View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Bilkent University Institutional Repository

# AMBIVALENT AND SHIFTING CODES OF FEAR AND DESIRE

# IN DRACULA MOVIES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE OF

ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

AND THE DEPARTMENT OF GRAPHIC DESIGN

OF BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN ART, DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE

by

Kaya Özkaracalar

October, 2004

I certify that I have read this thesis and that
in my opininion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality as a thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

----------------------------------
Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç (Principal Advisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and that
in my opininion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality as a thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

----------------------------------
Prof. Dr. Nezih Erdoğan

I certify that I have read this thesis and that
in my opininion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality as a thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

----------------------------------
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mahmut Mutman

I certify that I have read this thesis and that
in my opininion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality as a thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

----------------------------------
Assist. Prof. Dr. Asuman Suner

I certify that I have read this thesis and that
in my opininion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality as a thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

----------------------------------
Assist. Prof. Andreas Treske

Approved by the Institute of Fine Arts

----------------------------------
Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç, Director of the Institute of Fine Arts

ABSTRACT

AMBIVALENT AND SHIFTING CODES OF FEAR AND DESIRE IN DRACULA MOVIES

Kaya Özkaracalar

Ph.D. in A.D.A

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç

October, 2004

This study, which takes Robin Wood's methodology to find the answer to the question 'what does the monster stand for?' as its base with certain nuances, investigates the ambivalent and shifting sets of connotations embedded in Dracula movies. The main focus is on the sexual and sexuality-related connotations involving fear and desire. A secondary set of connotations related to Otherness attributed to foreign cultures is also investigated. The study aims to delineate the degree and the limits of variance across time and across different cinematic spaces.

Keywords: Repression, Other, vampire film, sexuality, fear, desire.

# ÖZET

## DRACULA FİLMLERİNDE KORKU VE ARZUNUN MUĞLAK VE DEĞİŞKEN KODLARI



Kaya Özkaracalar

Sanat, Tasarım ve Mimarlık Doktora Programı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç



Ekim, 2004



Robin Wood'un 'canavar neyi temsil ediyor?' sorusuna cevap bulma yöntemini belli nüanslarla temel alan bu çalışmada Dracula filmlerindeki muğlak ve değişken konotasyonlar incelenmektedir. Esas olarak korku ve arzuyu içeren cinsellik ve cinsellikle ilgili konotasyonlar üzerinde odaklanılmaktadır. Yabancı kültürlere atfedilen Ötekilikle ilgili ikinci bir konotasyon takımı da incelenmektedir. Çalışma, bu konotasyonlarda zaman içinde ve farklı sinemasal sahalarda varyasyonların ölçüsünü ve sınırlarını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır.



Anahtar Sözcükler: Baskı, Öteki, vampir filmleri, cinsellik, korku, arzu.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to the members of the committee to review my work-in-progress: My principal advisor Prof. Dr. Bülent Özgüç, Prof. Dr. Nezih Erdoğan, Assist. Prof. Dr. Mahmut Mutman and Assist. Prof. Dr. Asuman Suner. Prof. Erdoğan, who was also my initial advisor in the early phase of the study, had been instrumental in my passage to film studies in the first place. They have all supported me with great patience and tolerance and I hope have not failed their faith in me.

Özlem Öz's moral and logistical support over the years and especially towards the end was beyond measure and I simply cannot thank her enough.

Özge Özyılmaz deserves thanks, and credit for the painstaking labor she put in the preparation of the appendix. Last but not least, I also owe thanks to the *Geceyarısı Sineması* crew: Orhan Anafarta, Sadi Konuralp, Savaş Arslan and Dilek Kaya-Mutlu as well as Giovanni Scognamillo and Pete Tombs for sharing material, ideas –and enthusiasm for the 'other' cinema.

Those who gaze too long into the Abyss, beware, for the Abyss also gazes back at you. -Nietzsche

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT……………………………………………………………………………..iii

ÖZET…………………………………………………………………………………iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…………………………………………………………...v

TABLE OF CONTENTS……………………………………………………………..vi

CHAPTER I: Introduction…………………………………………………………..1

A. The Purpose of the Study………………………………………..…………….1

B. General Framework……………………………………………………………2

1. Introduction…………………………………………………………………….2
2. Robin Wood's Conceptualization of Otherness in Horror Cinema……………3
3. Franco Moretti's Conceptualization of the "Dialectic of Fear" with Regards to Dracula……………………………………………………………………………8
4. Ambivalence of the Monster and Return of the Repressed According to Wood and Moretti…………………………………………………………………13
5. Revisiting Wood and Moretti on the Basis of A Critique Questioning the 'What Does the Monster Stand For' Outlook………………………………...15
6. A Consideration With Regards to the Framework: Women as Abject……………………………………………………………………………17
7. The Usefulness and the Limitations of Seeing Dracula as an 'Oriental Other'……………………………………………………………………………19

C. Scope of the Study……..……………………………………………………..23

CHAPTER II: Overview of Vampire from Folk Belief to Literature to Cinema ……………25

A. Introduction………………………………………………………..……………..25

B. The Vampire up to *Dracula*……………………………………….……………26

1. Vampire as a Folk Belief……………………………………………………..26

2. Vampire in Literature prior to *Dracula*..........................................................27

C. *Dracula*.....................................................................................................29

1. Introduction....................................................................................................29

2. Two Different Ways to Approach *Dracula*....................................................30

a. 'Critical Biographical' Approach...............................................................30

b. 'Cultural Studies' Approach......................................................................33

3. The Novel.......................................................................................................36

a. The Plot......................................................................................................36

b. Characters...................................................................................................39

D. An Historical Overview of Vampire Cinema and Dracula Movies………………40

1. The Early Classics...........................................................................................41

2. The Crossroads: the British Hammer Studios' Series……………..................44

3. Revisionist Takes…………………………………………………………..46

CHAPTER III: The Dracula Figure and the Transylvania Setting………………..………48

A. Introduction……………………………………………………………………..48

B. Dracula Figure in Major Screen Adaptations……………………………...…49

1. Dracula in Hollywood's First Adaptation……………………………………49

2. Dracula in Hammer Studio's Series…………………………………………..56

a. Hammer's 1957 Adaptation……………………………………………………..56

b. Hammer's Sequels………………………………………………………………60

3. Dracula in Hollywood's 1979 Adaptation………………………………………64

4. Dracula in Coppola's Adaptation………………………...............................68

B. The Transylvania Setting……………………………………………………..71

1. Transylvania as 'the East'……………………………………………………71

2. Dichotomies between the West and Transylvania……………………………73

3. The Depictions of the Castle…………………………………………………74

CHAPTER IV: The Female Figures …………………………………………………76

A. Introduction……………………………………………………………………..76

B. Dracula's Transylvanian Brides ………………………………………………..77

C. Dracula's Western Female Victims.................................................................................82

1. Detour For Elaboration with Regard to the Source Novel.......................................82

2. Female Protagonists in *Dracula* Adaptations ………………………………..84

C. The 'Other' Female Vampire Movies …………………………………………...94

CHAPTER IV: Conclusion……………………………………………………………105

APPENDIX.....................................................................................................................110

REFERENCES...............................................................................................................116

# I. Introduction

## A. The Purpose of the Study

This thesis will entail comparative analyses of Dracula movies with a view to studying the ambivalent and shifting sets of connotations embedded in them. To put it briefly, Dracula will be studied as a figure embodying Otherness. The main focus will be on the sexual and sexuality-related connotations involving the dialectical relation between fear and desire. Furthermore, it will be investigated if this main axis along sexuality is co-existent with another but secondary axis of Otherness attributed to foreign cultures, partially remiscent of the attributes of the Oriental Other, and, if so, to what degree and in which ways these two axes overlap and reinforce (or, theoretically at least, contradict) each other.

