen voor hebben gekozen om de vampier te portretteren als Vlad Tepes, terwijl Bram Stoker's Dracula geen kopie van Tepes was. Dit is een van de aspecten waarin de boeken beïnvloed zijn door filmadaptaties. In ieder van de drie boeken wordt Dracula's uiterlijk onderzocht en daarnaast is er ook aandacht voor facetten die uniek zijn per boek. Om dit goed te kunnen doen is ervoor gekozen om intertekstualiteit als theoretisch kader te gebruiken met daarnaast *adaptation studies*. Dit laatste is belangrijk, omdat film een grote invloed heeft op de boekadaptaties.

Keywords

Dracula
 Bram Stoker
 Vlad Tepes
 Adaptations (adaptaties)
 Intertextuality (intertekstualiteit)
Dracula: The Un-Dead
 Dacre Stoker
 Ian Holt
The Historian
 Elizabeth Kostova
Anno Dracula
 Newman
 Film adaptations (filmadaptaties)

Table of Contents

<i>Chapter 1: Introduction</i>	
1.1. Introduction to the topic	4
1.2. Dracula and Vlad Tepes	10
1.3 The vampire in folklore versus Bram Stoker's vampire	13
<i>Chapter 2: The Historian and Dracula</i>	
2.1. A short introduction to <i>The Historian</i>	15
2.2. Dracula's appearance	17
2.3. Dracula as a solitary villain	18
2.4. Dracula, the historian	19
2.5. Conclusion	21
<i>Chapter 3: Dracula The Un-Dead and Dracula</i>	
3.1. A short introduction to <i>Dracula The Un-Dead</i>	24
3.2. Dracula's appearance	26
3.3. Dracula, God's warrior	28
3.4. Dracula, the dark prince	29
3.5. Conclusion	33
<i>Chapter 4: Anno Dracula and Dracula</i>	
4.1. A short introduction to <i>Anno Dracula</i>	35
4.2. Dracula's appearance	36
4.3. Dracula, the Prince Consort, and law and order	40
4.4. Dracula and Jack the Ripper	42
4.5. Conclusion	45
<i>Chapter 5: Analysis of the results and conclusion</i>	
5.1. Introduction to the analysis	49
5.2. Dracula's appearance in the adaptations	50
5.3. Book specific aspects of Dracula	52
5.4. Conclusion	55
<i>Bibliography</i>	57

Introduction

1.1. Introduction to the topic

Count Dracula, the villain from Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897) has become almost a legendary character since his first appearance and Stoker's novel has been adapted numerous times throughout the last century. Browning and Picart express that the success of *Dracula* is certainly rare: "Like Dracula himself, the story's ability to endlessly shapeshift seems to be an essential key to its immortality" (17). Although this immortality ascertains that the novel and its vampire villain are not forgotten, there are also more negative sides to this success, at least if one tries to get a pure view on *Dracula*. In the Yorkshire Post, Christopher Frayling describes how the popularity of *Dracula* has influenced the audience: "It's moved from the world of literature to the world of myth where people think they've read it. There's sort of a parallel text going on which is all these accretions that have happened in the 20th-century [sic]" (par 10). *Dracula* has become the type of novel that has been adapted in various ways and as it is such a well-known book, it seems as if (almost) everyone knows it, but yet, at the same time many are influenced by the adaptations and not by the book itself. The story of the adaptations differ from the original and the character of Dracula has been portrayed in various ways, too.

This adaptability of the vampire is visible within the film industry, as there are numerous film adaptations featuring Dracula, but it is also apparent in literature and popular fiction. Three examples of books that feature the Count are *The Historian* by Elizabeth Kostova, *Anno Dracula* by Kim Newman, and *Dracula The Un-Dead* by Stoker's great-grandnephew Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt. This thesis will focus on these three books and the original *Dracula* novel and there will also be references to relevant film adaptations, as these are important influences on the novels, as well as the original novel. To be more specific: the focus will lie on their representation or adaptation of the character of Dracula.

The field of Dracula studies is a field that has been explored abundantly by critics. One of the most prolific writers on the topic of Bram Stoker's Count is Elizabeth Miller, who is for instance responsible for the research that concludes that it seems very unlikely that Bram Stoker based his Count Dracula on Vlad Tepes. She hereby challenges the popular misconception that links Count Dracula to Vlad Tepes: "There is not the slightest bit of evidence to prove such knowledge, either in Stoker's sources, his Notes or the novel itself" (Miller par. 16). Miller is an expert on this subject, as she and Eighthen-Bisang wrote *Bram*

Stoker's Notes for Dracula; a book that contains Bram Stoker's notes, which were both hand-written and typed text. Miller and Eighteen-Bisang have annotated and transcribed Stoker's notes and bound them with the original. Aside from these two works, Miller has also been active in other research about *Dracula* and its famous Count, which will not be fully listed here, as the list is extensive. Yet, it is worth mentioning that one of the three aforementioned novels contains an afterword written by Miller herself. This afterword can be found in *Dracula: The Un-Dead*, which has been written by Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt.

Although one might say that Miller is the greatest name in *Dracula* studies, there are many others that have also added their work, such as Rottenbacher, Sahay and Bird. Rottenbacher discusses how *Dracula* has transformed from a monster in the original novel into a seductive character in the films, and although this thesis deals with novels, there might be filmic influences in them, and therefore these aspects are looked into, as well. Sahay describes this shift from *Dracula*, the monster, to *Dracula*, the seducer and links it to a shift towards individualism in society. It is worth noting that nothing has been written about *The Historian* and *Dracula: The Un-Dead* yet in connection with the character *Dracula* as portrayed in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Kathryn Bird has written an article on *Anno Dracula*, though, in connection to *Dracula*, Victorian Values and "Ripperature," (Bird 3) which is the term she uses to label literature concerning Jack the Ripper. As only Bird has written on *Anno Dracula* thus far, and no academic research has until now been done on *The Historian* and *Dracula: The Un-dead* in connection to Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, this specific angle will give new and unique insights to the adaptations of Stoker's *Dracula* character in these three novels. The question central to this research is the following: How is *Dracula* portrayed when it comes to his appearance, characterisation and adaptation in *The Historian*, *Dracula: The Un-Dead* and *Anno Dracula*, and how does this compare to the way in which he is portrayed in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and relevant film adaptations?

Although Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is certainly important, as it is the source in which the character of the Count appeared first, the main focus are the adaptations and only those aspects of the *Dracula* novel that are essential to this research will be pointed out and looked into. The book adaptations of *Dracula* will also be compared to the film adaptations discussed by Rottenbacher. He examines more recent *Dracula* films, such as *Dracula 2000*, *Dracula Rising*, and *Dark Prince: The True Story of Dracula* and finds that: "It is worth examining the physical representations of Count *Dracula* in these films to note the extent to which they adhere to or depart from Stoker's original concept" (Rottenbacher par. 4). In these newer *Dracula* adaptations, the Count is portrayed as a seductive, tragic hero figure. This could not

be further from the way in which Bram Stoker described the Count in his novel through the eyes of Jonathan Harker:

His face was a strong – a very strong – aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale and at the tops extremely pointed; the chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of extraordinary pallor. (B. Stoker 29)

This description of Dracula does not put him in a very attractive light, which is in contrast with the way in which he is portrayed in the newer film adaptations, according to Rottenbacher. Dracula is described with “a lofty domed forehead,” which might be linked to dwarfism in a way, he has a mouth that was “cruel-looking” and “sharp white teeth.” The description of the mouth is characteristic for vampires, but the description of his ears as “extremely pointed” makes one think of some kind of elf. Yet, still this description is significantly different from the view that comes to mind when one thinks of a modern-day film vampire. While this thesis does not look directly at film adaptations, it is certainly interesting to look at the adaptations of Dracula in the books that will be discussed.

Film adaptations are in a different medium than the book adaptations that will be investigated, yet they have a significant influence on the novels that cannot be neglected. As adaptations can be compared to translations or paraphrases (Hutcheon 16-17), one could say that the film and novel adaptations are different versions of the same original. Yet, this original, in our case Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* and more specifically its Count, will change after adaptation, according to Bruhn. Once a source is adapted the original is changed. He describes the example of a text being turned into film. Although he admits the amount of words in the text do not change, there will be editorial and/or changes in reception. (Bruhn 73). The first category is relatively easy to see; after a book has been made into a film, for instance, a new version may be published with the film poster as cover. The differentiation in reception by readers is less simple to summarize, as it is such a large category:

Including ‘popular’ readers acknowledging new aspects to an otherwise well-known text after an adaptation; expert/professional readers’ discussions of adaptations as ‘interpretations’ of a work; changes in hierarchical position to canon-formation or age-differentiation (a children’s book being transformed into a grown up text, for instance). (Bruhn 73)

This is why the film adaptations are important when investigating the three book adaptations in connection to Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*; these films have changed the way the book is perceived by the audience and therefore the adapted novels will inevitably be influenced by the film adaptations.

The topic that will be discussed in this thesis is most fit to be investigated with the help of the theory and methodology of intertextuality and adaptation studies. The use of these concepts is essential for this topic, as it is concerned with several texts and explores the relations between the source text (Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*) and the adaptations. The use of adaptation studies and intertextuality will be used in connection to each other, as the adaptation and the adapted cannot be seen without the other in this thesis. Also, the fact that the focus lies on the three novels makes it impossible to leave intertextual relationships out of this. The concept of adaptation studies has already been mentioned briefly in connection to the *Dracula* films and their influence on the book adaptations, but there is more that needs to be addressed concerning this methodological framework.

In this thesis adaptation studies will mainly be used for defining the theoretical boundaries of the adaptation side of the investigation. A crucial aspect is therefore to determine what definition is given to the word “adaptation” in this thesis. Hutcheon has a neat definition that is helpful: “As a creative and interpretive transposition of a recognizable other work or works, adaptation is a kind of extended palimpsest and, at the same time, often a transcoding into a different set of conventions” (33). Although this definition describes what falls under adaptation, it does not specify its boundaries. Not all products inspired by other products result in an adaptation. Hutcheon answers the question of what is not an adaptation as follows: “In answer to this question, defining an adaptation as an extended, deliberate, announced revisitation of a particular work of art does manage to provide some limits: short intertextual allusions to other works or bits of sampled music would not be included” (170). The boundary Hutcheon describes here has been used to determine whether or not the three novels under discussion are adaptations and the conclusion is that they are. There may be one remaining question for those that are not familiar with adaptations that are

created within the same medium as the original, but Hutcheon is clear on this point: “Sometimes, but not always, this transcoding entails a change of medium” (33-34). In other words, it is not essential for an adaptation to be of a different medium than the original. Books can therefore be adaptations of other books.

Aside from adaptation studies, it is unavoidable to refrain from making use of intertextuality for our investigation. In order to determine how to use intertextuality, it is useful to compare what some of the experts on this concept say, such as Genette, Allen and Riffaterre.. In *Palimpsests*, Genette offers an interesting definition of the subject of poetics: “Today I prefer to say, more sweepingly, that the subject of poetics is *transtextuality*, or the textual transcendence of the text, which I have already defined roughly as ‘all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts’” (1). Although Genette discusses transtextuality here, his definition is related to intertextuality, too, he namely sees intertextuality as one of “five types of transtextual relationships” (1). It is useful to understand that Genette sees it as such, as it makes it easier to understand his definition of intertextuality, which he defines:

As a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another. In its most explicit and literal form, it is the traditional practice of *quoting* (with quotation marks, with or without specific references). In another less explicit and canonical form, it is the practice of *plagiarism*, which is an undeclared but still literal borrowing. Again, in still less explicit and less literal guise, it is the practice of *allusion*: that is, an enunciation whose full meaning presupposes the perception of a relation between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible” (1-2).

Genette’s definition is certainly useful, as it is specific and creates a clear boundary between what is and what is not intertextuality. His definition will be used as the leading description for intertextuality in this thesis when considering whether or not certain references should be considered intertextual relationships.

Graham Allen has also written about intertextuality and although Genette’s definition is the one preferred in this thesis, it is still interesting to take more than one definition into account. Allen argues that: “Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text into a

network of textual relations. The text becomes the intertext” (1). This point of view is useful, yet he is not as specific as Genette, even though his definition is correct, as well. Although intertextuality is a concept that is used often by academics, Allen warns that it is not a simple concept: “Intertextuality, one of the central ideas in contemporary literary theory, is not a transparent term and so, despite its confident utilization by many theorists and critics, cannot be evoked in an uncomplicated manner” (2). It is crucial for this research to keep in mind that intertextuality is a complicated concept, as this asks for a very careful handling of the concept. It is relatively easy to see connections between the different sources, but it is dangerous to assume that there is only one reason for these connections, when there may be more.

The third expert on the concept of intertextuality that will be discussed is Riffaterre, who describes intertextuality for both literary and non-literary texts: “Textuality, however, is inseparable from intertextuality. Because of their practical, pragmatic, utilitarian aims, non-literary texts rely on referentiality to carry meaning and on explanatory features to clarify it. By contrast, literary texts replace referentiality with ad hoc linkages from sign-system to sign-system” (Riffaterre 781). The way Riffaterre sees it, it is impossible to have a text without intertextuality. All texts gain meaning from something they refer to. This can be seen at a basic level, for instance because we have given words a certain meaning, for example the word “table” that is meant to refer to the object we have named a “table.”

Riffaterre claims that: “The control that text and intertext exercise upon each other is not unlike the functioning of an entropic system” (786). Thus it could become incredibly complicated to find the messages that one needs to find, but Riffaterre fortunately also describes how intertextuality should not take into account irrelevant information: ‘Intertextuality, by contrast, excludes irrelevant data. It underscores the main point(s) of the text by making explicit those data that are only implied or presupposed in the text, thus defining their relevance. The remainder is excluded, but not erased, through entropy (786). This enables one to use the concept of intertextuality on only those aspects that are of relevance. This creates order in what would otherwise be chaotic data that may or may not be relevant. In order to do this, one needs to be careful to not become too influenced by hypertextuality: “To put it more succinctly, intertextuality, a structured network of text-generated constraints on the reader’s perceptions, is the exact contrary of the reader-generated loose web of free association that is hypertextuality” (Riffaterre 781). In other words; the reader may have many associations that have possibly nothing to do with the text and intertext. While reading a reader may for example connect a character with a name he/she

already knows from real life, to the actual person he/she knows with that same name. This is however, not relevant for this research and our focus will be on non-personal references.

Although personal associations will not be taken into account, aside from the literary references to Bram Stoker's *Dracula* this thesis will also look into how the book adaptations of the Count refer to the film adaptations. Interestingly, Allen does mention that intertextuality can be applied to non-literary forms, as well, which seems to link it very closely to adaptation studies, simply because these non-literary forms are not specified to be necessarily of a certain medium; they could therefore belong to any medium. As the book adaptations that are researched in this thesis can be seen as both *Dracula* adaptations from Bram Stoker's book and filmic *Draculas*, it can be a useful angle to link intertextuality closely to adaptation.

This thesis will provide an answer to its central research question. Descriptions of the Count from the three adaptations will be analysed and compared to the original. A short introduction to *Dracula* and Vlad Tepes and Stoker's vampire versus the vampires from Romanian folklore are represented in the following sections of this introduction. These sections have been added to this thesis in order to provide the reader with some basic background knowledge that is essential in understanding some of the aspects encountered in the core chapters. This is followed by three core chapters that are divided per novel, which are followed by a chapter that analyses the results and after that there can be found a conclusion.

1.2. *Dracula and Vlad Tepes*

Bram Stoker did not his character Count *Dracula* on fantasy alone. The name "Dracula" is for instance not one he invented himself. It is interesting to look at the origins of the name "Dracula." According to Rezachevici there were many theories about this from "the claim by Grigore Nandris that it was the genitive Slavonic form meaning 'the son of Dracul' to the false connection with a coincidentally similar Romanian word 'dragulea', meaning 'the dear one or lover'" (par 3). Another possible origin could be the Romanian "dracul," meaning "the devil" (par 3). It is difficult to determine which one of the two was originally the meaning given to the name "Dracula," yet is relatively simple to ascertain which meaning Stoker had in mind when he came up with the name of the Count. In his notes, which have been bound and transcribed by Miller and Eighteen-Bisang, he wrote the following: "DRACUL in Wallachian language means DEVIL. Wallachians were accustomed to give it

as a surname to any person who rendered himself conspicuous by courage, cruel actions or cunning” (Miller and Eighteen-Bisang 245). What is remarkable about this note by Stoker, is that he discusses “Dracul,” which inspired his “Dracula,” as a surname that was given to “any person who rendered himself conspicuous by courage, cruel actions or cunning.” This suggests that any person could have received this last name, even a peasant, whereas the Count from *Dracula* is far from just any person; he is from a highborn noble family. Yet the meaning of the name, “devil,” fits in with the Count as Stoker originally wrote him; he was a villain after all.

Rezachevici describes how Stoker based Dracula on the historical Vlad Tepes and although it seems wise to be careful about such strong claims, *Dracula* actually contains a hint towards the history of Vlad Tepes:

Who was it but one of my own race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground! This was a Dracula indeed. Who was it that his own unworthy brother, when he had fallen, sold his people to the Turk and brought the shame of slavery on them! Was it not this Dracula, indeed, who inspired that other of his race who in a later age again and again brought his forces over the great river into Turkeyland; who, when he was beaten back, came again, and again, though he had to come alone from the bloody field where his troops were being slaughtered, since he knew that he alone could ultimately triumph? (B. Stoker 41-42)

The fact that Stoker mentions that Dracula was betrayed by his own brother, is telling. When Vlad Tepes was a boy, he and his brother were taken hostage by the Turks, as a means to control their father. According to Miller, there were treated relatively well and his brother “betrayed” Vlad by going over to the Turkish side, in spite of their captivity. “But Vlad held enmity, and I think it was one of his motivating factors for fighting the Turks: to get even with them for having held him captive” (Miller as qtd. in Lallanilla). With this information, it is easy to assume that Stoker used Vlad Tepes, the Impaler, as his inspiration for Dracula. Yet, even though the citation from *Dracula* is telling, it is still dangerous to assume too much. Miller argues that is a widespread mistake to believe that “Bram Stoker deliberately modelled his Count Dracula on Vlad” (par 12). She is also very critical about the widespread speculations that Vlad did have qualities that would make him vampire-like, such as drinking the blood of his victims. And even if he did not do things like that, it is assumed that Stoker knew of Vlad’s bloodthirsty character and deeds (Miller par 15). Yet, according to Miller:

“There is not the slightest bit of evidence to prove such knowledge, either in Stoker’s sources, his Notes or the novel itself” (Miller par 15).

The fact that Miller bases her information on Stoker’s sources, notes and *Dracula* itself, lends her statements credibility, and it certainly seems peculiar that Stoker did not mention Tepes in his notes. Yet he must have heard of Vlad the Impaler somewhere, as the quotation from *Dracula* clearly describes events that occurred in the life of Tepes. Miller and Eighteen-Bisang have an answer to how Stoker got to know the name Dracula: “Stoker discovered the name he would make famous (or, more correctly, which would make him famous) in William Wilkinson’s *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia* in the local library in Whitby” (285). Miller and Eighteen-Bisang base their account on the notes of Bram Stoker himself. They also note that even though the fact that Stoker did know something about Vlad Tepes, does not prove he knew all. The only source Stoker mentions in his notes about Dracula is Wilkinson’s and Miller and Eighteen-Bisang say the following about Wilkinson’s work: “Note that Wilkinson is vague about which Dracula is which. The first paragraph refers to Vlad’s father, Vlad Dracul. Wilkinson refers to “Dracula” and “Voivode,” but never to “Vlad,” “Vlad Tepes” or “the Impaler” and he does not bring up any of Vlad’s atrocities (285).

From this information, they conclude that it is unlikely that Stoker based his Count on Vlad Tepes and knew of his deeds. Although this is a logical conclusion, it does not provide us with a definite answer to the question whether or not Stoker based Dracula on Vlad Tepes. There might for instance be more notes that have gotten lost through time. Yet, with the information that is currently available, it is easy to agree with Miller and Eighteen-Bisang. Even the quotation from *Dracula* about the Dracula family is rather vague and it is remarkable that a character like Dracula does not elaborate on his family history on many occasions throughout the book. After all, he comes across as a character that thinks his family history is of great importance. The following words illustrate that he is proud to be a Dracula: “Who was it but one of my own race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground!” (B. Stoker 41) The fact that the proud Dracula does not tell us about his family history on other occasions suggests that the history of the Dracula family was only used as a means to give a background to the Count, and not as something to base Dracula on too closely. In this thesis the view of Miller and Eighteen-Bisang is agreed with, because they base themselves on Bram Stoker’s notes that do not mention the history of Vlad Tepes.

1.3 . *The vampire in folklore versus Bram Stoker's vampire*

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* has become the standard idea of a vampire, even though some aspects might be different in some types of vampire fiction or films, depending on the tastes of the creators. Johnson has done some research on this and has found thirteen characteristics for *Dracula*'s vampirism and references in folklore to these characteristics for twelve of them (par 5). Although all of these aspects are interesting, they will not all be discussed here. Johnson begins his article with what is undoubtedly the most important characteristic of the vampire as he is known today, namely that he is a drinker of blood. He points out that folklore does not in most cases of vampires refer to it, but "Yet, for most countries or ethnic groups which hold belief in such revenants, there is usually found at least a minority of cases in which the revenant is said to be a blood drinker" (Johnson par 7). This suggests that although the drinking of blood did occur in some cases, it still was not as widespread as it is in vampire fiction today.

In *Dracula*, the vampire's victims become a vampire as well after they die, as is demonstrated in the case of Lucy Westenra. Johnson explains that the belief that a victim of a vampire turns into a vampire after death was common in the folklore of Eastern Europe. Even historic reports seem to refer to vampires as the reason for plagues and diseases. Victims of the plague were sometimes dug up in order to see whether the body has started rotting, or had remained fresh, the latter would be a sign indicating that the corpse was undead. "If the corpse exhibited such a condition, it was most typically treated by such means as driving a stake through the heart, decapitating it, cremating it, or otherwise mutilating it" (Johnson par 11). The way in which the supposed vampires were killed is, in this way, similar to the way in which vampires are killed in Bram Stoker's novel.

Although Johnson claims that there is no evidence that Stoker knew of it, the shape shifting his Count is capable of can also be found in Romanian folklore. There are for instance examples of people that turn into a cat or dog after death and torment their relatives at night. "The solution is to exhume him and pierce his body with a needle or nail. Another solution is to walk around the grave with burning hemp [marijuana]" (Petrovici as qtd. in Johnson par 18). This may not explicitly refer to vampires, but "a dead person can turn into a moroi in the form of a dog, horse, sheep, or a man" (Perkowski as qtd. in Johnson par 18). Moroi is one of the words that is used for vampires in Romanian folklore (Johnson par 4) and that means vampires and shape shifting is linked in Romanian folklore, whether Stoker knew about it or not.

Another aspect of vampires that are both recorded in Stoker's *Dracula* and in folklore, is the ability of vampires to change the weather. Dracula for instance uses the winds to his advantage when he is on the ship to England and in Romanian folklore there is the mention of "heavy rains in Zarnesti were supposed to be caused by a recently buried girl, thought to be a vampire" (Murgoci as qtd. in Johnson par 20). Yet, Stoker did certainly not learn about all the different characteristics and folklore of Romanian vampire lore and even though many points he mentions in *Dracula* are similar to Romanian folklore, he did also deviate a bit. Bram Stoker's vampire does for instance have no reflection in a mirror: "He throws no shadow; he makes in the mirror no reflect, as again Jonathan observe [sic]" (B. Stoker 286). This characteristic is not discussed in lore: "There are anecdotes concerning superstitions that the shadow or reflection of a person was actually that person's soul" (Johnson par 39). Aside from that "there was also an old belief that the vampire was a corpse that had been possessed by a demon after the person died and the soul had departed" (Johnson 39). Johnson suggests combining these two beliefs into the reason for a vampire casting no reflection, but as logical this may sound, he admits that he is only speculating here whether or not Stoker knew this. At least he does not refer to this information in his notes, which suggests he did not base this characteristic on the Romanian vampire lore. It will possibly always remain an assumption as to whether or not Stoker had more notes or information that has gotten lost through time, but it is certainly interesting that his *Dracula* has so many similarities to the vampires as described in Romanian folklore and that his vampire villain is not the same person as Vlad Tepes, as is often thought. In the next chapter, though, Kostova's adaptation *The Historian* will make Dracula and Vlad Tepes into one and the same person.

Chapter 2: *The Historian* and *Dracula*

2.1. A short introduction to *The Historian*

Elizabeth Kostova's debut, *The Historian*, is divided into three different parts within the book and each of these parts begins with a quotation from Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. What is most noteworthy for the setting of the tone, is the opening for the first part of the novel. It does not only begin quoting from *Dracula*, but it also sends a message:

How these papers have been placed in sequence will be made manifest in the reading of them. All needless matters have been eliminated, so that a history almost at variance with the possibilities of latter-day belief may stand forth as simple fact. There is throughout no statement of past things wherein memory may err, for all the records chosen are exactly contemporary, given from the stand-points and within the range of knowledge of those who made them (B. Stoker, as qtd. in Kostova 1).

These exact same words can be found at the beginning of Stoker's novel, before the first diary entry. The message is clear; the writer tries to make his/her story come across as more convincing. In Stoker's case, he made up the words himself, and in Kostova's case, the words are borrowed from Stoker. It seems as if Kostova attempts to be seen as a more serious and historical novelist here. The fact that her book is 704 pages long (in the edition that can be found in the bibliography) and she claims, through Stoker that "all needless matters have been eliminated," suggests that she has a lot of important things to tell the reader and that she has done lots of research. The last point is certainly true; Kostova spent ten years on her research for *The Historian*, according to the "A Conversation with the author of *The Historian*" (Kostova 725). In the back of the novel, she also mentions a list of suggested further reading, which suggests she knows enough about her topic to suggest sources for others.

The book is written from multiple perspectives and also contains several letters. All of the narratives are written in the first person, which gives a postmodern aspects to the novel, even though Kostova clearly tried to have a more historical tone in the novel, which the title of the novel seems to support. According to Currie, intertextuality would rank Kostova's book amongst postmodern works: "Postmodern novels are intertextual novels. They are highly aware of their condition in a world pervaded by representations, and of their place in a

tradition, or a history of representations including other novels” (3). Intertextuality is certainly an aspect of importance for *The Historian*, as it is an adaptation of Bram Stoker’s Dracula character. Not only is it in this way an adaptation, Kostova’s novel also includes direct quotations from *Dracula*. Currie discusses fragmentation throughout his book, because it is a characteristic of postmodernism, and this fits in with the multiple perspectives that are used in *The Historian*. The fact that these perspectives are not made clear and therefore may confuse the reader, make it postmodern. Also, there is no unity of time in *The Historian*, and the reader has to travel back and forward in time with the first person narrators, which makes it all the more fragmented and confusing.

The reader is provided with the perspective of a girl, who is sixteen years old at the beginning of the novel, the point of view of her father, and the angle that is offered by letters to her father from his mentor, as the main perspectives. The daughter does not have a name, whereas the father and mentor are called Paul and Rossi, respectively. Rossi has disappeared while he was searching for Dracula and Paul turns out to be the “dear and unfortunate successor” (Kostova 5), Rossi addresses his letters to. As Paul searches for Rossi, his daughter searches for him and her mysterious mother, who disappeared shortly after her birth (to hunt Dracula). One could say that this results in all of them looking for Dracula, as there are bound to be traces found of the others, once they get closer. In the end they turn out to all be family, since Rossi turns out to be the father of the daughter’s mother, Helen.

Now that a short introduction has been given to *The Historian*, the portrayal of Dracula in the novel will be investigated. First his physical appearance will be investigated and after that his character will be discussed. It will become clear in this chapter that Kostova’s Dracula is a true villain and a historian. The latter might suggest a Neo-Victorian view could be used on the novel, yet it is dangerous to assume *The Historian* has Neo-Victorian characteristics, as the novel has many postmodern characteristics. Postmodern and Neo-Victorian characteristics tend to overlap, but Hadley explains the difference: “Although Neo-Victorian fictions engage with ‘postmodern’ questions about the possibility of narrating of the past, they move beyond the self-reflexivity of postmodern fiction to consider specifically Victorian forms of historical narratives” (Hadley 19). According to this explanation it would be wise to consider *The Historian* as a postmodern novel rather than a Neo-Victorian one, as it is not concerned with “specifically Victorian forms of historical narratives” (Hadley 19). Kostova does not focus on anything Victorian, aside from the direct quotations from Stoker’s *Dracula* that she uses.

2.2. *Dracula's appearance*

The first time any mention of Dracula is made in *The Historian*, is when Paul describes how he came into the possession of a mysterious book that he then opens at two pages with a woodcut of a dragon, and one word: "DRAKULYA" (Kostova 11). Paul brings this book to Rossi, who then asks him whether he has heard of Vlad the Impaler. Paul answers him: "Yes, Dracula. A feudal lord in the Carpathians, otherwise known as Bela Lugosi" (19). He refers to popular culture here, by naming Bela Lugosi, who portrayed the Count in the 1931 *Dracula* film. Interestingly, this does indirectly suggest a certain image of Dracula's character, namely the image created by Bela Lugosi. As mentioned before, the original Dracula from Stoker's novel was not exactly what one would describe as an attractive character, but some kind of horrendous monster. It therefore would make sense for the earlier *Dracula* film adaptations to portray Dracula as a monster, "but Lugosi's old-world European charm served to imbue the Count with a hitherto absent sexual quality" (Oliver par 10).