The analyses will be in-depth on the one hand to see the ambivalence in each case (each movie studied) and comparative on the other hand to see if and how this ambivalence varies from case to case over time and across different cinematic spaces, i.e. from mainstream to non-mainstream cinema. The expected insight from the comparative perspective will be twofold, that is to see how and how much it varies and consequently to see the limits of this variance, in other words, beyond what point it cannot vary.

Of course, the analyses of Dracula movies will not (and cannot) be restricted to studying solely the Dracula figure in these movies, but will incorporate studying the persistent secondary figures of the 'female vampires at Dracula's castle', 'Dracula's female victim who cannot be saved', 'Dracula's female victim who is

saved' and other motifs, such as the Transylvania setting, chiefly the castle, all of whose representations and connotations are structurally related to those of the paramount Dracula figure.

## B. General Framework

### 1. Introduction

The novel *Dracula* (1897), chronicling the malevolent deeds of a Transylvanian vampire aristocrat in London, has been adapted to the screen several times and, not only the novel itself, but Dracula movies also have been subject of vigourous academic study, taking their place among academic interest in horror cinema in general. The conceptual framework utilized in the study will largely draw on theses put forward by Robin Wood on horror cinema monsters in general and, to a slightly lesser extent, by Franco Moretti on Dracula in particular. However, I will not adopt the frameworks offered by these two authors completely, but with some reservations and modifications, incorporating some critical approaches as well. I will take into consideration reservations to and critiques about Wood and Moretti offered by James Donaldson. In other words, I will assess Wood and Moretti as well as their critiques such as Donaldson to arrive at a conceptual framework for the task outlined above as the purpose of the study. Beyond the general conceptual level, various works by various authors such as Dadoun, Freeland, Hardy, Holte, Joslin, Skal and Tudor will also be reflected on at the actual level of the specifics of analysis.

It seems one of the earliest noteworthy assessments of Dracula has been made by David Pirie in his pioneering study *A Heritage of Horror: The English Gothic Cinema 1947-1972* (1973) where he says "Dracula can be seen as the great submerged force of Victorian libido breaking out to punish the repressive society which had

imprisoned it (cited by Moretti, 98).” In similar vein henceforth from Pirie onwards, a very common approach to horror cinema (and, on the other hand, to horror literature as well) is asking the question ‘what does the monster stand for’ and putting forward answers to that question. Albeit in a nuanced and modified manner, with the intended nuances and modifications to be explained below, the approach I will utilize is compatible with this basic framework.

## 2. Robin Wood’s Conceptualization of Otherness in Horror Cinema

Robin Wood’s approach to horror cinema takes such a starting point (‘what does the monster stand for’) as well. He refers to the Freudian psychoanalytic notion of repression for finding his answer. According to him, “one might say that the true subject of the horror genre is the struggle for recognition of all that our civilization represses or oppresses, its reemergence dramatized, as in our nightmares, as an object of horror, a matter of terror, and the happy ending (when it exists) typically signifying the restoration of repression (75).” Wood notes “one could, I think, approach any of the genres from the same starting point.” Indeed, melodrama, for instance, comes to mind in this regard, at least in western cinema contexts (whereas other discourses might also be prominently at work in melodramas from other cultures). Gérard Lenne argues that “the melodrama illustrates the most visceral impulses and the more primitive instincts,” all of which “share the theme of desire.” While acknowledging, “rather than a genre in itself, melodrama is a substance that colors all facets of cinema”, he emphasizes that “the melodrama’s naiveté is, of course, a false one (106).” The ‘subtlety’ in melodrama per se “permits this genre to reach into the depths of eroticism without having to answer to the censors (107).” Wood says, among all the genres which fit the basic pattern he outlines, “it is the horror film that responds in

the most clear-cut and direct way" because "the actual dramatization" of the repressed as an Other in the figure of the Monster is "central to it" (75).

With regards to the notion of repression, Wood refers to Gad Horowitz, who had given a Marxian twist to Freud's conceptualizations via Wilhelm Reich and Herbert Marcuse. According to this framework, repression can be subdivided into 'basic' and 'surplus' repression. Whereas basic repression, which makes development from an uncoordinated organism into a human being, is universal, the form of surplus repression is specific to particular cultures in that it conditions individuals from infancy onwards to socially determined roles within that culture. It is this 'surplus' repression that is of relevance for Wood.

Basically, Wood says, this repression "makes us into monogamous heterosexual bourgeois patriarchal capitalists." He is aware of the imminent pitfalls of such a simplistic and determinist-sounding assertion and qualifies it in two ways. First, he notes that he is using the word "bourgeois" in the sense of "ideological norms rather than material status". Equally significant is his emphasis that repression makes us into monogamous heterosexual bourgeois patriarchal capitalists "*if* it works" hence waiving deterministic implications to some degree. He follows that "if it does not, the result is either a neurotic or a revolutionary (or both) (71)."

Wood notes that "in psychoanalytical terms, what is repressed is not accessible to the conscious mind," except through analysis. He lists four items as the answer to "what exactly, in the interests of alienated labor and the patriarchal family, is repressed […] in our culture?" According to Wood, "the "ideal" inhabitant of our culture is the individual whose sexuality is fulfilled by the monogamous sexual union necessary for the reproduction of future ideal inhabitants." The first target, so to speak, of repression accordingly is sexual energy itself in general. Beyond this, three

specific repressions are of bisexuality, sexuality of females and of children. Bisexuality represents the most obvious and direct threat to the principle of monogamy and its supportive romantic myth of “the one right person.” More generally, what is at stake in bisexuality is

> the whole edifice of clear-cut sexual differentiation that bourgeois-capitalist ideology erects on the flimsy and dubious foundations of biological difference: the social norms of masculinity and femininity, the social definitions of manliness and womanliness, the whole vast apparatus of oppressive male/female myths, and the systemic repression from infancy of the man’s femininity and the woman’s masculinity, in the interests of forming human beings for specific predetermined social roles. (72)

The “particularly severe” repression of female sexuality and creativity is also along similar lines as it entails “the attribution to the female of passivity, and her preparation for her subordinate, dependent role in our culture, […] the denial to women of drives culturally associated with masculinity: activeness, aggression, self-assertion, organizational power, creativity itself (72).”

Last but not least, Wood also adds the repression of the sexuality of children to his surplus repressions. I should note in passing that while all of the first three issues will be of central importance to my analysis of Dracula films, repression of the sexuality of children will play at best a tangential role in my cases.

Closely linked to the concept of repression – indeed, truly inseparable from it, as Wood acknowledges – is the concept of “the Other”. Wood’s approach to Otherness is generally in the same vein as that of Jameson who points out that the archetypical figures of the Other is “not so much that he is feared because he is evil; rather he is evil because he is Other, alien, different, strange, unclean, and unfamiliar (115).” According to Wood, Otherness “represents that which bourgeois ideology cannot recognize or accept but must deal with”. Otherness is dealt with “in one of two

ways: either by rejecting and if possible, annihilating it, or by rendering it safe and assimilating it, converting it as possible into a replica of itself." Wood's attribution of a derivative status to Otherness specifically via the bourgeois ideology is of course debatable if not outright objectionable, but it must be born in mind that he is in effect talking about Otherness in a 'bourgeois' society, rather than Otherness in general even if his language betrays a contrary tendency as well. However, even with such a qualification, his attribution of a derivative status to Otherness still cannot escape being debatable but only being outright objectionable. This issue will be discussed further a below section of this chapter.