The fact that Kostova suggests this image of Dracula this early in the novel, seems to be meaningful, yet it does not seem that she desires to describe Dracula in a more sexual way throughout the book, which suggests that Paul's words were meant in a mocking way. Although she describes Dracula clearly as a lord, he does not appear to possess significant physical resemblances to Lugosi. Dracula is described as follows:

He is shorter than both of the young monks but seems to tower over them. He is dressed in purple and red damask under a long black velvet cloak, which is pinned across his broad chest with an elaborate brooch. His hat is a pointed cone, black with red feathers fastened at the front. His hand, heavily scarred across the back, fiddles with the short sword at his belt. His eyes are green, preternaturally large and wide-set, his mouth and nose cruel, and his black hair and mustache show coarser white. (Kostova 700-701)

The way in which Dracula's appearance is described here, does not sound seductive at all. Although Kostova does not directly say that Dracula is a short man, she does suggest this by the reference to the young monks. Yet he still manages to have the type of evil presence that seems to make him bigger than he is and he is clearly dressed in fine clothes, fit for the lord he is. Her description of Dracula's looks does certainly deviate from the way in which the

Count is described in Bram Stoker's novel and he also clearly has a more attractive appearance than the original Count, but:

Yet this Dracula, though more alluring than Stoker's, cannot be mistaken for anything but the villain, just as in the Bela Lugosi film (1931). True, Lugosi's Dracula quotes Swinburne's line about "worse things waiting for man than death," a remark one would not expect to hear from Stoker's Count. But despite this touch of pathos and the erotic overtones of the film, he remains unmistakably diabolical, as do vampires in general and Dracula in particular until the early 1970s (Carter par 6).

Even though Carter is not specifically talking about *The Historian* in this case, the information she provides is still applicable to the novel, because of the way in which she refers to the Lugosi film and her reference to vampire/Dracula portrayals in general up to the early 1970s. This simply suggests that Kostova's Dracula is quite remarkable for its time, as he is still described as an evil character. What is even more noteworthy: in spite of Paul's remark about Lugosi, Kostova's Dracula is far from being a sexual character. This makes Kostova's portrayal of Dracula different from many Dracula adaptations. She has deviated from Stoker's portrayal, but still she decided to let her Dracula remain a villain.

2.3. *Dracula as a solitary villain*

Dracula proves his evil characteristics throughout the storyline, but the moment that will be analysed next is quite telling, as it proves how selfish he is. When Professor Rossi is in Romania, in search of Dracula, he falls in love with a local woman and their affair results in him making her pregnant with Helen. Yet he leaves for Greece and does not seem to remember her later on. Paul and Helen found this peculiar, but after a while they figure it out, with the help of Rossi's letters: "I let a stranger buy me a drink called amnesia," I paraphrased, trying to keep my voice down. "Who the hell do you think that stranger was? And that's why Rossi forgot –" (Kostova 511). Rossi was getting too close for Dracula and therefore he gave him the "amnesia drink," which is a telling name for a drink that erases your memory. There are several things that can be concluded from this passage from *The Historian*. The first would be that it is remarkable that Rossi, who is intelligent enough to have earned the title "professor," accepts a drink from a stranger with the name "amnesia." Considering the fact that he was hunting Dracula at that time and that he was getting close, it

seems he would become more cautious, especially because he is intelligent enough to know the danger he is in. Yet, he accepts a drink with a suspicious name from a complete stranger. Although this was necessary for the plot of the novel, it is not realistic that Rossi would accept this drink.

The aspect that is of more importance to our specific topic, is the implication that the mysterious stranger is Dracula himself. Again, this is an occurrence that does not seem likely to happen. Why would the vampire risk being seen by his hunter? Even if he could disguise his appearance in such a way that Rossi would not recognise him, it still seems an easier option to simply send someone else to offer the drink. Yet, Kostova implies that it was Dracula himself who gave the amnesia drink to Rossi. This is suggestive of the character of the vampire as she portrays him. First of all, it suggests that Dracula is a solitary creature, who prefers to work alone, even though he could use others for his own purposes. This could stem from a desire to not involve others in his own troubles when this is not absolutely necessary, but his portrayal throughout the rest of *The Historian* suggests that there is another reason for his behaviour. Dracula does not trust others to do his work, which suggests he is paranoid to a certain extent.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from Dracula giving the amnesia drink is that he puts himself above others, especially when it concerns his safety. The professor was getting close and that formed a threat to Dracula, which he removed by offering the amnesia drink to the unknowing Rossi. The vampire is aware of the position Rossi is in and therefore accepts the side effects; his pursuer will not only forget about the research, but also about the woman who is carrying his child. To Dracula the cure is worth the side effects, which is already immoral, but if he had looked after the woman and child afterwards in some way, it might be slightly less terrible, because it would prove he did care at least a little. Unfortunately, he does not take interest in the woman and her child at all and this suggests that Kostova's Dracula is not in the possession of a sense of morality, which makes him only more evil. It can also be suggested that he simply lacks the ability to care for anyone but himself.

2.4. *Dracula, the historian*

Now that Dracula's villainous characteristics have been discussed, it is time to investigate another aspect of his character. Dracula himself is the historian Kostova refers to in her title. Although there are other historians in the novel, he is the oldest and most learned one, due to the fact that he is a vampire and has all the time in the world to study and pursuit his cravings

for information. It is even suggested that his desire for knowledge has made him the creature he is. When he prepares his grave and he explicitly says he does not want a cross on his gravestone, the abbot protests, but: “Dracula’s face darkens. ‘I do not plan to subject myself long to death,’ he says in a low voice” (Kostova 703). The abbot then starts to talk about God as the only way to escape death, but Dracula seems unconvinced and says:

“But recently I met a man, a merchant who has traveled to a monastery in the West. He said there is a place in Gaul, the oldest church in their part of the world, where some of the Latin monks have outwitted death by secret means. He offered to sell me their secrets, which he has transcribed in a book.” The abbot shudders. “God preserve us from such heresies,” he says hastily. “I am certain, my son, that you refused his temptation.” (703)

To this, Dracula answers: “You know I am fond of books” (703). The description of this event and especially Dracula’s, very suggestive response to the abbot, summarizes the way in which Dracula is portrayed in *The Historian*. He is the historian, one might even say that with a capital H, as he is the oldest of all of the historians in the novel. His greed for knowledge makes him who he is. The fact that Kostova decided to make him a villain can be seen as a unique choice, as she herself is an academic, which makes her greedy for knowledge, too. Certainly, most academics do not go as far for knowledge as Dracula goes, but it is still remarkable that an insatiable taste for knowledge is what made Dracula who he is. Although Kostova, in this way, portrays Dracula as a scholar gone wild, she also refers to the historical Vlad Tepes, when she lets Dracula say: “Yes, my own father left me to the father of Mehmed, as a pledge that we would not wage war against the Empire. Imagine, Dracula a pawn in the hands of the infidel. I wasted no time there – I learned everything I could about them, so that I might surpass them all. That was when I vowed to make history, not to be its victim (642).

The way the historical Vlad Tepes handled the Turks, can be seen reflected in Dracula’s words. The fact that Kostova chose to add this historical aspect, whereas there is no evidence for Bram Stoker having even known the name Vlad Tepes, is remarkable. It can be assumed that she does know about this, since she suggests Miller in her list of suggested further reading in the back of the book, and Miller is not a supporter of the idea of Bram Stoker having modelled Dracula on Vlad Tepes. Interestingly, Kostova then chooses on the one hand to deviate from Stoker’s Dracula and on the other hand to add to the false idea of Dracula as Vlad Tepes. Throughout *The Historian* there are more instances of comparisons of Dracula

and Vlad Tepes. An example is the one quoted earlier in this chapter from page 19. The way in which she deviates from the facts does not fit in with the quotes she uses from Stoker's *Dracula* at the beginning of the three parts of *The Historian*. It certainly is a popular theory that Dracula and Vlad Tepes are one and the same, as it is often misinterpreted from Stoker's *Dracula*. Miller describes this as follows: "The incessant linking of Vlad the Impaler with Stoker's vampire Count that has beleaguered Dracula studies for the past thirty years has made it virtually impossible to separate fact from fiction" (par 13) and the fact that Kostova keeps this link intact, in spite of all her research, is curious. She is aware of the fact that Bram Stoker's Dracula and Vlad Tepes are not one and the same, yet she decides to lend more credibility to the myth by writing about it. Readers that are not familiar with Dracula studies may be inclined to believe the story of Dracula and Vlad are linked to a certain extent, because after all, Kostova is an academic and knows what she is writing about. Instead of writing about the, probably less exciting, truth, she creates a story that agrees with popular culture. It is an understandable choice, because she might have preferred this angle for herself as well, and her audience likes it, as it acquiesces to the Dracula they know from popular culture, such as film adaptations.

Whereas Kostova does not always stick to the facts of Stoker's history, her vampire certainly tries to be careful about handling the facts of his history, properly. Dracula himself even says the following: "I became an historian in order to preserve my own history forever" (634). The vampire is in the possession of a great library filled with rare books and he tells Rossi: "I have told you, I am a scholar at heart, as well as a warrior, and these books have kept me company through my long years." (634) The villainous vampire, Dracula, has become a historian in *The Historian*, but aside from that he does still remain a villain. Yet there are certain differences that will be summarized and compared in the conclusion.

2.5. Conclusion

After looking at the way Dracula is portrayed in Elizabeth Kostova's *The Historian*, a few things are especially noticeable. One of these things is the fact that the title of Kostova's book refers to Dracula himself, who has become a historian in her novel. This new role could to a certain extent be derived from Stoker's Count without deviating too much. Although Bram Stoker's Dracula is not a historian, he is certainly intelligent, which could be linked to scholarly preferences, such as a love for history. This passion for the past is an aspect that is not seen in film adaptations of the vampire villain. Yet Kostova refers to Dracula film

adaptation very early on in the novel by letting Paul mention the name of Bela Lugosi, but this is where most of her connections to Dracula film adaptations end. She certainly has made an adaptation of Dracula, but he does not have the typical characteristics that are seen often in the more recent films. These characteristics are described by, for instance, Rottenbacher: “The more recent Dracula films tend to keep the romantic themes as the main focus points for their narratives and have increased the physical and sexual appeal of Dracula” (Rottenbacher par 3). Kostova does have some romances in her story, but none of these feature Dracula as a lover or seducer, whereas the more recent films tend to portray him as a lover/seducer, in spite of his dangerous characteristics. As her book is relatively recent (it was first published in 2005), one might have expected a more romantic Dracula in *The Historian*, especially because she does make use of the popular misconception that links Vlad Tepes to the vampire Dracula. It is remarkable that she on the one hand uses such a popular aspect of the mythology surrounding the Count, while on the other hand she does not make her Dracula the vampire seducer. She chooses an angle that differs from both the original source and the other adaptations. Kostova’s Dracula is historian and a villain.

Only the last aspect can also be found in Bram Stoker’s novel. After all he is a villain. Kostova’s Dracula is compared to some of the worst dictators this world has known:

The strange thing, you know, is that Stalin openly admired Ivan the Terrible. Two leaders who were willing to crush and kill their own people – to do anything necessary – in order to consolidate their power. And whom do you think Ivan the Terrible admired?” I felt the blood draining from my heart. “You told me there were many Russian tales about Dracula. (Kostova 559)

With these words, spoken by Helen, Kostova describes dictators, such as Stalin as equals of Dracula. She also links Hitler to Dracula: “‘And I wonder,’ Helen added somberly, ‘if destroying him would make that much difference in the future. Think of what Stalin did to his people, and Hitler. They did not need to live five hundred years to accomplish these horrors’ (Kostova 559). Here the tone is rather sad, because of the fact that real evil does not need a lot of time to manifest horrors, as Hitler and Stalin have proved, which suggests Dracula must have done even worse than them. Kostova here clearly distinguishes herself from more recent film adaptations, featuring Dracula as a seducer, by making Dracula like Hitler, Stalin and Ivan the Terrible in his evilness. By this comparison, she disables even the slightest grain of sympathy to be felt for Dracula. Also, she shows the reader that she knows her history, as

most (if not all) readers will recognise that Hitler and Stalin were evil. The novel for instance mentions how Helen's Aunt Éva's sons were killed in a public square because of how she felt about the communist government, which led her to flee to Yugoslavia, "with fifteen thousand other Hungarian refugees from the Russian puppet state" (336). Although Kostova does describe these historical wrongs, she does not try to change them. Her role is much like a historian here; she describes history. Yet she has also made her vampire villain the same person as Vlad Tepes, which is not a historical fact, but a common misconception.

Even though she made her Dracula the same person as Tepes, Kostova's Dracula is not too far removed from Bram Stoker's Count. There are differences, but these have not changed the core of Stoker's character. She has adjusted his appearance, but despite that he still does not look attractive at all, which matches with Stoker's Count, and even though she focuses on Dracula being a scholar and a historian, he is not less of a villain in *The Historian*. The vampire is compared to Hitler and Stalin, which leaves no doubt of his evil character. He still is undoubtedly evil in her novel.

Chapter 3: *Dracula The Un-Dead* and *Dracula*

3.1. A short introduction to *Dracula The Un-Dead*

Dracula The Un-Dead is “the official sequel” to *Dracula*, or at least that is what it claims to be on the cover. This is not a fully false claim; the novel has been written by Ian Holt and Dacre Stoker, who happens to be Bram Stoker’s great-grandnephew. So although the novel has not been written by Bram Stoker himself, it has remained in the family, which lends the claim “the official sequel” some credibility that other novels about *Dracula* should dare not claim. Dacre Stoker says “I am very proud to have the support of my extended Stoker family to reclaim *Dracula*. I think Bram would be proud that a family member has taken this initiative, and finally done justice to the legacy he created” (D. Stoker & Holt 401). The fact that he has the support of his family, also gives some degree of authority to *Dracula The Un-Dead*. Another aspect that lends the novel credibility as being the sequel to *Dracula* is the fact that the novel has been based on Bram Stoker’s notes.

The story of the novel is set twenty-five years after the heroes of *Dracula* destroyed the Count, yet there are suspicious signs of an evil that is on the loose in Europe. Familiar characters, such as Mina and Jonathan Harker, Arthur Holmwood and Van Helsing return in the sequel to find out what this evil is, and a very important new character, the Harkers’ son, Quincy, also joins in. After some time it turns out that there is another vampire, a woman with the name Elizabeth Bathory, who has the same name as the historical figure she represents. This vampire is of noble birth, as she bears the title of Countess and is more evil than *Dracula* has ever been. Mina soon realizes that Bathory is the real evil that should be destroyed, not *Dracula*, but her opinion is distrusted, because she drank *Dracula*’s blood all those years ago. The heroes are in a way divided, but in the end some side with *Dracula* in order to destroy Bathory. The story is written from multiple perspectives, which offers a little of the type of atmosphere found in the letters in *Dracula*. There are some letters in the novel, but they do not play the crucial role they did play in Bram Stoker’s novel.

Although it at first seems as if Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt have tried to do justice to Bram’s *Dracula* and remain close to it, they have also incorporated some references to *Dracula* adaptations, in order to make the novel as appealing as possible for the greatest *Dracula* fans (412). They had a specific goal in mind with this: “In the end it was our most important goal with this sequel to right the wrongs done to Bram’s original classic. We have worked hard on this front. In this way, I, as a Stoker, and Ian, as *Dracula*’s greatest living

fan, hope to apologize for losing the copyright and control of Bram's magnificent and immortal story for almost a century" (D. Stoker & Holt 413).