Nevertheless, what is crucial for my purposes in Wood's approach is that he points out that otherness "functions not simply as external to the culture or to the self, but also as what is repressed (though never destroyed) in the self and projected outward in order to be hated and disowned." In this regard, Wood gives the example of the case of American Puritans' perception of native Americans "as sexually promiscuous, creatures of unbridled libido [as] a classic case of the projection on to the Other of what is repressed within the Self in order that it can be discredited, disowned and possibly annihilated (73)."

Wood lists several zones of operation of the figure of the Other "in our culture" and then embarks on finding correspondences with these in horror cinema. According to Wood, the figure of the Other operates (within "our" culture) as 1) "quite simply, other people", 2) woman, 3) the proletariat, 4) other cultures, 5) ethnic groups within the culture, 6) alternative ideologies or political systems, 7) deviations from ideological sexual norms – notably bisexuality and homosexuality, 8) children (75-76).

He notes that the first item, Otherness as "quite simply, other people" naturally cannot be represented by any specific films. For all other categories, he mentions either specific titles, such as the 'panther woman' of *Island of Lost Souls* and the heroine of *Cat People* being the earlier examples of Otherness as female sexuality in horror cinema or groups of movies such as most of the 1930s horror movies in general where "the monster was almost invariably foreign" for Otherness as foreign cultures (73-75). Naturally, it is not my task or concern whether the correspondences Wood makes from horror movies to his categories of Otherness are valid with regard to titles or groups he pinpoints, as the scope of my study is not horror cinema in general but Dracula movies in particular.

Hence, up to what has been discussed so far, I will follow Wood in acknowledging (1) the repression of sexual energy itself in general as well as bisexuality/homosexuality and female sexuality specifically, according to the social norms of heterosexual monogamous family, (2) Otherness functioning "not simply as external to the culture or to the self, but also as what is repressed (though never destroyed) in the self and projected outward in order to be hated and disowned", and (3) in utilizing his categories of the operation of Otherness in various manifestations to see which of them (and possibly others) apply to Dracula movies. It can be said in advance that, of Wood's list, Otherness as (a) woman, or rather female sexuality and (b) foreign cultures, apply by and large to my cases.

Beyond these points of following Wood's framework, some of his other arguments, especially emphasizing the "protean" nature of horror cinema monsters and the "ambivalence" surrounding them, will also be introduced in discussion during my study, but, for the sake of developing a line of thought from general to specific to come back to general, I will now turn to Franco Moretti at this point as he discusses

the figure of Dracula in particular, only to revisit both Wood and Moretti later in light of Donaldson's critiques.

## 3. Franco Moretti's Conceptualization of the "Dialectic of Fear" with Regards to Dracula

Parallel to Pirie and Wood, Moretti's approach can also be in the line of asking the question 'what does the monster stand for?' and looking for answers to that question as he explicitly states that the central characters of horror – the monster, the vampire – are "metaphors". However, whereas Marxian influences are visible in Wood, Moretti is pronouncedly Marxist, albeit incorporating Freudian psychoanalysis centrally to his framework. It should be noted at the outset that while, unlike Wood, who covers the whole span of horror cinema, Moretti discusses Dracula specifically and at length, he is not talking exclusively of Dracula movies but of the Dracula figure as mainly in the literary sources with references to various filmic adaptations. This does not diminish the relevance of his analysis for the purpose of my study, but it must be borne in mind – the points where the fact that his main focus is on the novel hinders its relevance for my purposes, will be pointed out accordingly shortly below.

Moretti's analysis is twofold: He puts forward two different answers to the question of 'what does the monster stand for' and then explores ways of reconciling these answers. One issues directly from Marxist analysis, the other from psychoanalysis.

Taking his cue from Marx's analogy in *Das Kapital* that "capital is dead labour, which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the labour it sucks", Moretti argues that Dracula is a metaphor for capital. He directly applies Marx's analogy specifically to Dracula who "manages to live thanks to the

blood he sucks from the living. *Their strength* becomes *his* strength. The *stronger* the vampire becomes, the *weaker* the living become." Moretti also furthers Marx's analogy beyond capital being accumulated exploited labor into the Marxist assertion that, by its nature, capitalist is compelled to continue endlessly to accumulate and expand its capital: "Like capital, Dracula is impelled towards a continuous growth, an unlimited expansion of his domain: accumulation is inherent in his nature. […] Dracula is not impelled by the *desire* for power but by the *curse* of power, by an obligation he cannot escape." Moretti also draws an analogy between the facts that Dracula has no shadow and, while his body admittedly exists, it is incorporeal with the nature of commodity being, in Marx's words, 'sensibly supersensible' (91-92)."

No matter how remarkable these analogies are, clearly aware that seeing Dracula as a metaphor for capital sits uneasily with the Count being a feudal aristocrat from the countryside, Moretti argues at the outset that "Count Dracula is an aristocrat only in the manner of speaking." His justifications for this rather contestable argument are as follows:

> Dracula lacks precisely what makes a man 'noble': servants. Dracula stoops to driving the carriage, cooking the meals, making the beds, cleaning the castle. […] Dracula also lacks the aristocrat's conspicuous consumption: he does not eat, he does not drink, he does not make love, he does not like showy clothes, he does not go to the theatre and he does not go hunting, he does not hold receptions and he does not build stately homes. (90)

According to Moretti, Dracula's lack of conspicuous consumption brings him in line with the Protestant ethic in the sense that he avoids waste. Nevertheless, it should be reminded that Dracula's motive in moving from Transylvania to London is an aspiration precisely to get closer to what he lacks in his homeland. This point is underlined in many Dracula movies (of course, also in the novel; so Moretti's missing

of this point is not permissible) where Dracula often expresses his admiration of the glamourous social life-style in London, contrasting it to his stagnating homeland whose glorious past is nothing but a memory; actually the first thing Dracula does in London is precisely going to the theater, in sharp contradiction to what Moretti claims, or to the cinema from Holywood's first to latest Dracula movies. In addition, Moretti's argument that "Dracula is a true monopolist: solitary and despotic, he will not brook competition" (92), applies not only to monopolistic capital but also to feudal aristocracy as well. Thus, Moretti's counter-arguments in these regards cannot be held to be valid. It should be noted that Dracula's lack of conspicuous consumption can better be analyzed within a context of a colonial discourse where the Orient is devalued as lacking what the West possesses and vice versa.

As for Moretti's analogies between capital and Dracula's vampiric nature, which were covered at the beginning, it might tentatively be speculated that such analogies, while definitely having internal consistency and making sense, probably would make a better resonance in the context of the reception of the original novel, which was written and published in late 19$^{th}$ century, when capitalism was more of a novelty, and consequently, had more urgency as an issue than it is today. Nevertheless, the insight from these analogies will be debated in the study at some length even though not as centrally as discussions of Dracula as an Other in sexuality-related terms and as an Other signifying foreign cultures.

Like Wood, Moretti also has significant contributions in the sexuality-related implications of Dracula as well. He points out that "a sociological analysis of *Dracula* [and of *Frankenstein* as well, which he also studies] reveals that one of the institutions of most threatened by the monsters is the family." He acknowledges that "this fear cannot be explained wholly in historical and economic terms. On the

contrary, it is very likely that its deepest root is to be found elsewhere: in the eros, above all in sex." He points out that "one of the most appealing things that Dracula does to the wantonly women of his Victorian enemies (in the novel as in the film) is to make them sensual." Lucy, vampire's female victim who cannot be rescued, "is punished, because she is the only one who shows some kind of *desire*. […] All the other characters are immune to the temptations of the flesh, or capable of rigourous sublimations. (98)"

It is noteworthy that whereas Wood, under Marxian influences, is eager to tie up all his analysis in the final instance to references to "bourgeois ideology" as seen above, Moretti, the pronounced Marxist, refrains from such reductionism and acknowledges a space different from those which can and should be explained in purely and directly economic and historical terms. Moretti does explore extensively if and how these different analyses can be brought together:

> Marxist analysis and psychoanalytic analysis have permitted us to isolate two prominent groups of signifieds which come together […] They are, clearly, different signifieds, and it is hard to unite them harmoniously. I do not propose here to construct the many missing links that might connect socio-economic structures and sexual-psychological structures in a single conceptual chain. Nor can I say whether this undertaking […] is possible. (104)

It should be emphasized that what Moretti states is that it is doubtful whether different levels of analysis can be linked in a *single* conceptual chain; consequently, he is adopting the utilization of *different* analytical tools for each case (Marxism and psychoanalysis). An even more significant point is that the indeterminacy of *how* these different levels can be linked together does not exclude underlining *why* different levels co-exist together. In this regard, Moretti reiterates his notion of the *metaphoric* nature of horror monsters including the vampire, since metaphors are

"rhetorical figures built on the analogy between *different semantic fields*. Wishing to incarnate Fear as such, they must of necessity combine fears *that have different causes*: economic, ideological, physical, sexual." *This* is *why* it is "possible, if not obligatory, to use different tools in order to reconstruct the multiform roots of the terrorizing metaphor (105)."

Speaking of metaphors, Moretti reminds that in literature, as a rule, metaphors are intentionally created by the author as metaphors and can be perceived by the readers as such. However, he underlines that this rule does not apply as much in horror fiction. Indeed, as Tzvetan Todorov points out, a basic characteristic of fantastic fiction is that allegorical intentions are ruled out and a figurative sense is taken literally (33). The importance of this aspect is that the transformation of sexual, political or other fears into a fear of the horror monster, in Moretti's words, is not simply a work of 'mystification' but also a work of production: The creators of a horror fiction "do not have the slightest intention of 'mystifying' reality: they interpret and express it in a mendacious manner. […] They are not confined to distortion and falsification: they form, affirm and convince." The monster – the metaphor and the ideology expressed within – "has become a material force, an independent identity, that escapes the rational control of its use. [It] will lead an autonomous existence: it will no longer be a product, a consequence, but the very origin". The author "no longer builds the cultural universe; rather, this universe speaks through [his/her] mouth (105-106)."

The real insight Moretti offers over Wood is not his argument, based on analogies, that Dracula is a metaphor for capital for one, which can and should be contended; it is partially invalid and stands on shaky grounds and even where plausible, have doubtful priority in studying Dracula in cinema and can best be given

a secondary degree of attention in that context. Nevertheless, his approach in handling different levels of analysis is commendable. I will follow Moretti less on studying Dracula as a metaphor for capital, but adopt more his approach in handling different levels of analysis, which were capital and sexuality for him, but sexuality-related Otherness and Otherness as foreign cultures in my study. In other words, I will follow him on the proposition that "metaphors are rhetorical figures built on the analogy between different semantic fields [and] wishing to incarnate Fear as such, they must of necessity combine fears that have different causes", but the fears and causes covered in the present study will not necessarily be identical to those Moretti covers.

4. Ambivalence of the Monster and Return of the Repressed According to Wood and Moretti

Wood offers a simple definition of horror films: for him, "they are our collective nightmares." He sums up their basic formula as "normality is threatened by the Monster." He clarifies that he is using the word 'normality' in a "strictly nonevaluative sense" to simply mean "conformity to the dominant social norms" (78). The manifestations of normality in horror films are in general quite constant ("boringly constant", in Wood's words): the heterosexual monogamous couple, the family and the social institutions such as police, church, armed forces that support and defend them. On the other hand, the Monster is, of course, much more "protean, changing from period to period as society's basic fears clothe themselves in fashionable or immediately accessible garments." Wood holds this to be similar to the notion that dreams use material from recent memories to express conflicts or desires that may go back to early childhood (79).

In addition to being versatile over time, the Monster is also ambivalent in itself, Wood remarks. First, in several movies, the Monster is to some degree or other portrayed as sympathetic as well as terrifying. The most well known example is of course Frankenstein's monster. The same can be told to varying degrees in various films about Dracula as well; indeed, this will be one of the main areas of inquiry in my study.

However, the principle of ambivalence goes beyond the Monster being sympathetic to some degree. Ambivalence extends to the other component of the basic formula of horror, to our attitude to 'normality'. Wood gives the example that "the overwhelming commercial success of *The Omen* cannot possibly be explained in terms of simple, unequivocal horror at the devil's progress." According to Wood, "central to effect and fascination of horror films is their fulfillment of our nightmare wish to smash the norms that oppress us and which our moral conditioning teaches us to revere (80)." The same can be argued about Dracula films as well and that will be the other main area of inquiry in my study.

Moretti covers the issue of ambivalence as well, saying, "vampirism is an excellent example of the identity of desire and fear (100)." This "ambivalence exists *within the psyche of the person suffering from fear*." And fear breaks out when – for whatever reason – "this repressed impulse returns and thrusts itself upon the mind. […] Fear, in other words, coincides with the 'return of the repressed'. […] The repressed returns, then, but disguised as a monster (101-103)." This is also the conclusion drawn up by Wood as a summation of his 'thesis': "In a society built on monogamy and family there will be an enormous surplus of repressed sexual energy, and that what is repressed must always strive to return (80)."

5. Revisiting Wood and Moretti on the Basis of A Critique Questioning the 'What Does the Monster Stand For' Outlook

What I referred to as 'what does the monster stand for' approach to horror cinema does not lack its critiques. James Donald for one argues that both Wood's and Moretti's works "flirt with a certain functionalism and a certain reductionism." What Donald objects to is the inherent assumption in both Wood and Moretti that "the meanings of these fictions can be unscrambled confidently enough once you find the right code" which, in admittedly simplified fashion, amounts to "History? Here's Marx with the answer. Repression? Wheel on Freud (236)."

First of all, as Donald himself admits in passing, this is a "simplified" account of Moretti and Wood's approach. As Donald acknowledges, Wood and Moretti, in line with Jameson, are "onto something important" and his account of their work "inevitably sacrifice the sophistication and nuances of these analyses (236)," which I believe I have covered in the above sections. However, there are indeed some tensions and contradictory tendencies in both authors' works, which play against and undermine the force of their analyses. For instance, Moretti's overall conclusion is that horror fiction's function is "to take up within itself determinate fears in order to present them *in a form different from their real one*: to transform them into *other* fears, so that readers do not have to face up to what might really frighten them (108)." This is clearly an overly functionalist assumption. Wood, while avoiding a blanket generalisation as to the function of horror movies, argues in a not dissimilar vein: "these notions of repression and the Other affords us not merely a means of access but a rudimentary categorization of horror films in social/political terms, distinguishing the progressive from the reactionary, the criterion being the way in which the monster is presented and defined (76-77)." Hence, Wood, unlike Moretti, does not lay out a

single function, but offers simply a case of ‘either/or’, but this is not qualitatively a very different claim.