One might say that *Dracula The Un-Dead* is an attempt to reclaim Bram Stoker's *Dracula* for the Stoker family. Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt could have done this by remaining as close to the original *Dracula* story as possible, which is what they have done in many instances, yet to be truly able to reclaim the Stoker legacy, it was necessary to change certain details. This is simply because many *Dracula* fans have only seen the films and have not read the book. In order to appeal to those fans, as well, instead of only appealing to fans of the novel, Stoker and Holt thought it was necessary to choose some of the most popular aspects of the *Dracula* film industry, such as a romance between *Dracula* and *Mina*, and incorporate them into the novel. Some details are therefore not the way they were in the book and even the timing of the original events of *Dracula* has been adjusted a bit, in order to make it possible for *Quincy Harker* to be a young adult in *Dracula The Un-Dead*, which at the same time has allowed them to time the events of the first novel around the time of the *Jack the Ripper* murders. Another reason for the story to be set in the time it is, in 1912, is that it allows for the appearance of *Bram Stoker* himself as a character. Stoker and Holt have added some historical characters, such as *Inspector Frederick Abberline* and *Elizabeth Bathory* to the novel and they have also added some characters, based on names found in *Bram Stoker's* notes (such as *Kate Reed*). These characters never made it into *Dracula*, but *Dacre Stoker* and *Ian Holt* have found a way to bring them to life within *Dracula The Un-Dead*.

As *Dacre Stoker* and *Ian Holt* have taken many different aspects into account when they were writing the novel, the result has become a combination of the original *Dracula* with influences of film adaptations. In the "Author's Note" of the novel, *Ian Holt* explains that they have added some aspects that were known in the films only, in order to make the book appealing to *Dracula* fans that have only seen the films, in the hope of encouraging them to read *Bram Stoker's Dracula* one day: "The concessions are as follows: the romance between *Mina* and *Dracula*; the ability of vampires to walk in daylight, fly, and transform themselves; the weapons used to destroy them; and the location and names of certain geographical sites" (408). The concessions *Dacre Stoker* and *Ian Holt* made while creating *Dracula: The Un-Dead* have on the one hand moved the novel closer towards the film adaptations and away from *Bram Stoker's* novel, which would make one think the book is less literary than *Dracula*. Yet on the other hand, these references strengthen the novel as an adaptation that has something in it for all audiences (both film fans and booklovers).

3.2. *Dracula's appearance*

In *Dracula The Un-Dead* one would expect a Dracula that looks a lot like the original Dracula described by Bram Stoker, as it does remain in the Stoker family. Yet this could not be further from the truth. Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt provide the reader with an ambiguous portrayal of the vampire. He has conflicting sides, which is reflected both in his character and appearance. In *Dracula The Un-Dead* the vampire hides in plain sight as the famous actor Basarab. Basarab happens to be the name of the royal house to which Vlad Tepes belonged, as Miller clarifies in the afterword of *Dracula The Un-Dead* (395). “*Dracula* is only the title he chose when he became prince. But *Dracula's* true name is... Vladimir Basarab,” according to Van Helsing in the novel (300). If one already knew that much, it is rather clear from the beginning that Basarab is Dracula. For those that did not know that much, Basarab certainly is an intriguing and suspicious character. After all, he is a Romanian actor with an air of mystery around him. Bram Stoker's Count is not described as an attractive character, which should be emphasized, because all the films featuring a handsome Dracula may blur one's judgment on this. In this aspect the influence of film is very present in *Dracula The Un-Dead*, as Dracula is portrayed as handsome: “His piercing black eyes fixed on the audience from under his dark brows. Quincy was in awe of the impressive transformation of the handsome actor into the hideous Richard III” (D. Stoker & Holt 40). In this passage, Dracula, who is at this moment still known only as Basarab in the novel, is actually described as handsome. The following line also suggests that Dracula is attractive: “The dashing young Romanian stepped out of the car and stood on the ride rail” (24). It is clear from these examples that the main impression one gets from the vampire in *Dracula The Un-Dead* is that he is an attractive man. He has the looks of a dark, mysterious “stranger” from Eastern Europe and as an actor, he also has a lot of charisma. This is remarkable for a novel that claims to be the sequel to Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, as he did not exactly describe his Count as an attractive man. It is clear that this was an aspect on which Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt have decided to please the film fan, as it fits in better with the seductive vampire from films.

In spite of Dracula's appearance being described as attractive in *Dracula The Un-Dead*, there is also a scene in which Mina gets to see his naked torso, which turns out to be scarred and emaciated:

Dracula's chest was emaciated; Mina could count his ribs. The scarred flesh was stretched tightly over his bones, and she could see the scars from where Morris and

Jonathan had stabbed him. She could see the wounds from the attack she had seen through Bathory's eyes on his body, too, and remembered Bathory's boot driving the kukri knife deep into his chest (356).

Later, when Dracula drinks Mina's blood in order to turn her into a vampire like himself, his scars start to heal. The fact that his ribs show through, suggests he has not had much human blood to feed from in some time. Although his scarred torso does not look attractive, the reason it is in this state could be seen as attractive. Dracula's torso suggests that he has not drunk enough blood and therefore knows how to restrain himself. This is evidence that he is not a beast and thinks before he feeds. In this way Stoker and Holt seem to deviate both from the concept of the seductive Count and the original villain in Bram Stoker's novel. Here Dracula becomes the one who sacrifices himself for others, and in a way he can be seen as a martyr. He needs to replenish his strength, but has refrained from truly doing that for twenty-five years. It gives the strong vampire a more vulnerable appearance, as it proves that although he is nearly immortal, he can still be hurt.

Near the end of the novel, Dracula and Bathory have a final fight, and she describes him as follows: "Dracula, eyes wide, teeth clenched, looked every inch God's madman, as he drove Bathory up the stairs" (372). Her description has a bitter tone because she hates God and despises Dracula's love of God. As the fight continues, the reader gets a glimpse of the "old Dracula;" the unattractive creature that reminds one of Bram Stoker's Count: "Dracula's eyes had become those of a reptile, his skin an ashen green, his ears pointed. His mouth widened, filled to overflowing by gory fangs protruding outward in a hideous snout. His face became thus when he wanted to instill fear in his mortal enemies and when he was in danger (375).

It is remarkable that Dracula is here described as a kind of weird monster, whereas he is described as "handsome" and "dashing" during most of the novel. This glimpse of the more monstrous original Dracula has its reasons though; the monster within comes through because he is in mortal danger during the fight with Bathory. In this way, Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt give Dracula a multidimensional appearance. On the one hand he is the attractive Basarab, while on the other hand he is the monster fighting another monster. This unifies both target audiences; the film fans that are used to an attractive Count and the booklovers that are used to Bram Stoker's monstrous Dracula. Both audiences receive the character they are used to. Yet this ambiguity in Dracula's appearance can also be seen as a means to capture the double nature of the vampire. After all, he is both the hunter and the hunted. At the same time he is

both the assassin and the hero. His character does not match the creature he is; as a vampire is meant to be a parasite to a certain extent and feed off others, whereas Dracula desires to exterminate parasites, such as Bathory. The fact that *Dracula The Un-Dead* offers the vampire prince the chance to tell his side of the story, neatly fits this ambiguous package. Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt wanted to portray more than just one side or view on the story and they had the freedom to do so. As they mention in their “Author’s Note” they wanted to appeal to book and film audiences alike, as that seemed important for their goal to reclaim *Dracula* for the Stokers. Film adaptations have deviated from Bram Stoker’s novel and with that being the case, almost everything can be done now in newer adaptations of *Dracula* or its Count.

3.3. *Dracula, God’s warrior*

Aside from Dracula’s appearance, his character also deviates from the original Count from Bram Stoker’s novel. One thing about his personality that immediately strikes one as remarkable when reading *Dracula The Un-Dead*, is the fact that Dracula himself has a distinct image of who he thinks he is and he believes this image is the truth. He thinks of himself as God’s warrior, someone who helps God protect Christendom:

‘In life, I was God’s hand,’ Dracula said, defiant. ‘I fought to protect all of Christendom. Brutality and death was all I ever knew. I yearned for a second life, a new chance. When the opportunity came, I pursued it, regardless of the consequences. Yes, I rose from my own death, but I do not kill for sport. The blood I need to survive is taken only from animals, murderers, rapists, and thieves. I am still doling out God’s justice.’
(357)

Dracula portrays himself as a very noble and good person. He admits that becoming a vampire might have been a questionable thing to do, “regardless of the consequences,” but he also says that he does not kill for fun and that he takes blood only from animals and humans that have already done bad things, which according to him is doing justice in the eyes of God. Whether or not the reader agrees with this kind of justice, one has to admit that it is at least better than a vampire preying on the innocent. The idea of Dracula as God’s warrior is a unique way of portraying him, which is an angle that has not specifically been taken in films before. Yet there are films that portray the vampire as a hero or at least do not portray him as

the absolute villain. In the 1992 *Dracula* film by Francis Ford Coppola, the vampire has for instance a reason to become the way he is. He becomes vengeful only after his wife commits suicide because she received a false report saying that he has died in battle (Dracula is here the historical Vlad Tepes). The fact that he immediately forsakes God, could be seen as drastic, but it does help express how he feels about her suicide and with it, her damnation. As Francis Ford Coppola's *Dracula* renounces God, he is not exactly a warrior of the Lord, but at least his character is multi-faceted and the fact that he has a reason for his behaviour makes his vampire not an absolute villain, even though he is still far from being a hero.

Aside from being God's warrior, Dacre Stoker's and Ian Holt's *Dracula* is also not afraid of coming across as arrogant: "I was made in God's image, but I am of a higher order" (357). He does not say here that he is of a higher order than God, but that he is like humans, only of a higher order. In some way, he seems to be justified in this opinion. He is not greedy about keeping all this highness to himself, though; in order to win the battle against Bathory, he wants to turn Mina, which will make her stronger. When she, at first, disagrees with this idea, he claims: "Then the Devil has won" (358). Although not all the other characters may agree with him, *Dracula* himself certainly thinks he is a hero, not a villain.

3.4. *Dracula, the dark prince*

The original *Dracula* could be seen as a Victorian Gothic novel and modern adaptations may be modern or contemporary Gothic works of fiction. *Dracula The Un-Dead* is one of the adaptations that certainly has many Gothic characteristics and the fact that the aristocratic Countess is a villain, only adds to this. As Thorslev puts it: "By birth the Gothic Villain was always of the aristocracy, partly for the sense of power which his nobility confers, and partly for the air of the fallen angel, the air of Satanic greatness perverted" (Thorslev 54). This observation is applicable not only to Bathory, but also to Bram Stoker's Count. It is worth noting that the *Dracula* character in *Dracula The Un-Dead* is not called "Count" in the novel. It is simply "Dracula," "Basarab" or in some cases "the dark prince" (381). There is a *Dracula* play in the novel in which there is a Count *Dracula*, but the actual character himself is not referred to as a Count. This does not only deviate from the title Bram Stoker gave his character (the play in the novel is written by Stoker and based on his *Dracula*, which explains why there is a "Count" in it), but it also links *Dracula* to Vlad the Impaler. Elizabeth Miller suggests in her afterword to Stoker's and Holt's novel that the *Dracula* in *Dracula The Un-Dead*, who is also known as Basarab "is in part homage to Sir Henry Irving" (395) Since the

novel is set in 1912 and Irving passed away in 1905 he could not play an active role in the novel, but Miller suggests that Basarab and Quincy Harker in a way reflect Henry Irving and Bram Stoker; Harker is quite drawn to Basarab, as Stoker was to Irving. Miller even mentions that some scholars believe Bram Stoker modelled his *Dracula* on Irving, yet she also notices that such ideas have already been challenged to a certain extent (395).

Remarkably, although *Dracula* is not given the title “Count” in the novel, aside from during the play, the greatest villain in the novel, Elizabeth Bathory, does get the title “Countess.” This gives an evil ring to the title, especially as Bram Stoker’s Count is also the villain. Somehow aristocrats tend to be villains in fiction more often, especially in the Gothic. Holland and Sherman discuss why the Gothic has remained popular through centuries (279). They try to find an answer to this question, even though this seems to be almost impossible:

The gothic and all such genres lead to the fundamental problem of literary causality. Each literent creates a uniquely individual experience from these gothic materials. Yet gothic novels offer the material for certain kinds of experience and not others. Each novelent has the human freedom to ignore the text, critics, common sense, and everything else in making a gothic experience. Yet psychological laws say each literent creates an experience within his own identity or character. There are also regularities (but not laws) beyond the individual’s psychology: gothic novels appeal strongly to some novelents (women of a certain age and society) and scarcely at all to others (adolescent boys of whatever culture). (Holland and Sherman 281)

Holland and Sherman clearly attempt to find a reason for the success of the Gothic, but as this quotation proves, they cannot find one single answer that explains this. Yet they do claim that women are more often attracted to the Gothic than adolescent boys. There has to be something that makes this type of fiction appealing enough to have remained popular, but the exact reasons are always difficult to indicate, if this is possible at all.

As Gothic fiction has never truly disappeared from the literary field, the fact that Bram Stoker’s novel and its adaptations stem from different periods is not a problem for this interpretation. The fact that *Dracula* in *Dracula The Un-Dead* is a Prince instead of a Count is telling, though, when thinking of the Gothic villain, as he was the villain in Bram Stoker’s novel and a Count. Changing his title changed his character as well in this case. Yet even with *Dracula* being God’s warrior and a seductive Prince and actor, he still has some characteristics of the Gothic villain. After all, even though he is God’s warrior, he still has a

title and he could be seen as a fallen angel. Although he is a “fallen angel” that has decided to keep fighting in the name of God, he still is “fallen” for the simple reason that he is a vampire, which is after all a creature of darkness. This makes him a dark Prince; he is interested in doing good, but the nature of the creature he has become is dark. Another aspect of the Gothic Villain that can be recognized in Dracula is the following: “an air of mystery is his dominant trait, and characteristic of all his acts” (Thorslev 54). The mystery surrounding the vampire begins with his name for he uses the name Basarab to hide his true identity. He also has a strange power over people: “Basarab had not uttered a single word, yet he controlled everyone before him” (D. Stoker & Holt 24). The novel offers no explanation for this influence, which only adds to its mystery.

Dacre Stoker’s and Ian Holt’s Dracula, in spite of him not being called “Count,” is certainly of noble birth. He also has many of the aristocratic characteristics Bram Stoker’s Count has, such as his pride and his idea of fear as a powerful tool. He advises Quincy to use fear, as well, when he, as Basarab, describes how Dracula saved his country: “That great day, Dracula saved his country. He saved the Christian world. Dracula used the only weapon he had... *fear*. That’s right. Fear can be a powerful tool, young Quincy. *Embrace it*” (199). This scene seems telling enough, as it describes how the mentor teaches his student “a valuable lesson” (199) as Quincy interprets it, but near the end of the novel, the reader discovers that Dracula is actually Quincy’s real father, instead of Jonathan Harker. Therefore this little piece of advice can also be seen as a father teaching his son. Although Quincy is not aware of this at the moment he receives this advice, Dracula himself turns out to have always known, when Mina tries to confess it to him (362). She has kept the fact that Dracula was the father a secret for all these years, even from Jonathan and Quincy himself.

The life of the Harkers has been difficult ever since Dracula came into their lives. All these years ago, Mina gave her virginity to Dracula, which Jonathan did know, aside from drinking the vampire’s blood. Mina had not aged a bit since then, whereas Jonathan grew older. Although her looks remained the same, she did change on the inside, as Jonathan describes it “she became insatiable in the bedchamber” (102) which is something that scared him, as it reminded him of his first, shameful sexual experience with the vampire women in Dracula’s castle. Remarkably, although both partners turn out to have betrayed each other before they were actually married, Jonathan found it difficult to consummate the marriage because of his shame, whereas Mina did not seem to have any difficulties with this. Their marriage has long been dead when Dracula returns after twenty-five years; Jonathan has become an alcoholic, they sleep in separate rooms and he is often not home, because he is

drinking and whoring in London (103). While the marriage with Jonathan has turned sour, Mina still subconsciously yearns for her dark prince, who brought passion to her.

The idea of Dracula as a more romantic figure is not new. As mentioned before, many recent films have given the vampire Count the role of seducer. Sahay mentions how the 1992 *Dracula* film from Francis Ford Coppola, also gave Dracula more human qualities. She claims this may be related to the fact that the Victorians were very much afraid of “the Other,” whereas this idea has shifted in later times, which explains the shift in Dracula’s portrayal. She explains this as follows: “Twentieth-century culture embodies a sense of isolation and fragmentation that creates an individualism in which people see themselves as outsiders and often feel misunderstood by their society. Coppola exploits this sentiment in a film that tantalizes the viewer into a romance with Dracula, the ultimate outsider (Sahay par. 5). Sahay here suggests that the shift in Dracula’s portrayal, stems from the individualism of society. Everybody thinks he/she is different from the rest, or, as Sahay suggests, they see themselves as outsiders and feel misunderstood. According to her, this leads to a more romantic view of Dracula, who in Victorian times was the dreadful “Other,” but who has now become much more like us, because he is different as well. The romantic idea here is that Dracula is also misunderstood and from that notion comes the idea of trying to understand him.

Although Sahay’s research focuses on the 1992 *Dracula* film, her view could also be applied to *Dracula The Un-Dead*. The romance between Dracula and Mina has been portrayed in films often, and now it is also portrayed in the book. Mina could be seen as the outsider, the individual that is easy to identify with, as she is the only female member of the band of heroes. Also, she is not fully trusted by the others, because she had a weird dream about Dracula and later on, because she drank his blood. Although Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* does not mention a romance between Dracula and Mina, film has made it such a part of the story that it would possibly shock those readers that have only seen films on Dracula, if the romance was left out. It is a part of the modern-day charm that Dracula has as well, as Rottenbacher says: “Sex, of course, is what sells” (par 14).

The notion of Dracula as not being the monstrous villain, but a romantic, dark prince, deviates quite a lot from Bram Stoker’s villain, but Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt believe that this is mainly a matter of perspective, as Holt describes it in the “Author’s Note”: “In Bram’s novel, Dracula was only described through the view of his enemies, the journals, letters, etc. of the band of heroes. In our sequel we decided that we would give Dracula his say” (497). He follows to explain how the found this a possibility to combine Prince Dracula with Count

Dracula and make him “a complex antihero” (497). It is remarkable that he calls Dracula an antihero, as Dracula himself certainly sees himself as a hero and warrior of God instead. Certainly, there is darkness within him, but his morals seem to be relatively good and even though he is a vampire, he does not kill people because he is capable of it, but rather restrains himself when this is not necessary. There is some vagueness about whether or not he kills the human criminals from which he does feed, though, and one could say that this is where his morals might be corrupted by his vampirism. This depends on one’s personal ethics. Whereas it is certainly better that he feeds of animals and criminals, instead of preying on the innocent, taking human lives to sustain himself, might be seen as a morally incorrect thing to do. Yet, this is complicated, and in that way I agree with Holt describing Dracula as “complex,” even though there can be different views on whether or not he is an antihero. He could also be seen as a tragic hero, for instance, which might actually suit his character, as portrayed in *Dracula The Un-Dead* better. As he does not want to feed on others, but is forced to, in order to survive, he is destined to live (even though he is technically speaking, un-dead) with the tragedy of doing that which conflicts with his own high morals.

3.5. Conclusion

Although *Dracula The Un-Dead* has been written by one of Bram Stoker’s descendants (and Ian Holt), the Dracula portrayed in this novel does not resemble the original Dracula from Bram Stoker’s novel a lot. The Dracula that is described in *Dracula The Un-Dead* reminds one more of the romantic dark prince or the seducer as portrayed in many modern Dracula films than the monster Bram Stoker created. His appearance is quite attractive, which fits in with the role of the vampire seducer, as he is described by, for instance Rottenbacher. The fact that Dracula’s scars on his chest heal after he drinks Mina’s blood, fits in with this in a way, as the original Count did not become more attractive after drinking: “When he is rejuvenated with fresh blood, his appearance is no less repulsive (Rottenbacher par 4). The Dracula in *Dracula The Un-Dead* however does heal and in that way gets rid of the ugly scars and his too skinny chest. The act of sharing blood in this way, can be seen as a healing, but also as a liberating experience, as it liberates Mina sexually from her bond with Jonathan. It can also be said that she frees herself of her moral doubts and simply follows her instincts when she gives in to Dracula. “Critics claim that Dracula’s bite and indeed Dracula himself are metaphors for sexual liberation” (Rottenbacher par 13) and for Mina this seems certainly to be true. She has tried to be a good wife to Jonathan, but their relationship has not been

satisfying for a long time. Dracula on the other hand, knows exactly how to give Mina passion, and although he is supposed to be the soulless, evil vampire, she has been thinking about him all these years. Dracula is her liberator and his bite is the final act to free Mina. “All her life, Mina had fought against repression. Accepting Dracula’s eternal kiss would break those chains” (D. Stoker & Holt 361). These lines are a good example of how Dracula can be seen as a liberator, especially in a sexual way.

Another important aspect of the Dracula in *Dracula The Un-Dead* is the fact that he is not the villain that he was in Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*. The new Dracula is actually more of a tragic hero, or a complex antihero, as Ian Holt describes him. One could argue that he is an antihero, but a tragic hero seems more fitting, because he has a very high moral sense. Dracula thinks he is God’s warrior and therefore tries to do what would be right in the eyes of God. He also tries to protect God’s world from evil threats, such as Elizabeth Bathory. It is understandable that Holt thinks of the Dracula he and Dacre Stoker created as a complex antihero, because he does have to do some bad things, and perhaps one could say that the nature of vampires is in essence evil, but one could also say that about humans if one were to take a pessimistic view on human nature. There is of course the part of vampires not having a soul and that could make a vampire less of a hero, but in the case of Dracula, his morals seems to be high enough to refrain from giving in to the beast inside too much. In this way the liberator restrains himself from complete freedom, even though he liberates Mina. The Dracula character in *Dracula The Un-Dead* does have some bad character traits, such as arrogance, the concept of using fear as a tool and then there is the fact that he is a vampire, but he is not evil in essence. Although he has some of the characteristics of the Gothic Villain, he is not the real villain in contrast to Bathory, who is an absolute villain. Yet he is sometimes seen by other characters as the villain and the fact that he has characteristics of a Gothic Villain lends their misinterpretation strength. He is for instance of noble birth and has an air of mystery surrounding him. Still this does not make him a villain. He is capable of love, too, which makes him, in his own opinion, not evil: “Can any man who loves you as much as I do be truly evil?” (D. Stoker & Holt 357). His argument certainly makes sense, as one who is incapable of love is logically more evil than one that can and his ability to love makes him more of a tragic hero than a villain. Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt have created a version of Dracula who can be ranked amongst the heroes instead of with the foes and who is seductive and attractive, even though he may at times use fear as a weapon.

Chapter 4: *Anno Dracula* and *Dracula*

4.1. A short introduction to *Anno Dracula*

Kim Newman's *Anno Dracula* is set in 1888, three years after the events that occur in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Although Newman has used this as a starting point, a few crucial changes in the *Dracula* plot have enabled the vampire to spread his curse throughout the United Kingdom. Whereas the Count was killed in Bram Stoker's novel, he is not in *Anno Dracula*. Furthermore, he is not actually a Count in Newman's novel, but he is Prince Dracula, also known as Vlad Tepes. Van Helsing, Quincey Morris and the Harkers are dead (with Mina one might say she is technically not dead, as she has become a vampire). Arthur Holmwood has sided with the vampires since he has become one himself and the sole true survivor of the band of heroes seems to be Jack Seward. He did receive an injury to his hand, but aside from that he managed to escape unhurt.

Dracula has turned Queen Victoria and married her, making him the Prince Consort. This has given him a significant amount of power and he uses this strength to enforce a vampire police state in Britain. More and more of the British decide to turn and the amount of vampires in the nation grows. Unfortunately, Dracula's bloodline is corrupted and many from his blood have a low survival rate. The greatest problem for his children is that they inherit his ability to shape-shift when they are turned, but shape-shifting does not go smoothly for the new-born vampires and many die because of these problematic transformations.

Geneviève Dieudonné is an ancient vampire, like Dracula, but she is from a different bloodline that is pure and uncorrupted. She nurses those of the Transylvanian's bloodline in Whitechapel with some other helpful humans and vampires. The main doctor in Whitechapel is Seward, who is early on in the novel exposed by himself as being behind the Whitechapel murders. This makes him first Silver Knife, but later he earns the name Jack the Ripper. Whereas the original Ripper murdered human women, Jack Seward only assassinates vampire prostitutes. He hates Dracula, who took away Lucy, whom he is still obsessed about and determines to decimate the vampire's prostitutes.

As the murders continue, a man from the mysterious Diogenes Club, named Charles Beauregard, comes into the picture. He and Dieudonné join hands in order to find the murderer. They do not figure out that it is Seward quickly and while they are trying to discover who Jack the Ripper is, unease and anxiety grows in London. For the reader the hints towards Seward's guilt that are dropped are clear. It is, for instance, impossible to find

him when he is needed most (after another Ripper attack for example). In the end, Dieudonné and Beauregard do discover that Seward is the Ripper. They are credited for their work by Queen Victoria herself in the presence of Dracula. Beauregard knows he cannot defeat the vampire in a direct confrontation and therefore he offers the Queen a choice in the form of a silver knife, with which she commits suicide in order to save her country. Vlad's power is related to her and as she is no longer there, he has no claim to the throne, which means he will have to flee the country for his own safety.

The novel is written from multiple perspectives and between chapters there is a shift in the point of view. The most prominent angles that are shown are the viewpoint of Beauregard and the perspective of Dieudonné. Although it is interesting to discuss characters such as Dieudonné and Beauregard, the main focus in this chapter will be on Dracula himself. The vampire does not appear in the novel until the end and we mainly see the influence he has on England. When it comes to Dracula's character in Newman's novel, it is clear from the beginning that he is a villain. Yet he is more, namely an important part of Newman's message: "I was trying, without being too solemn, to mix things I felt about the 1980s, when the British Government made 'Victorian Values' a slogan, with the real and imagined 1880s, when blood was flowing in the fog and there was widespread social unrest" (Newman 423). In this way Newman tries to address the problems of Thatcher's "Victorian Values" and the complications involved in excluding certain lower groups from society, as they might be a danger to the definition of a perfect society. Newman addresses the ethical complications of excluding lower groups by focussing mainly on the lower classes of society.

4.2. *Dracula's appearance*

An aspect of *Anno Dracula* that is remarkable is the fact that although the novel bears the title *Anno Dracula* and is about the vampire, he does not actually appear physically in the novel until the end. There are some references to his appearance before that, though. He is for instance described as Victoria's "fiercely moustachioed, red-eyed consort" (Newman 35). The moustache that can also be found in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*: "The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache," (29) certainly suggests a heavy or, as Newman describes it "fierce" moustache. The red eyes Newman mentions are not exactly mentioned in that way in *Dracula*, but could fit in with how Jonathan Harker expresses himself when he cuts himself while shaving and the Count sees it: "When the Count saw my face, his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury, and he suddenly made a grab at my throat" (B. Stoker

37-38). Although Stoker does not explicitly say that his Count has red eyes, one might say that the demonic fury that is mentioned, suggests his eyes might be red, as it is colour that can be associated with fury. Piatti-Farnell mentions that: “Red eyes, in particular, are a very difficult, if not impossible occurrence to find in nature” (22). She continues to describe that there is one type of fruit fly that does have a red eye colour and some types of fish, such as the Scorpionfish, but one would hardly think Newman based the red eyes of his vampire prince on those creatures, as Dracula does not bear resemblance to them. The vampire is a shape-shifter, though, and could be linked to bats and wolves, but none of these tend to naturally have red eyes. It could be a possibility that he decided to give his Dracula red eyes, because it simply looks unnatural and therefore may be considered disturbing or terrifying, which is, after all, in a way what the Prince Consort is.

He could have interpreted Stoker’s eyes with “demoniac fury” as red eyes, which would account for this adaptation. Yet, what is more probable, is that Newman has been influenced by popular culture. After all, red vampire eyes have been seen in vampire films since as early as 1958 in the *Horror of Dracula* (Piatti-Farnell 23). Also, those of us that are familiar with more modern popular culture, will be aware that the vampires in *Twilight* also have red eyes if their diet includes human blood and even though this is a more recent series than *Anno Dracula*, it might be part of the same trend or tendency. The colour red can be connected to blood. Eyes reflect who one is and those with red eyes must therefore be different, because it can be seen as a rather unnatural colour. This suggests that even though the world in *Anno Dracula* is filled with vampires, it is still unnatural to be a vampire. Also, red eyes suggest bloodlust, and if one relates it to the “demoniac fury” as described in the eyes of Bram Stoker’s Count, it might also insinuate both anger and a demonic quality. This demonic aspect fits in with the fact that the red colour in itself is not seen often, and can therefore be seen as unnatural; a demon is not a natural being either, as it is supernatural and has abilities and forms that cannot be explained with the help of science. What is definitely true about red eyes, is that it does not make Dracula more attractive. After all, it looks unnatural and whichever the reason for its colour, it gives him a dangerous appearance. His are the eyes of a predator.

Near the end of the novel, when Beauregard and Dieudonné are finally confronted with Dracula, he is also described in unattractive terms. When they enter the room where they see him, he is described as follows:

Prince Dracula sat upon his throne, massive as a commemorative statue, his

enormously bloated face a rich red under withered grey. Moustaches stiff with recent blood hung to his chest, his thick hair was loose about his shoulders, and his black-stubbed chin was dotted with the gravy of his last feeding. His left hand loosely held the orb of office, which seemed in his grip the size of a tennis ball (Newman 385).

The way in which the vampire is described here, is rather disgusting. The “orb of office” that is described is the Koh-i-Noor, which was a diamond with symbolic meaning, as Kinsey describes: “Koh-i-Noor was a symbol of Britain’s civilizing mission in India”(394). This makes it not only a symbol of the British Empire, but also of the oppression that Empire brought to the its victims (the colonized) and its theft, as the Koh-i-Noor is not a diamond from British soil. Yet, Kinsey describes how the British public was made to believe it was a positive symbol: “When the Koh i-Noor Diamond entered public discourse in Britain, however, the court and the colonial government used the biography of the stone to cast British conquest in India in a progressive light” (292). People were made to believe that Empire was a positive and progressive movement, whereas the truth was that instead of bringing something good to the colonized countries, the British were taking more, such as the diamond. The fact that the Prince Consort has this symbol, suggests that he is the oppressor, not only of Victoria, but also of the rest of the Empire.