The problem with both Wood and Moretti is that they seem unaware of the true implications of the ‘ambivalence’ issue both raise and do not take it up to its implications. It was Moretti himself, as seen above, who had pointed out that vampirism was an “excellent example of the identity of desire and fear” and that this “ambivalence exists *within the psyche of the person suffering from fear*. (100-101” Hence, since the ambivalence stemming from the identity of fear and desire exists within the psyche of the person suffering from fear, it is a short sight to reduce horror fiction (consequently cinema as well) down to a function of relieving readers/spectators from facing up what might really frighten them. As Wood seems to be more aware and as my study intends to illustrate in my case studies of Dracula movies, the monster’s presentation is also in tune with the ambivalence of the concomitance of desire and fear. Thus there is far more room to play than Moretti’s functional assumption suggests. Roger Dadoun points precisely to this aspect, while acknowledging that “in the cinema the spectator’s potential for perversion [needless to say, Dadoun is using this word in a non-judgmental manner] is managed by the institution,” underlining that there is nevertheless “room for play, […] slippage and mobility (59).” In similar fashion, Donald argues that ‘what’s at stake in vampire films’ is that

> They are not just ideological mechanisms for domesticating terror and repression in popular culture. […] They can be seen also as symptoms of the instability of culture, the impossibility of its closure or perfection. The dialectic of repulsion and fascination in the monstrous reveals how the apparent certainties of representation are always undermined by the insistent operations of desire and terror. (247)

Wood comes halfway towards Dadoun’s and Donald’s position from Moretti’s, but stops short. He acknowledges, as seen in the above chapters, the

‘symphatic’ nature of the monster in certain cases as well as the spectator’s ambivalence towards the ‘normality’ the monster threatens, but harks back to an either/or duality: One movie is either ‘progressive’ or ‘reactionary’ depending on the presentation of the monster. However, such clear-cut distinctions do not really work, as it is intended to be shown in my study. The issue of ‘ambivalence’ is a far more central problematique which goes deeper than Wood allows. Actually, this dichotomic error of Wood is reflected in his primary attitude towards repression. As noted above, Wood *only partially* overcomes his deterministic attitude towards repression by qualifying that it “makes us into monogamous heterosexual bourgeois patriarchal capitalists *if* it works. If it does not, the result is either a neurotic or a revolutionary (or both)” (71). Rather, repression *never* works and neither does it *ever* fail. That is the reason why the repressed *always* returns.

Hence the nuance in this study about ‘what does the monster mean’ approach is not so much of a disavowal of the utilization of discourses for this end, but stressing the tendential and non-dualistic, non-dichotomic, thus ‘ambivalent’ nature of the answers. ‘What does the monster mean’ is a legitimate and necessary question, given the tendential nature, the ‘ambivalence’ of what it stands for is fully allowed. That is also why the study is comparative. Pointing out the shifts in ambivalence will come back and highlight the full force of what it means to be ambivalent.

### 6. A Consideration With Regards to the Framework: Women as Abject

In the above sections, it had been concluded that the framework of this study will follow Wood in utilizing his categories of the operation of Otherness in various manifestations to see which of them (and possibly others) apply to Dracula movies. It had also been noted at the outset of the introduction of Wood’s approach that this

operation of Otherness, or more precisely these operations of Otherness were related to *surplus* repression, i.e. conditioning individuals from infancy onwards to socially determined roles within that culture, as distinct from *basic* repression, i.e. development from an uncoordinated organism into a human being.

Julia Kristeva's discussion of 'abjection' on the other hand can also been taken as a lead in seeking an answer to the 'what does the monster stand for?' question and yet she traces abjection to 'primal repression' (corresponding to 'basic repression') rather than 'secondary repression' (corresponding to 'surplus repression'). It is this point of *Kristeva's of tracing abjection to primal rather than secondary repression* which needs to be taken into consideration with regard to the framework utilized in this study.

However, first, it is necessary to briefly go over Kristeva's understanding of abjection in general so as to be equipped with the conceptual tools necessary for this task. The customary examples of abjection are revulsion at various bodily wastes. Kristeva argues that, even in such customary cases, it is "not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order." Abjection, according to her, is "what does not respect borders, positions, rules;" it is "the in-between, the ambiguous, the composite (4)."

The abject "takes the ego back to its source on the abominable limits from which, in order to be, the ego has broken away (15)." Hence, abjection is not related to "the sphere of unconsciousness but [to] the limit of primal repression (11)." In other words, "the abject is that pseudo-object that is made up *before* but appears only *within* the gaps of secondary repression. *The abject would thus be the "object" of primal repression* ([her emphasis] 12)."

Kristeva notes that primal repression entails "our earlier attempts release the hold of *maternal* entity even before ex-isting outside of her." Thus "mother" turns into an abject in this "reluctant struggle (13)." In other words, abjection is a "confrontation" with the 'feminine' (58). It is clear at this juncture how the Kristevean take on abjection can be taken as another lead in pursuing the 'what does the monster stand for question?'. However, it should be re-emphasized that this lead is distinct from Wood's lead in the sense that it is traced back to a universal and eternal primal repression rather than socially-conditioned secondary repression: "[Abjection] is a universal phenomenon; one encounters it as soon as the symbolic and/or the social dimension of man is constituted, and this throughout the course of civilization (68)."

Of course, the difference is not that Kristeva denies secondary repression; on the contrary, she also acknowledges its repercussions:

> abjection assumes specific shapes and different codings according to the various "symbolic systems." [...] Socio-historical considerations can be brought in at a second stage. They will allow us to understand why that demarcating imperative, which is subjectively experienced as abjection, varies according to time and space, even though it is universal (68).

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, this study involves a comparative dimension at its core and, consequently, it is related to the implications of socially and historically conditioned 'secondary' or 'surplus' repression.

## 7. The Usefulness and the Limitations of Seeing Dracula as an 'Oriental Other'

It has been noted above that Dracula is also embedded with connotations of Otherness attributed to foreign cultures, partially remiscent of the attributes of the Oriental Other, in addition to sexual and sexuality-related connotations involving the

dialectical relation between fear and desire. However, it should be acknowledged that there are several issues which needs to be covered at the outset in the regard of drawing from Oriental discourses.

According to Edward Said (1978), Orientalism is a colonial discourse for representing the colonies of North Africa and the Middle East, that is the Islamic colonies. Orientalism is enmeshed with western Europe’s historical conflicts with the Islamic powers, chiefly the Ottoman Empire. Hence, the Occident’s ideological constructions of the Islamic culture and the Islamic people as an ‘other’ predate colonialism and thus the central place of Islam in Orientalism is reinforced by this fact. On the other hand, obviously neither Dracula is an Islamic figure nor his homeland (Transylvania, that is Eastern Europe) a part of the Middle East or North Africa. These plain observations would put the legitimacy of utilizing Orientalism in question in this case.