Aside from being portrayed as an oppressor, the way in which Dracula’s appearance is described also function to make him even less sympathetic or even disgusting. He is not even clean, but still has the remnants of his last feeding upon him. The use of the word “gravy” is disturbing, as it may suggest that he actually eats the meat of his victims, too. Also, he is described as “massive” and “bloated,” which suggests he is a glutton that feeds too much. In this first description of him, even if one were to ignore the way in which he was described earlier on in the novel, it already becomes clear that he indulges in his feedings. What is also noticeable, is that he is not described as a young man, but more like an older or middle-aged man, as is suggested by “withered grey.” Although Bram Stoker’s Dracula is not described as a young man either, it is still remarkable that Newman’s vampire prince seems to be in decay.

Yet, the Prince Consort has grown, as “in life, Vlad Tepes had been a man of less than medium height; now he was a giant” (Newman 386). This suggests that after someone is turned, he or she can still grow and change appearance. Hence, the “withered grey” and the increased size of the Prince Consort. Changing in appearance after taking the dark kiss, is something that also happens to the other vampires in the novel when they are new-born. There are the changes that one would expect, such as the retractable vampire teeth that grow

after the turn and the physical transition from a breathing human, to dead, to un-dead. Aside from the more general changes that occur to every newly turned vampire, there are also changes in their appearance that are connected to their character. Their true selves seem to shine through. This can be concluded by examples from vampires in the novel. The most obvious example is that of Dracula himself who grows taller after his turn.

Penelope Churchward also proves that personality will shine through in a vampire's appearance. She is engaged to her deceased cousin Pamela's former husband. (It is worth noting that although they were cousins, they were practically raised as sisters.) After she is turned, she drinks poisoned blood, which weakens who she is as a person. As a result, Penelope's body starts to shift towards appearing more like Pamela, because she has always been in the shadow of her cousin. She is used to being the second-best and therefore her body's weakness results in a weakening of her own features, and replacing them by those of the person who has always seemed to be better than her: "Her face had changed subtly, her hairline shifted. She looked like Pamela"(Newman 320).

Although Newman only describes Dracula in more detail on the latest twenty pages of the novel, he does mention lots of details that give the reader a full image of the character. He is described as having "yellow teeth, the size and shape of pointed thumbs" (386) and his breath "was everything dead and rotten" (387). Aside from his cape, the Prince Consort is completely naked. Newman also mentions a fact from Bram Stoker's novel; Dracula speaks proper English. What is in a way peculiar, is the matter that on the one hand, Newman describes Dracula in detail, but on the other hand, he also says that the vampire is constantly changing shape: "The red eyes and wolf teeth were fixed, but around them, under the rough cheeks, was a constantly shifting shape; sometimes a hairy, wet snout, sometimes a thin, polished skull" (387). This must refer to Dracula's ability to shape-shift, although the continuing changes suggest that he is not fully in control of them, which would explain why he is constantly shape-shifting. The fact that he does not wear clothes can also be connected to his inability to control his shifting form, or at least Geneviève thinks it can: "She suspected he chose to go naked not simply because he was able to, but because clothes could not contain his constant shifting of shape" (Newman 389). Geneviève's observation suggests that she also suspects that the Prince Consort has no control over his shape-shifting, even though she says that he is able to be naked. This must refer to his position, not the simple fact that anyone could go naked, whether this is socially accepted or not. Geneviève's observation seems to imply that due to his position, Dracula can choose to wear no clothes and still be feared and respected. Yet even though this enables him to be nude, it would have been likely

that he would have worn clothes to show his status to others, after all, that is one of the functions of fashion. It can be seen as personal adornment, and Roach and Eicher describe how it distinguishes different types of people from each other:

Adornment is communicative of many subtleties in social relations. It suggests the behaviours (roles) expected of people on the basis of their various and sometimes multiple connections with each other and can, therefore distinguish the powerful from the weak, the rich from the poor, the hero from the outcast, the conformer from the nonconformer, the religious from the irreligious, the leader from the follower” (Roach and Eicher 112)

It is clear that Dracula would only desire to be seen to fit into some of the types of people Roach and Eicher mention. He would want to be seen as powerful, rich, religious and a leader. Also, he might want to be seen as a hero, but as Newman’s Prince Consort is a clear example of a villain, this may be doubtful. Dracula’s lack of clothes suggests a lack of respect for the social conformities of Victorian Britain, as it was (to say the least) unusual to be naked in public, regardless of one’s status. Yet, the fact that fashion helps to distinguish one from others, makes it peculiar. Even though the Prince Consort can be nude in public, this does not mean he does so voluntarily and this probably has something to do with the fact that his blood is cursed. His children have difficulties with shape-shifting and even die because their bodies cannot survive the wrong ways in which their bodies shift form. Though Dracula does not die like his children do, he has not enough control over his shape-shifting abilities to be able to wear clothes and take them off when he wants to change form.

4.3. Dracula, the Prince Consort, and law and order

Now that the psychical appearance of Dracula has been discussed, one may look further into his character in *Anno Dracula*. As was mentioned before, the vampire prince has become the Prince Consort to Queen Victoria and although Victoria is still Queen, in reality Dracula turns out to have more power than she has, as he uses manipulation and fear as a tool to control her. To the outside world it looks as if she has sided with him, for instance in the following line: “The Queen and her Prince Consort were much concerned with law and order” (Newman 118). Not only does this line suggest that the Queen and her husband are both of the same viewpoint, but it also connects the rule of Dracula to that of Margaret

Thatcher, who was also in favour of law and order and she was known as the Iron Lady. Dracula certainly also has the reputation of being harsh and can in that way be compared to Thatcher: “The Prince was proud to be known as harsh but just” (Newman 126). Thatcher used the term “Victorian values” and in her article, Bird examines how Thatcher’s term may be applied to *Anno Dracula*. She quotes Mitchell who explains what Thatcher meant with the term: “‘Thatcher used the term ‘Victorian values’ as a measure against which to identify the social ills of her milieu – a regulated economy, welfare dependency and the decline of the family’, and, relatedly, to reassert ‘traditional and naturalised boundaries between normalcy and deviancy, morality and perversity’” (Mitchell as qtd. in Bird 3).

At a first glance, the “Victorian Values” may not immediately sound like something that means risking doing worse evils in order to contain or eliminate something that could be seen as wrong, yet it is undoubtedly the result of it. By trying to assert “Victorian Values” certain groups will be unable to conform to what is fitting within these values. Those groups that threaten the ideal of “Victorian Values” will be threatened by elimination, containment or even by prevention.

The groups that threaten this ideal are focused on in *Anno Dracula* and according to Bird: “the novel considers the question of who must be excluded from a society in order for it to be regarded as ‘civilised’, a process of exclusion which in contemporary culture is intimately bound up with the notion of ‘Victorian values’” (Bird 3). The novel is set mainly in the lesser neighbourhoods of London with an especially large role for Whitechapel. Vampirism is spreading there fast, as prostitutes offer the dark kiss in exchange for a little blood, which is looked down upon in the novel, not only because it is a rather cheap way to turn into a vampire, but there is also the fact that the prostitutes are of Dracula’s bloodline (even if not directly, in the end they are of his blood). This means their blood is poisoned and that those that turn will end up just as low on the social scale as the prostitutes that turned them. Bird connects this to the way those lowest on the social ladder were looked upon by those that believed in Thatcherism, such as Sir Keith Joseph. He warned society that “‘our human stock is threatened’ due to the high proportion of children being born to ‘those least fitted’ to be parents” (Joseph as qtd. in Bird 8). In *Anno Dracula* the same happens with the vampire prostitutes and their dark children. They create more vampires in order to sustain themselves, which will eventually lead to their having more difficulties at finding human blood to feed upon, as the percentage that is vampire heightens whereas the number of humans decreases. With the procreation of vampires from the impure bloodline of Dracula, disease spreads and even human diseases are passed on to vampires: “Disease was still a

danger; the Prince Consort's Dark Kiss, at whatever remove, did something strange to diseases a person happened to carry over from warm life into their un-dead state" (Newman 42).

As the vampire prostitutes that turned were in many cases already carrying diseases during their human life as prostitutes, this would remain the case in their life as a vampire. An example of this is Cathy Eddowes, who got terrible sores after she turned, which spread and would have been the end of her if she had not been murdered by Jack "The Ripper" Seward before the disease could kill her. Seward certainly understood Victorian values as he eliminates the vampire prostitutes; they are the greatest group of those that threaten society and also the lowest. His manner of doing this makes the reader wonder how wrong or justified this is. He assassinates the prostitutes in cold-blood and with precision, which makes him a cold serial killer, yet he is correct in seeing the threat they pose to society. Fortunately, Geneviève has a more moderate view on this problem of society. Although she believes the prostitutes should not spread their disease and turn people, she does not judge the prostitutes and their victims harshly as Seward does. She tries to help them where she can, and especially one girl named Lily earns her devoted care. The girl dies in Geneviève's arms, and the vampire lady has the following stream of thought just before the girl passes away: "Rose Mylett or whoever was the child's human mother, was not here. The sailor on the market porter who spent his fourpence to become her father probably didn't even know she had lived. And the murgatroyd from the West End – whom Geneviève would track down and *hurt* – was passed on to other pleasures (Newman 172).

Geneviève describes the sad truth of the situation; the poor do not get the help and support they need even when they are alive, but after they are turned they are abandoned even more. There is little interest in helping others and all have to fetch for themselves and try to survive as long as possible, which in most cases is not too long. Geneviève's role is to care for those that are not cared for by others, but that does not prevent more of the poorest to come into the same situation. Seward on the other hand actually stops a few vampires by murdering them.

4.4. *Dracula and Jack the Ripper*

Jack Seward is Jack the Ripper in *Anno Dracula*. If Newman had not made this clear from the beginning, he would not have been the first choice, as he is not seen as an extremely aggressive character by the other characters. At a first glance, one would immediately think

of Dracula as the Ripper, simply because of his bloodthirsty nature in the original Bram Stoker novel. In *Anno Dracula* he is also a ferocious creature, yet he is not the Ripper. The fact remains that only vampire prostitutes are murdered in the novel and that is not something one would expect from the great vampire. He has no reason to assassinate his own kind. Also, in the beginning of the novel, Seward himself makes it quite clear that he is in fact the Ripper. His assassinations of vampire prostitutes, who are of the lowest classes, fits in with the idea of degeneration, or as Bird puts it: “The idea of the ‘wrong people’ becoming vampires in the novel also highlights the close links between degeneration theory and the late-Victorian interest in eugenics” (Bird 8). The vampire prostitutes are certainly what one would judge as “the wrong people” and their spreading vampirism is a problem for society.

Yet the government does not seem to do anything about this and it is Jack who tries to do something about it by assassinating some of the prostitutes. The rest of society seems to do nothing to improve society, partly (“partly” is used here to exclude those like Dracula that do not seem to possess any morals) because it is unethical to destroy those that do not fit into an idealized notion of society. It seems impossible to help the prostitutes and other lower class vampires from Dracula’s bloodline. They are shape-shifters with defects and are therefore vampires that seem less human. Some of the prostitutes are for instance described as having “fur on her arm” (Newman 345) and also: “She kept rubbing her whiskered cheek against him, letting him sniff her animal musk” (345). The way in which this prostitute (who goes by the name of Nell) is described, suggests that she is more of an animal than a human, which is a complicated matter, because in fact she is a vampire in the first place. Yet this description reminds one more of a cat than of a vampire. Vampire prostitutes like Nell are a problem for society as they spread their diseased blood to others and the question is whether or not they should still be considered human, in spite of their vampire blood and animalistic appearances and behaviour. One could therefore say that:

Anno Dracula is thus concerned with the ways in which the disposability of a life is tied to its proximity with the non-human, but the novel also recognises that the definition of human life is constantly in flux. Indeed, just as civilised society doesn’t simply happen, the human subject which functions as the source and object of society’s laws and values likewise has to be constructed and maintained. (Bird 6)

Bird is certainly correct to state that *Anno Dracula* concerns itself with the worth of life in connection to how human or non-human one is. Also, the definition of what is human is not

set in stone, but flexible. This flexibility can be seen in Newman's portrayal of Moreau. The doctor searches for evidence that humanity can be perfected and sees Dieudonné as an example. She wonders what would happen if all humans became vampires, but Moreau is not worried about that: "Why we would import Africans or South Sea Islanders" (Newman 206). He also thought of another option: "Or we raise lesser beasts to human form. If vampires can shift shape, so can other creatures" (Newman 206). The doctor here suggests that humanity can be created through science, which would make humanity a flexible concept.

Seward is not so much concerned with the flexibility of humanity, but more with what is non-human and therefore disposable in his own opinion. If one were to ask Seward, the lives of the vampire prostitutes are disposable, especially because he does not consider them to be human. As they are non-human, he thinks he is doing society a favour by removing them from society. Seward believes the following: "My duty is to cut out the corrupt heart of the city" (Newman 162). He also does not consider himself a joker like the person who wrote the Jack the Ripper notes or a mad murderer: "I am not a lunatic practical joker. I am a surgeon, cutting away diseased tissue" (Newman 196). It is clear that he does not believe he is doing something unethical, but the Queen and Dracula are concerned about the murders. Yet, it is hypocritical of the Prince Consort to act as if the assassination of vampire prostitutes is terrible, whereas he does in essence the same as Seward, only with a different group and while Seward does the deeds himself, Dracula has people to do it for him.

An example of who he punishes is Count Vardalek, who I is found out with a boy and therefore impaled. Kostaki, one of Dracula's Carpathians, does as the Prince wishes, even though he does not think it necessary: "Vardelek's preference for boys did not strike him as anything to fuss about, but Prince Dracula had strange prejudices" (Newman 126). Dracula expresses himself against homosexuality in any form and therefore he tries to exclude this group from society, just as Seward does so for the vampire prostitutes. Both try to diminish a group of society and in this way the vampire Prince could actually be seen as more of a Ripper than Seward. Even though Dracula does not undertake the actions himself, his way of eliminating enemies is more effective and his men execute many. Aside from the execution of homosexuals, the Prince Consort is also concerned with removing other groups from society. Those that are not executed immediately are removed to Devil's Dyke, a concentration camp that nobody in London knows much about. Even Bram Stoker, who, along with others, has been fictionalized in the novel, has been removed to the concentration camp:

No one had the courage or the cruelty to enquire after Bram, who was rumoured to have been removed to Devil's Dyke after an altercation with the Lord Chamberlain on a point of official censorship. Only the distinguished intervention of Henry Irving, Stoker's employer, prevented Bram's head from joining that of his friend Van Helsing outside the Palace (Newman29).

This quotation suggests that Stoker is fortunate to be placed in Devil's Dyke, instead of being executed immediately, but still it is a harsh way of exercising the power of censorship. Also, it can be doubted whether he will get a chance to leave Devil's Dyke alive. After all, concentration camps are not known for having many survivors and instead of an immediate and possibly not too painful death, he will probably die slowly and painfully. Although Irving must have meant well, it has probably done nothing good for Stoker. Furthermore, one might say that the removal of Stoker to Devil's Dyke is telling for the way in which Newman approaches the original *Dracula*. He censors it by having Dracula remove Stoker to a concentration camp.

The fact that Dracula has created a concentration camp immediately connects him to Hitler. When one looks at the fact that he is also against homosexuality and exercises censorship, they seem to be similar indeed. Seward is the Ripper, but Dracula himself is a Ripper on a much larger scale. All groups from society that stand in his way or are against what fits in his ideal society he will have removed.

4.5. Conclusion

Kim Newman has portrayed Dracula as a true villain in *Anno Dracula*. Although Bram Stoker also depicts the vampire as a villain, there are still clear differences between his original and Newman's variant. The first difference that immediately becomes clear is the fact that *Anno Dracula*'s vampire villain is not a Count but a Prince. More specifically; Newman has made Dracula and the historical Vlad Tepes the same person in his novel. Naturally, the story is also different from that of *Dracula*.

When it comes to the appearance of the vampire villain, it seems that Newman has taken some inspiration from Bram Stoker, as he has a moustache, which he also has in Stoker's novel. Also, the Prince Consort has the ability to shape-shift, yet this seems not to be as refined an ability as it is in *Dracula*. The Prince for instance wears no clothes, which hints at his inability to control his shifting shape. If he could choose when to change his form, he

could still have worn clothes and taken them off before changing shape. The clearest hint at this is an observation by Geneviève: “She suspected he chose to go naked not simply because he was able to, but because clothes could not contain his constant shifting of shape” (Newman 389). Shifting shape constantly is not useful at all and therefore it is incredible to believe that he would do this voluntarily. The fact that his offspring is also incapable of controlling their shape-shifting and therefore often die is another point that supports this argument.

If one were to summarize Dracula’s appearance in Newman’s novel, one would describe him as disgusting. After all, he is naked, at least relatively old (as his hair is described as greying), hairy, red-eyed, smells rotten and has big yellow teeth. Also his face is described as bloated and he does not trouble with cleaning himself after he has fed, but leaves the remaining blood and gravy on himself (Newman 385-389). The fact that he shape-shifts constantly only adds to his appearance not being attractive or agreeable at all. His red eyes even make him look more appalling. Newman might have been inspired to give his vampire red eyes by Stoker’s description of “demoniac fury” (B. Stoker 37), but it is more probable that Newman has also been inspired by vampire films or even just Dracula film adaptations, as red eyes are a frequent aspect of vampires in film.

Social issues are an important part of Newman’s *Anno Dracula* and especially the issue of excluding certain groups from society is important. The problematic group in this novel consists of vampire prostitutes with the Prince Consort’s cursed blood, which has given them complications when it comes to shape-shifting. They are turning others into vampires and in this way the amount of vampires from the lowest classes with cursed blood increases. This is something that needs to be stopped, but the cost is also something that needs to be considered. If one believes Moreau, the vampires with shape-shifting problems are the beginning of regression: “‘It’s the shape-shifters,’ Moreau said. ‘They are evolution run backwards, an atavism. Mankind stands atop the parabola of life on earth; the vampire represents the step over the prow, the first footfall on the path of regression to savagery’” (Newman 204). According to Moreau, the shape-shifters as he names them, are a danger to society as they are the first step towards regression and dehumanization. In this way Newman makes one wonder where the boundaries between human and non-human life lie. The prostitutes for instance can sometimes hardly be seen as human, as they have shape-shifting problems and therefore may have fur, whiskers or even wings. Aside from that non-human aspect, they also are vampires, and it is the question whether or not one should see a vampire as a human being.

If one were to take Moreau's view on the situation, one would simply say that the lives of the shape-shifting prostitutes are interesting to study, but not necessarily worth saving. Dr. Jekyll takes a milder view, as he is concerned with the fact that they are all dying because of the shape-shifting problems. Moreau is known as a vivisectionist and this connects him to Seward or Jack the Ripper. They both know how to make incisions and make use of this knowledge. Whereas Moreau tries to create something more human out of animals, Seward claims: "I am a surgeon, cutting away diseased tissue" (Newman 196). His "cutting away diseased tissue" could be interpreted in more than one way as he does not only make incisions in his victims, but he also literally cuts their lives away, because they are "diseased tissue" for society.

Seward is not the only who tries to remove those groups of society that are threat to it, but Dracula himself is a Ripper in his own way. Although the Prince Consort rarely completes the executions himself, he is still the one giving the orders. One group that Dracula feels is a threat to his idea of an ideal society are homosexuals and when his men find practicing homosexuals, they have to be executed on the spot. He also has a concentration camp named Devil's Dyke and everyone who does something that does not agree with him can be send there, or at least if they are not impaled immediately. Those that challenge his censorship, such as for instance Bram Stoker himself, are send there. These aspects remind one of Hitler; censorship, hate against homosexuals and concentration camps were after all part of his regime as well. In that way one could see Dracula as more than just a Ripper, he is a Ripper on a large scale.

All in all, Newman's Dracula is in its evil essence similar to Bram Stoker's character, but there are differences, such as the red eyes on a more superficial scale, but there are more disturbing dissimilarities, too, especially when it comes to how much evil his character can perform from his powerful position as Prince Consort. One might conclude that Kim Newman's Dracula comes across as an even worse villain than the original vampire that was portrayed by Bram Stoker. The vampire from *Dracula* was evil and a true villain, but Newman's Prince Consort has taken a greater stage and is therefore a threat to more than simply his near environment; he threatens the whole British Empire and through this he also threatens the world. The fact that Newman chose this approach fits in with his own interests: "I was already interested in alternate history science fiction and recognised in this mostly-forgotten genre the precursors of many twentieth-century stories which imagine an alternative outcome to the Second World War featuring a Nazi occupation of Britain (Newman 419). An addition that explains why his Dracula seems to be successful where Stoker's was not, is the

fact that Newman felt: “disappointment that Stoker’s villain, after all his meticulous planning and with five hundred years of scheming monstrosity under his cloak, has no sooner arrived in Britain than he trips up and sows the seeds of his eventual undoing by an unlikely pursuit of the wife of a provincial solicitor” (Newman 419). The way in which he describes Mina Harker does suggest that he found it peculiar that someone like her would be a part of Dracula’s destruction. He found it disappointing that the villain did not win and in his own novel he created an alternative outcome.

Chapter 5: Analysis of the results and conclusion

5.1. Introduction to the analysis

This thesis provides answers that are significant especially to the field of Dracula studies. For those that are active within Dracula studies, this thesis might be more than simply interesting, as it covers new terrain in many ways. Not only the choice of source, but also the angle is unique. Never before has this combination of novels been chosen with this specific angle. To be more precise: two of the three novels have not been the main focus of research before. The only novel that has been discussed in this way is *Anno Dracula*, yet the angle Bird takes in her article on this topic is not focused on *Dracula* as an adaptation from Bram Stoker, but much more on the social and ethical issues discussed in the novel. The fact that little has been written about the three book adaptations, has made doing research for this thesis more challenging, as there were few or no examples to serve as a guidance. It is therefore fortunate that *Dracula* has such a rich afterlife filled with adaptations from various mediums, as this has been incredibly useful in finding the reasons behind some of the aspects in the portrayal of the vampire. Although there are numerous adaptations, there are remaining concepts in the novels that are not mentioned in any of the relevant Dracula film adaptations (or at least not yet). Examples of this are the idea of Dracula as God's warrior, a historian or as a supporter of Victorian Values.

In the core chapters, the book adaptations were discussed separately, which has offered some insights as to what the answer to the research question will be, but these chapters do not provide a complete answer. This will be provided in this final chapter. In order to do that the information found in the three core chapters will be compared to each other, to the way in which Bram Stoker portrayed his Count, and to some relevant film adaptations. Dracula's appearance and characterisation will be looked into, as well as his adaptation in general in the novels.

As the goal of this concluding chapter is to offer an answer to the research question in a clear and structured way, it is a natural step to follow the structure that has been offered in the core chapters and modify it to fit the goals here. One aspect that has recurred throughout the chapters is a paragraph focused on the appearance Dracula has in the book adaptations and therefore in this concluding chapter there will also be a paragraph devoted to this aspect. The other aspects are book specific, as the three novels vary their portrayal of the characterisation of the vampire villain significantly. To make up for the absence of an all-

encompassing name that mentions all of the individual aspects from the novels separately, there will be a paragraph simply named “book specific aspects and relevant film adaptations” in which attention is paid to all these aspects.

5.2. *Dracula's appearance in the adaptations*

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is not, as mentioned in the first chapter of this thesis, described in attractive terms. It is therefore logical to a certain extent that two of our three book adaptations describe the vampire as an unattractive creature. Yet these adaptations, *The Historian* and *Anno Dracula*, do portray Dracula in a different way than Bram Stoker. Also, whereas the exception, *Dracula: The Un-Dead* does describe Dracula as a handsome character, he continues to have the monstrous side of the original vampire when he is in danger. For clarity the description of Bram Stoker's Count has been added here:

His face was a strong – a very strong – aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale and at the tops extremely pointed; the chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of extraordinary pallor (B. Stoker 29).

An aspect of the Count that recurs in the adaptations is the fact that he is from Romania. All of them mention this, but that seems to be the only aspect they all have in common. Whereas Newman's *Dracula* has red eyes, Kostova describes her Dracula as having green eyes that are “preternaturally large and wide-set” (701). In *Dracula: The Un-Dead* the vampire's eye colour is not specified, but as he is described as a dark-haired Eastern European man, it could be implied that he has brown eyes, which would fit his hair colour most naturally. Also, Dacre Stoker's and Ian Holt's *Dracula* seems to transform into a terrifying monster when he is in danger or wants to use fear as a weapon against his enemies: “Dracula's eyes had become those of a reptile, his skin an ashen green, his ears pointed. His mouth widened, filled to overflowing by gory fangs protruding outward in a hideous snout

(375). By this transformation the vampire's portrayal comes closer to the original Count, but still the adaptation of Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt differs most from Bram Stoker's *Dracula* when it comes to appearance. The reason for this is not necessarily that the other adaptations have more aspects that are similar to Bram Stoker's Count, but the fact that *Dracula: The Un-Dead* shows an attractive Dracula is in such a sharp contrast with Bram Stoker's vampire that it is automatically more different from the original Count. The other two adaptations describe an unattractive Dracula, which even though details may vary, at least remains true to the essence of the vampire's appearance. He was originally an unattractive villain, even though film adaptations have made use of the freedom to portray him differently, especially more seductively as Rottenbacher suggests: "Dracula for the new millennium has taken on a new form. No longer just a monster, he has become a sex symbol" (par 13). The portrayal of the vampire in *Dracula: The Un-Dead* certainly fits in with this trend from the film adaptations; he is after all portrayed as a more seductive and attractive character.

An aspect that Kostova's vampire has in common with Bram Stoker's original is a "cruel-looking" mouth; "his mouth and nose cruel" (Kostova 701). Aside from the moustache this seems to be the only exact similarity to the original Count. Yet the nature of her Dracula remains villainous and therefore the essence remains the same. He is not the seductive vampire one sees in popular films. Kostova describes him as someone who is shorter than the young monks he meets with, but nevertheless he seems to be taller than them. This suggests that her Dracula has an average height or even smaller, although this will not be noticed because of his large presence. Also, she described him as wearing fine clothes (701). The full impression the reader gets of the vampire is that he is a villainous and unsympathetic man.

In *Anno Dracula* the vampire is also portrayed as a villain, and although the Prince Consort does not appear to have many exact similarities to Bram Stoker's Count, he may seem more similar because he is such an evil character and because he is portrayed in unattractive terms. He is described as having "withered grey" (Newman 385) hair on his face, which would fit in with the following words of Bram Stoker that are concerned with Dracula's teeth and lips: "whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years" (B. Stoker 29).

When comparing the appearance of Bram Stoker's Count to Dracula as portrayed in *The Historian*, *Anno Dracula* and *Dracula: The Un-Dead* it is remarkable how relatively little exact matches to Bram Stoker's description of the character can be found. There is a great amount of freedom for those creating an adaptation of the vampire and it can be

concluded that he does not even have to be portrayed as a villain, as *Dracula: The Un-Dead* proves. The only aspect from Bram Stoker's depiction of Dracula that has remained in all three of the adaptations is the fact that he is an Eastern-European (to be precise Romanian) vampire, which influences his appearance to a certain extent, as well.

5.3. *Book specific aspects of Dracula and relevant film adaptations*

As the three adaptations differ greatly, it is difficult to compare their book specific aspects of the vampire. These differences may have something to do with the fact that Dracula is a character that has been adapted frequently and in numerous ways throughout the years. After all, every Dracula adaptation should add a new element or a different combination of aspects in order to make it more interesting. There would be no reason for creating a new Dracula adaptation if one were to make an exact copy of an earlier version, simply because it has been done already. The rich afterlife of Dracula offers in this way both freedom and difficulties. It is possible to stretch the boundaries of Bram Stoker's vampire, but at the same time the target audience needs to be able to accept the changes that are made. Therefore one might say that the character of Dracula has been shape-shifting over the years. He still is.

An example of this is the way in which the vampire is portrayed when it comes to his appearance; as is mentioned in the previous paragraph all three of the adaptations are quite different in their description of Dracula's physiognomy. Even his character changes, in two of the three novels he is still a villain, while in the third the vampire has become a tragic hero. There is only one aspect of Dracula's character that is the same for all three of the novels; the vampire is the historical Vlad Tepes. This deviates from Bram Stoker's character, as he was not explicitly linked to the Impaler. Yet somehow this has become an important aspect of Dracula adaptations. Although in this thesis the focus is on three novels, the influence of film on them should not be denied or forgotten. Therefore, instead of only describing the book specific aspects of Dracula's character here, these aspects will be tried to link to other sources (mainly film adaptations) that have similarities. Waltje describes the last century of Dracula adaptations shortly and predicts the future:

Over the last 100 years, the image of the vampire has proven itself to be highly adaptable and it is far from being depleted. It will certainly be around for the next century, and as soon as the pendulum swings back from the blood-and-gore extremes, a definitive version of Bram Stoker's novel – possibly this time starring Anthony

Hopkins as Dracula but without any other “innovative takes” – would be more than welcome by most fans of the genre (Waltje 9)

One can only agree with Waltje’s claim that Bram Stoker’s Count is highly adaptable, simply because it has been adapted so many times already. It is a popular character to adapt. Whether or not his prediction for the future will come true, remains to be seen, but it is certainly not an unrealistic suggestion, simply because it seems that everything is possible within Dracula adaptations. The three novels that are investigated in this thesis are only an example of how much is possible when adapting Bram Stoker’s Count.

Although the adaptations differ from each other, it is still interesting to find similarities and possibly even trends. One of the main trends in Dracula adaptations and one which has become part of popular culture so much that the original Stoker novel seems to have been forgotten in this aspect, is the fact that Vlad Tepes and Dracula seem to always be considered one and the same person. Or as Hillyer puts it: “Almost all literary, television and movie vampires are modelled after one historical figure ... Vlad the Impaler” (Hillyer as qtd. in Miller par 14). It is accepted and typical to adapt Bram Stoker’s Count by making him Vlad Tepes, which is a misconception addressed earlier in this thesis. In spite of it being a mistake, the novels that we have investigated use it, too. *The Historian*, *Dracula: The Un-Dead* and *Anno Dracula* have all made Dracula and Vlad Tepes into one and the same person. Somehow it has become a popular aspect to do this, perhaps because it adds a historical perspective to a fictional story. Florescu and McNally suggest the following: “Vampire symbolism became attached to Dracula essentially because his real life lent itself to being mythologized in that way. Dracula’s thirst for blood was well known, as was his fixation on impalement” (Florescu & McNally as qtd. in Miller 15). Note that they mean Vlad Tepes here with the name Dracula. They suggest that the life of Tepes has inspired the connection, which is logical, as after all it is a link that easy to see between Tepes and Dracula, whose name was based on Tepes nickname.