However, since Said and especially in film studies, Orientalist studies have already been nevertheless extended into cases where geographies other than the Middle East and North Africa and cultures other than Islamic cultures have been at stake. Matthew Bernstein, one of the co-editors of *Visions of the East: Orientalism in Film*, states in his introduction to this work that “one point of divergence from Said’s approach, it should be noted, is that most of the essays in this volume do not take the representations of Islam as an explicit point of departure (5).” Films which are set in India, the Chinese Far East, ancient (pre-Islamic) Egypt and even imaginary lands such as Atlantis have been studied in this framework. As these studies show, we can talk of a general framework of one discourse which is manifested in both Islamic and non-Islamic cases (notwithstanding the fact that the presence of the Islamic factor reinforces that discourse in those cases which it is present in).

The case of Dracula displays several striking features in tune with this framework. The most significant ones for my purposes are the ways gender stereotypes are formed and the 'rape and rescue fantasy' at play accordingly. In the Orientalist discourse, the polygamy present in the Orient is a center of attention. The fact that Dracula has a pseudo-harem of three female vampiric 'concubines' at his castle fits this pattern. In tune with but also in addition to polygamy, Oriental men and women are portrayed as being driven by a raging libido and being sexually 'hungry' (Shohat, 39-41), as is the case with Dracula and his female vampires. In contrast, the Occidental women "has to be lured, made captive, and virtually raped (41)." Shohat calls this dichotomy as the Oriental women (and men) being in perpetual "heat" and the Occidental women being "frigid." The role of the Occidental men in this schema is the "rescuer". The Dracula narrative is at its core a 'rescue' narrative as well with the Occidental gentlemen rescuing their women from Dracula.

However, it should be noted that the characterial components of the Dracula narrative show a nuance with the 'hot' versus 'frigid' binary dichotomy between Oriental and Occidental women. As will be discussed extensively in the relevant points in the thesis, there are two strikingly different women character-types among Dracula's victims: the victim who can eventually be saved from Dracula fits the 'frigid' typology, but the one who cannot be rescued is a relatively 'hot' character; definitely not as 'hot' as Dracula's native concubines at his castle, but nevertheless not as 'frigid' as the victim who is eventually rescued either. While Dracula's assault against this victim who cannot be saved can still be seen within rape parameters, nevertheless she is endowed with certain attributes, to be discussed later at relative points in the thesis, which predispose her to be a 'natural' victim even though not a willing victim either.

Yet, a more crucial divergence of the Dracula narrative from the patterns in Orientalist narratives is the fact that it is Dracula himself who propels the narrative and moves the setting from his native homeland right into the heart of Occident. The basic pattern of Orientalist narrative is that the plot is set in motion by western protagonists who arrive there on their own will (usually with implicit or explicit colonialist trappings) and that its setting is exclusively the Orient. In the Dracula narrative, the British protagonist is summoned to Transylvania by none other than Dracula himself who shortly afterwards arrives in Britain and is driven back to his homeland to be destroyed only at the finale. Hence, it is an assault against the Occident rather than vice versa. Such narratives have been labeled as 'reverse colonialization' fantasies. It should be noted in passing that a similar theme appears in several (but not all) of the 'Mummy' movies where a reincarnated Mummy stalks in the heartland of the Occident and incidentally one of the earliest Mummy novels, *The Jewel of the Seven Stars*, was written by Bram Stoker, the author of *Dracula*, and it was adapted to the screen as well. Even these Mummy movies are more in harmony with standard Orientalist narratives as it is none other than the western colonialists who set the events in motion in the first place by causing the reincarnation of the Mummy. Dracula's endeavor is apparently a far less frequent in the regard that it is explicitly himself who deliberately sets events in motion.

For these reasons dealing with these structural differences of the Dracula narrative from Orientalist narratives, even with or without the presence of the Islamic factor, Dracula differs from the Orientalist parameters and hence cannot fully be called as an Oriental Other, but rather a figure embodying Otherness attributed to foreign cultures in general, sharing several remarkable similarities with Oriental Other as well as displaying some differences from it.

## C. Scope of the Study

Tudor's research (of horror movies, British and export, released in Britain between 1931-84) shows that vampire movies compromise approximately 10 percent of horror cinema (20). It should be noted that Tudor's research includes science-fiction/horror hybrids as well and that, if these are left out, vampire movies' ranking rises to the top two, just after psychotic murderers. Hence, it can be said that vampires are the most predominant monsters in horror movies with a fantastic bent.

A tentative list compiled from various sources shows that more than 750 vampire movies have been made since the dawn of cinema and a close look indicates that more than 100 of them feature either the name 'Dracula' in the title and/or feature a character named 'Dracula' or one of its variants (see appendix). Hence it can safely be said that Dracula movies form the hard core of vampire cinema, which is actually a fact that a basic familiarity with the genre would bring up as a common sense observation without any resort to statics.

As noted at the beginning, this study will entail comparative analyses of Dracula movies, with a view to studying the ambivalent and shifting sets of connotations embedded in them. For this end, a core of Dracula movies obviously needs to be picked up from the vast body of movies featuring Dracula. I should stress that, my criteria are not merely availability (for I have made available some rare movies on tape as well), but qualitative (of course not in the sense of any 'artistic' or 'aesthetic' qualities): The hard core of my analysis will be those movies (from the US and Europe) which follow the shared basic plot pattern derived from the source novel (excluding movies which pit Dracula against Frankenstein monster, for instance). These are Universal's *Dracula* (1931) and its simultaneously produced Spanish-

language variant *Drácula* (1931), British Hammer Studio's *Dracula* (1957), the London-based international co-production *Count Dracula* (1970), again Universal's *Dracula* (1979) and Columbia's *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992).

Even though the classic *Nosferatu* (1922) did not have its vampiric count originally named as Dracula presumably due to copyright issues, its re-release prints and the 1979 remake feature the vampiric count under the proper name. However, the narrative of *Nosferatu* as well as that of its remake depart significantly from the source novel at several crucial points, so these two movies will not be included among the main adaptations to be analysed comparatively . The Hammer Studio's *Dracula* had spawned several sequels and some of these will also be covered when relevant. Since, as noted at the beginning, the study's comparative thrust is not only aimed at seeing variances across time, but also across different cinematic spaces so as to see as best as possible the limits of this variance, I will also cover lesser-known vampire movies which were produced in low budget 'exploitation' cinema and beyond. Some non-Dracula vampire movies will also be covered when their discussion is called for as a consequence of or as a necessary supplement to the discussion of Dracula movies and to the degree they are relevant for these purposes.

It should also be added that while the said analysis of the films will be carried out around the movies themselves (that is, via their video or dvd releases), occasionally some 'extra-filmic' materials will also be taken into consideration peripherally when available. These include trailers, posters and other promotional material as well as censorship data.

## II. Overview of Vampire from Folk Belief to Literature to Cinema

### A. Introduction

As Clive Leatherdale notes in the introduction of her *Dracula: the Novel & the Legend* (1993), a frequent answer to the casual question 'Have you read *Dracula*?' would be 'No, but I saw the film' (9). Even though it can safely be said that the widespread currency of the vampire imagery in popular culture today owes a lot to the popularity of *Dracula* movies, the genesis of the vampire imagery itself goes back further, actually even much further than the novel *Dracula* (1897) itself and has undergone many mutations before being (re-)popularized with the help of the cinema medium.