Another aspect that has become popular in adaptations of the vampire, is sexuality. Of the three novels, only *Dracula: The Un-Dead* portrays a seductive Dracula, even though in film, he has become more sexual as a trend, as Rottenbacher argues: “The more recent Dracula films tend to keep the romantic themes as the main focus points for their narratives and have increased the physical and sexual appeal of Dracula” (par 3). He has looked into four different Dracula films, namely *Bram Stoker’s Dracula*, *Dracula 2000*, *Dracula Rising* and *Dark Prince: The True Story of Dracula*. The oldest film of the four, *Bram Stoker’s*

Dracula, is the one who remains closest to the character as he was originally portrayed in the novel (even though he has a seductive side already in this film), whereas: “The other three films owe practically nothing to Stoker’s description; their Draculas are sleek and sexy, and have hardly any of the physical monstrosity that is so central to the novel. Dracula is both dark and mysteriously handsome, a stunning model fit for pages of fashion magazines” (Rottenbacher par 6). The way in which Rottenbacher describes the Draculas from the three films, fits in well with the way in which the character is portrayed in *Dracula: The Un-Dead*. The vampire is portrayed as a handsome and mysterious man in the novel, and furthermore he is also not seen as the villain. The vampire Prince can be seen as a tragic hero and he sees himself as God’s warrior. As his sexuality is seen in film adaptations, it seemed interesting to also look for aspects of his heroism and the concept of being God’s warrior in Dracula film adaptations.

A film that does portray Dracula as if he is a hero is for instance *Dracula Untold* (2014). It is necessary to note here that the film is newer than *Dracula The Un-Dead*, as the latter was first published in 2009 and therefore it is not possible that Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt based the vampire from their novel on that film, but still it may be useful to look into a comparison between the film and novel. The reason for this comparison being helpful is simple; although the book cannot be based on the film, similarities may still provide us with some insight in whether there are new developments in Dracula adaptations concerning the character of the vampire in relation to being God’s warrior. In *Dracula Untold* Vlad and Dracula are, again, made into one and the same, and Vlad evolves from the not so nice Impaler and warrior into Dracula, the vampire who fights for his family and people. In this film he only became a vampire, because he needed to defeat the Turks, in order to save his son and 1000 other sons that were demanded by the Turks. In this way he is the hero of his family and his people, by turning into a vampire. He is not God’s warrior, but he is a strong warrior type portrayal of Dracula. Yet, until now, it seems as if Dracula as a warrior of God is a new way of portraying the Count. Thus it can be said that although Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt certainly borrowed from both popular adaptations and Bram Stoker’s novel, they also came up with their own aspects for the vampire’s character.

When thinking of Dracula as a warrior, one may immediately think of *The Historian*, too, as the vampire is portrayed in this novel not only as a historian, but also as a skilled warrior. Yet Kostova emphasizes his greed for knowledge and love for history more. His skills as a warrior are mainly mentioned in connection to his past, which he wishes to preserve. This emphasis on history is something that may be linked to Kostova’s personal

interests. She is quoted as follows in an interview with Younge: ““We have experienced intense globalisation the last 10 years and we are aware as never before of history as a whole and of our place in it. We are aware of the world as a small and fragile place. I also think this is an age of great anxiety. The more I studied the middle ages for this book the more I thought we hadn't come that far in some ways”” (Younge, par. 17). As Kostova admits in the interview, she believes that there is more awareness of history in the current globalised world. Also, the fact that she admits that she studied the middle ages for *The Historian*, suggests that she has a personal interest in history. Furthermore, Younge’s article points out that: “It took Elizabeth Kostova 10 years to write her first novel” (par. 1). This is a long time and if one takes into account the list of suggested further reading she mentions, it becomes clear that she has done careful research. She is herself in this way a historian, even though she deviates from the facts by making Dracula and Vlad Tepes one and the same person. In film adaptations the concept of Dracula as a historian and a scholar has not been mentioned yet, and this suggests that Kostova was the first to do this and until now even the last.

The third of the Dracula adaptations that have been investigated is *Anno Dracula* by Kim Newman. His vampire is a true villain and as such he is similar to Bram Stoker’s Count. Yet it is noteworthy that the way in which Newman describes the vampire is rather drastic compared to the film adaptations. The Prince Consort, as is his title in the novel, is described as a red-eyed, shape-shifting vampire with a great moustache. A significant detail is that he is naked, because he does not control his shape-shifting abilities (at least this is what is suggested). Similar portrayals cannot be found in film adaptations, although especially the older films tend to portray the vampire as more of a villain and in less attractive terms. One aspect of Newman’s Dracula that can be found in other films that are concerned with vampires are the red eyes of the Prince Consort. An example is *Horror of Dracula* (1958) as the vampire villain (played by Christopher Lee) has red eyes in the film, too (Piatti-Farnell 23).

5.4. Conclusion

The final conclusion to this thesis is that the three book adaptations deviate from Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* and from each other, and even though there are some film adaptations that show resemblances to the novels, there remain book specific aspects that have not been seen elsewhere until today. There are certain similarities, though, such as the fact that all of the book adaptations have made Dracula and Tepes one and the same person, which is also the

case in most recent film adaptations. It could be said that the afterlife of Dracula consists of an intertextual web of influence. Not only does the original novel by Bram Stoker have an influence on the adaptations, but also other adaptations have a great influence. Aside from the web of influence there are also the unique aspects that are made by the creators of new adaptations and in this way the web expands. It can be expected that this expansion will continue indefinitely. The three book adaptations that are discussed all have their own unique aspects that have not been seen before, aside from the aspects that are inspired by the web of influence. As they all have unique aspects, it stands to reason that this will continue and in this way the web of influence is continually expanding. Only if the interest in Dracula disappeared the spread of the web would be hindered and stopped, but as the situation is now, this seems not the case in the near future, as the adaptations that have been discussed here are relevantly recent, which suggests the interest continues to this day.

Although this thesis offers answers, it also creates new questions that open the way for future research within the field of Dracula studies. One factor that will certainly offer interesting new possibilities is time. As Dracula's afterlife has been rich until now, it can be predicted that even in the future more adaptations will be made in different mediums. It would be interesting to see how these adaptations will change in the future and what new trends will arise. As the tendency in film has already shifted from portraying the vampire as a monster towards a seductive creature, it is only natural that more changes will take place. One could speculate on what these changes may be, which could be interesting, but there is not necessarily any truth to be found in this. Yet, one may suggest that the present-day trend of Dracula being more seductive than a monster may continue even more. Especially *Dracula: The Un-Dead* suggests a possible tendency to make the vampire even less of a villain; he is a tragic hero in that novel. This shows him as someone who belongs to the side of the heroes. It is possible that in the future the trend will be that Dracula becomes more of a heroic character or even a superhero. Yet this speculation does not take into account the fact that this would be a complete deviation from Bram Stoker's vampire villain and also the incessant linking of Dracula and Vlad Tepes would mean that Tepes life would need to be seen in a more positive light. In spite of this it seems possible, as it is possible in *Dracula: The Un-Dead* to portray the vampire not as a villain. Only the future can tell us what will happen with Dracula.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Kostova, Elizabeth. *The Historian*. 2005. London, Little Brown (Sphere): 2010. Print.
- Newman, Kim. *Anno Dracula*. 1992. London, Titan Books: 2015. Print.
- Stoker, Darce & Holt, Ian. *Dracula: The Un-dead*. New York, Harpercollins: 2009. Print.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. 1897. London, Penguin: 1994. Print.

Secondary Sources:

- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. 2000. London, Routledge: 2011. Print.
- Bird, Kathryn. "Civilised Society Doesn't Just Happen: The Animal, the Law and 'Victorian Values' in Kim Newman's *Anno Dracula*." *Neo-Victorian Studies* 7.1 (2014): 1-24. *NeoVictorianStudies*. Web. 28 Feb. 2016.
- Blinderman, Charles S. "Vampirella: Darwin and Count Dracula." *The Massachusetts Review* 21.2 (1980): 411-428. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Feb. 2016.
- Bowler, Alexia L. & Cox, Jessica. "Introduction to Adapting the Nineteenth Century: Revisiting, Revising and Rewriting the Past." *Neo-Victorian Studies* 2.2(2009-2010): 1-17 *Neo-Victorian Studies*. Web. 29 Mar. 2016.
- Browning, John Edgar & Picart, Joan (Kay). *Dracula in Visual Media: Film, Television, Comic Book and Electronic Game Appearances. 1921-2010*. Jefferson (NC), McFarland: 2011. Print.
- Bruhn, Jørgen. "Dialogizing Adaptation Studies: From One-Way Transport to a Dialogic Two-Way Process." *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*. Eds. Bruhn, Jørgen, Gjelsvik, Anne, Hanssen, Eirik Frisvold. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. Print.
- Buzwell, Greg. "Dracula: Vampires, Perversity and Victorian Anxieties." *British Library*. Web. 25 Feb. 2016.
- Carter, Margaret L. "Revampings of Dracula in Contemporary Fiction." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 3 (2001): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 23 Mar. 2016.
- Currie, Mark. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. 1998. London, Palgrave Macmillan: 2011. Print.

- Bram Stoker's Dracula*. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf. Gary Oldman, Winona Ryder, and Anthony Hopkins. Columbia, 1992. DVD.
- Dracula Untold*. Dir. Gary Shore. Perf. Luke Evans, Dominic Cooper, and Sarah Gadon. Universal, 2014. DVD.
- Ermida, Isabel, ed. *Dracula and the Gothic in Literature, Pop Culture and the Arts*. Leiden, Brill: 2015. Print.
- Frost, Robert James. "'A Race of Devils': Frankenstein, Dracula, and Science Fiction." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 5 (2003): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman & Charles Doubinsky. Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1997. Print.
- Greenway, John. "'Unconscious Cerebration' and the Happy Ending of Dracula." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 4 (2002): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Hadley, Louisa. *Neo-Victorian Fiction and Historical Narrative: The Victorians and Us*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010. Print.
- Holland, Norman N. & Sherman, Leona F. "Gothic Possibilities." *New Literary History* 8.2 (1977): 279-294. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 May 2016.
- Horror of Dracula*. Dir. Terence Fisher. Perf. Christopher Lee, Peter Cushing, and John Van Eyssen. Hammer Films, 1958. DVD.
- How Dracula's Movie Afterlife Drained Him of the Power to Chill Our Blood." *Yorkshire Post*. 20 April 2012. Web. 2 June 2016.
- Hutcheon, Linda & Siobhan O'Flynn. *A Theory of Adaptation*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2013. Print.
- Ingelbien, Raphael. "Gothic Genealogies: 'Dracula', 'Bowen's Court,' and Anglo-Irish Psychology." *ELH* 70.4 (2003): 1089-1105. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Johnson, Patrick. "Count Dracula and the Folkloric Vampire: Thirteen Comparisons." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 3 (2001): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 24. Mar. 2016.
- Kinsey, Danielle C. "Koh-i-Noor: Empire, Diamonds, and the Performance of British Material Culture." *Journal of British Studies* 48.2 (2009): 391-419. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 May 2016.
- Lallanilla, Marc. "The Real Dracula: Vlad the Impaler." *Live Science*. Live Science, 24 Oct. 2014. Web. 17 Mar. 2016.

- Lancaster, Ashley Craig. "Demonizing the Emerging Woman: Misrepresented Morality in *Dracula* and *God's Little Acre*." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 6 (2004): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- McGunnigle, Chris. "Root Canals: The Neutered Vampire and the Metamorphosis of Undead Metaphor." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 4 (2002): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- McNally, Raymond. "Separation Granted; Divorce Denied; Annulment Unlikely." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 1 (1999): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 28 Feb. 2016.
- Mewald, Katharina. "The Emancipation of Mina? The Portrayal of Mina in Stoker's *Dracula* and Coppola's *Bram Stoker's Dracula*." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 10 (2008): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Miller, Elizabeth. "The Question of Immortality: Vampires, Count Dracula and Vlad the Impaler." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 4 (2002): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 18 Mar. 2016.
- Miller, Elizabeth & Eighteen-Bisang, Robert. *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula*. Jefferson (NC), McFarland & Co: 2008. Print.
- Nandris, Grigore. "The Historical Dracula: The Theme of His Legend in the Western and in the Eastern Literatures of Europe." *Comparative Literature Studies* 3.4 (1966): 367-396. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Feb. 2016.
- Newman, Kim. *The Bloody Red Baron*. London, Titan Books: 1995. Print.
- Newman, Kim. *Dracula Cha Cha Cha*. London, Titan Books: 1998. Print.
- Newman, Kim. *Johnny Alucard*. London, Titan Books: 2013. Print.
- Oliver, John. "Why I Love... Bela Lugosi's *Dracula*." *BFI*. BFI, 6 December 2013. Web. 23 Mar. 2016.
- Piatti-Farnell, Lorna. *The Vampire in Contemporary Popular Literature*. New York, Routledge: 2014. Print.
- Podonsky, Amanda M. "Bram Stoker's *Dracula*: A Reflection and Rebuke of Victorian Society." *StudentPulse* 2.02 (2010): 1-2. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Rezachevici, Constantin. "From the Order of the Dragon to *Dracula*." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 1 (1999): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 28 Feb. 2016.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Intertextuality vs. Hypertextuality." *New Literary History* 25.4 (1994): 779-788. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May 2016.

- Roach, Mary Ellen & Eicher, Joanne Bubolz. "The Language of Personal Adornment." *Fashion Theory: a Reader*. Ed. Malcolm Barnard. London: Routledge, 2007. 109-121. Print.
- Rosenberg, Nancy F. "Desire and Loathing in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 2 (2000): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Rottenbacher, Donald. "From Undead Monster to Sexy Seducer: Physical Sex Appeal in Contemporary Dracula Films." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 6 (2004): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Sahay, Vrunda Stampwala. "Repulsive Pariah or Romantic Prince? Transforming Monstrosity in Bram Stoker's and Francis Ford Coppola's Dracula." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 4 (2002): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Smetana, Erik. "Book with Bite: the Evolution of the Vampire in Contemporary Literature." *The Missouri Review* 34.1 (2011): 173-180. *MUSE*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- "The Bat and the Beetle." *Beastly Journeys: Travel and Transformation at the Fin De Siècle*. 1st ed. Vol. 63. Liverpool University Press, 2013. 74-106. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Thorslev, Peter L. *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes*. Minnesota University Press, 1962. 51-62. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 May 2016.
- Waltje, Jörg. "Filming Dracula: Vampires, Genre and Cinematography." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 2 (2000): n.p. *Journal of Dracula Studies Archives*. Web. 26 May 2016.
- Wicke, Jennifer. "Vampiric Typewriting: Dracula and Its Media." *ELH* 59.2 (1992): 467-493. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 Feb. 2016.
- Younge, Gary. "Bigger Than Dan Brown." *The Guardian*. *The Guardian*, 18 July 2005. Web. 27 May. 2016.