To sum up a long history in brief, the 'vampire' first emerged as a folk belief which was then taken up by literature, being embedded with specific connotations. From literature, it spilled onto other performative and visual arts. Finally, it became embraced by that one most pervasive entertainment media of modern times, that is cinema. This chapter will trace this development in its bare outlines, naturally concentrating on the novel *Dracula* but locating its place in this trajectory by first going over its precedents -literary and even further back precedents-, and finally offering an introductory mapping of its cinematic adaptations as a bridge to the next chapter(s) which will cover these adaptations in depth.

## B. The Vampire up to *Dracula*

### 1. Vampire as a Folk Belief

Beliefs about blood drinking monsters exist in mythologies of various cultures all over the world from Far East Asia to Africa. However, it should be stressed that vampires are not any kind of blood drinking monsters, but of a specific kind which are ‘undead’ corpses that have risen from their graves. With the partial exception of Malaysia (Melton 389-392), none of the mythical blood drinking monsters of any other culture have such a qualification. Hence, it would be a Euro-centric flaw to argue that the vampire belief has existed all over the world since antiquity. For example, the Indian author Alok Bhalla rejects () the notion of several western scholars, including Leatherdale, that the blood drinking Indian god Kali should be regarded as a vampire.

Properly speaking, namely as “undead” corpses which have risen from their graves to prey upon the blood of the living, the vampire belief has originated in Eastern-Central Europe, possibly being rooted in pre-Christian pagan beliefs. The mythologies of ancient Greece and Rome feature ‘lamias’, which were held to be spectral beings emanating from corpses and depriving their living victims, often children, from their vitality. In Middle Ages, the Greco-Roman lamias had evolved into the succubi (female) and incubi (male) who would suck off vital fluids from sleeping victims, usually of the opposite sex. It should be noted that the succubi and incubi of the Middle Ages were still ethereal beings devoid of full corporeality. Sometime over the centuries, they apparently evolved into ‘flesh and bone’ beings (non-decomposed walking corpses) as the vampire belief sprang up (Leatherdale 18-19).

The etymology of the word ‘vampire’ is believed to be of Slavic origin linguistically (Melton 561). First written records about cases of vampirism appeared in late 17th century and proliferated especially in early 18th century. It seems there was an outbreak of vampirism in Serbia in the first decades of the 18th century. Official reports about vampirism cases coming from the Serbian countryside were widely discussed in west European academic and theological circles at the time (Melton 630 and Leatherdale 40-41).

Such officially documented cases provided a thorny issue not only scientifically but even more so politically and theologically because the Catholic faith had no room for such a belief as the Catholic dogma which argued that decomposition of corpses would be a sign of sanctity and hence only the corpses of saints would be immune from decay conflicted sharply with reports about undead corpses being malevolent vampires. On the other hand, the Orthodox Church asserted that the corpses of ex-communicants and other heretics would not decompose in their ‘unhallowed’ graves. It is striking that the vampirism belief originated and proliferated in predominantly Orthodox lands which came under imperial Catholic rule (Melton 101) as the Ottoman Empire lost its territories and seems to have served as a vehicle of power struggle and resistance between the Orthodox folk and the new Catholic ruling elites.

## 2. Vampire in Literature prior to *Dracula*

When vampire imagery spilled into literature from folk belief in the second half of the 18$^{th}$ century beginning with Osselndelf’s *Vampire* (1748), Bürger’s *Lenore*

(1773) and most notably with Goethe's *Die Braut von Korinth* (The Bride from Corinth, 1797), it underwent several transformations and became embedded in different sets of connotations. For the Church, vampirism was something to be fought against. For the Enlightenment circles embodied in the academia, it was something to be analyzed. Neither side thought least about romanticizing vampirism. Yet, romanticization of the vampire was precisely what happened when literature appropriated it.

It should be reminded that the cases of vampirism reported from Serbia involved plain peasantry. However vampires in west European literature were markedly different: they were seductive high-class, usually aristocratic, people. In romantic literature, such as in Goethe's poem, they were literal femme fatales:

> From my grave to wander I am forced,
> Still to seek the God's long sever'd link,
> Still to love the bridegroom I have lost,
> And the lifeblood of his heart to drink.

The origin of the word 'vamp' meaning seductive woman apparently originates from such usages of the vampire imagery in romantic literature.

The first vampire prose ever, John Polidori's novella *The Vampyre*, incidentally conceived in that same famous 1816 contest among Lord Byron's circle (who had himself contributed to vampire poetry with his *The Giaour*) which also gave birth to *Frankenstein*, featured a seductive and evil male aristocrat named Lord Ruthven which preyed on women. Leatherdale calls Lord Rutheven "a stereotypical, misanthropic, moody, nocturnal libertine – a classic Byronic hero with supernatural trappings" (51).

Vampires did not of course stay confined to the works of high literature figures, but eventually also appeared in popular pulp fiction, then named as "train station literature", beginning with the anonymous "penny-a-dreadful" serial *Varney the Vampire* from 1840s, which also featured a male vampire preying on women. Leatherdale notes that, among all other literary vampires, Varney appears to be the principal precursor of Dracula: a vampire with roots in central Europe coming to Britain, not to mention the inclusion of sleep-walking victims and scenes of scaling down castle walls which are also present in Stoker's *Dracula* (53).

Finally, in 1871-72 came Sheridan Le Fanu's highly-acclaimed gothic novella *Carmilla* featuring a lesbian vampire. *Carmilla* has also been a partial but significant influence on Bram Stoker for *Dracula*, which also features female (albeit non-lesbian) vampires (albeit as a supporting cast). It should also be noted that next to *Dracula*, *Carmilla* is the second vampire fiction most frequently adopted to cinema with at least a dozen adaptations. However, the most influential vampire fiction ever is undoubtedly *Dracula*.

### C. *Dracula*

#### 1. Introduction

Irish-born writer Bram Stoker's horror novel *Dracula* was first published in 1897. Stoker was a minor author whose previous works included several romantic adventure novels and a travelogue (all of his other horror novels would come after *Dracula* which was his first full-length excursion into the genre, not to mention a few short stories). Stoker's archived working notes reveal that he had began work on

*Dracula* seven years before its eventual publication, painstakingly and very gradually fleshing out his draft with multiple re-writes, as well as carrying out extensive library research in the meantime to ensure its credibility in terms of locations, history and other details.

*Dracula* was highly praised in the reviews of British popular media at the time of its publication. While the most respected literary critique periodical of the time, *The Athenaum*, had found the novel "wanting in the constructive art as well as in the higher literary sense. It reads at times like a mere series of grotesquely incredible events", *Punch* on the other hand had "reservedly recommended" it as the "weirdest of all weird tales". On similar lines, *Daily Mail* had said "this weird, powerful and horrible story" was reminiscent of such classics as *Frankenstein* and *The Fall of the House of Usher*, and *Pall Mall Gazette* had simply regarded it as "excellent" (Leatherdale 68-69 and Senf 12, 59-61).

Since then, *Dracula* has been consistently reprinted and has never been out-of-print; there are even –naturally impossible to substantiate- claims that it is the second best selling book of all time after the Bible (quoted in Leatherdale 9 and 11). Yet, it would remain largely out of academic attention until the early 1970s. Coinciding with the resurgence of applications of the psychoanalytic approach to works of popular culture, *Dracula* also had had its share of academic scrutiny.

## 2. Two Different Ways to Approach *Dracula*

### a. 'Critical Biographical' Approach

Most studies of *Dracula* reveal it to be a 'manifesto of sexual repression.' One

trend traces this ‘sexual repression’ directly to its author. This trend builds on biographical research, attempting to find clues in Bram Stoker’s life history in what Glover calls as ‘critical biography’ (4), to the point of treating him as a clinical case of post-mortem psychoanalysis, which would ‘explain’ the novel by putting forward parallels between non-fictional case of Stoker and the fiction he created. In other words, this trend can be said to seek the answers to the “what does the monster stand for?” question in Stoker’s own personal closet. Admittedly, Stoker’s biography does yield several interesting possibilities in this regard.

Bram Stoker (1847-1912) came from a Protestant Irish background, child of a petty civil servant in Dublin. He was inexplicably bed-ridden until the age of seven, possibly due to a psychological disorder as afterwards he came to excel in athletic feats. Following a successful education, getting a Master of Arts degree and acquiring prestigious posts at the academia, he gained access to the Dublin social elite where he came in close contact with several celebrities, including Oscar Wilde. He managed to befriend Henry Irving, the most prominent British actor of the time whom he had admired and became his manager in 1878, moving to London. In his part-time, he penned out and published some fiction, the most famous today being *Dracula* (1897). Daniel Farson, a great-nephew of Stoker who wrote a sensationalist biography of the author, claims that his great-uncle’s death was due to syphilis, a speculation doubted by other, more scholarly biographers (Belford, 321). Leatherdale says, “with so little incontrovertible evidence pertaining to his life, it is inevitable that half-truths, rumour and gossip should circulate to fill the gaps” (73).

The conspicuous homo-erotic tone in some of his correspondence with

controversial poet Walt Whitman at his youth for instance has been taken as an indicator of closeted homosexual desires in his part: “How sweet a thing it is for a strong healthy man with a woman’s eyes and a child’s wishes to feel that he can speak so to a man who can be if he wishes father, and brother and wife to his soul” (quoted in Glover, 154). Ironically, Stoker was in the same social circle as the notorious Oscar Wilde and, moreover, Wilde had at one time courted Stoker’s fiancée (Belford 85-87 and others). Hence, Oscar Wilde, the number one demonized scape-goat of late-Victorian society, in most likelihood must have been the target of Stoker’s hatred and envy or more at the same time. Thus he would indeed have made a perfect candidate for the elusive figure upon which Stoker is assumed to have shaped Dracula. Wilde had stood against everything which the Victorian society and morality upheld. This in turn had made it politically-correct and even socially-obligatory to despise him. Moreover, as noted, Stoker had more personal stakes in this regard as well. At the same time, Wilde was also likely to be a source of envy for Stoker as the eccentric Irishman was known to be a successful courtesan of women (besides men). In addition, if presumptions of bisexual orientation in Stoker’s own part are also held to be true, the possibility that Stoker might also have been attracted to Wilde cannot be ruled out either. To sum up, Oscar Wilde was in most likelihood a nexus of contradictory feelings of socially-regulated repulsion, personally-driven aversion and as well as envy and perhaps and even attraction for Stoker, which would have translated into the creation of the fictional Dracula.

Another such figure in Stoker’s life is Henry Irving, who was Stoker’s boss and mentor in the London theatre scene. Stoker’s memoirs reveal a deeply rooted

fascination at his mentor and yet hint possible envy which might have been accompanied by hostile feelings of being dominated by him and staying in his shadow throughout his career. Again, such a fascination-hate relation to a domineering male figure might have translated into or contributed to the creation of Dracula. Indeed, several observers (eg. Leatherdale, 103) have even noted that the physical appearances of Henry Irving and Count Dracula are conspicuously alike to some remarkable degree.

b. 'Cultural Studies' Approach

This 'critical biography' approach, while definitely thought-provoking, nevertheless cannot solely be the basis for a satisfactory reading of *Dracula*. The sole reason for this is not only that a great share of it is built on speculation, sometimes even to the degree of 'rumours'. The speculative nature of critical biography can be framed in a relatively acceptable manner if its conclusions are presented tendentionally in terms of 'possibilities'. In addition, this necessity is actually not unique only to critical biography.

The real detriment of critical biographical readings of fiction is the unacceptable scope of reductionism. In other words, such a reading reduces the fiction to the inner demons of one and only man, leave alone whether the speculations about these inner demons are based on solid assumptions or not which is actually a secondary issue of concern. While critical biography goes beyond the text by linking it with one extra-textual agent, that is the author, that one agent is still delinked from everything else. What critical biography does is simply replicating psychoanalysis of

one case (the text) in another case (the author) and is content with finding parallels.

In addition to being inadequate in principle, such an approach is of little use for the particular purposes of this study either. This study will entail a comparative analysis of *Dracula* movies over time. Hence a critical biographical reading of *Dracula* would not pose much insight in a comparative manner. Even if this study would set aside the drawbacks of a critical biography in principle and attempt to expose critical biographies of the 'authors' of each movie, it would be futile as the 'authorship' of a movie, a collective product of a large group of individuals in which the relative determination of each post varies from case to case, is very problematic, definitely far more problematic than 'authorial' approach in film studies single-handedly assumes the director as the 'author.'

David Glover is one scholar who has expressed dissatisfaction with readings of Stoker's works, *Dracula* and others, which solely draw on "reading [Stoker] as a tormented clinical case history". An alternative to the 'critical biography' approach is employing the methods of what Glover, perhaps rather loosely, calls as the methods of 'cultural studies'. What this approach entails is, in Glover's words, seeking the "discursive continuities" between the text of an author (Stoker's *Dracula*, in our case) and the "various 'régimes of truth'" which were in circulation and which the text/author draws from (4-6). Needless to say, such an approach is obviously also applicable to cinema and hence studying the source novel precisely from such a perspective would be illuminating in view of prospective analyses of its adaptations.

Glover's study, *Vampires, Mummies and Liberals: Bram Stoker and the Politics of Popular Fiction* (1996), on one hand takes Stoker's oeuvre, not only

*Dracula*, and on the other hand focuses on one particular web of regimes of truth, those relating to the Irish question. While his discussions and arguments on this issue are well-taken, they happen not to resonate much with *Dracula*'s cinematic adaptations and hence there is not any need to go over them here. Salli Kline, in *The Degeneration of Women: Bram Stoker's Dracula as Allegorical Criticism of Fin de Siécle* (1992), in similar fashion to Glover, stays away from a critical biographical approach which treats Stoker as a clinical case study, and employs a 'cultural studies' approach which seeks to uncover discursive continuities between the text and regimes of truth in circulation at the time. Kline's work is more helpful for the purposes of this study because on one hand she concentrates on *Dracula* and, on the other hand, the regimes of truth which she seeks to find discursive continuities with this text are more relevant in studying its future cinematic adaptations.

Kline insists that the novel's "significance lies precisely in its topicality" (10). According to Kline, *Dracula* is one of the 'typical' cultural documents of ultra-conservative reaction to *fin de siécle*. The term *fin de siécle* refers to the combined aesthetic, intellectual and social movements and attitudes of 1890s, drawing from and/or reflected in the philosophy of Nietzche, the music of Wagner, the paintings of the pre-Raphalites and Symbolists, the literature of Decadance, etc. which, in the words of Yeats, amounted to a "revolt against Victorianism" (quoted by Kline in 15). In the eyes of the conservative reaction to *fin de siécle*, what was particularly worrying was the fascination of individual freedom held for young women, that is the 'degeneration' of women.

Kline notes that one of the most influential works of the reaction to *fin de*

*siécle* was proto-fascist German author Max Nordau's *Entertung* (1892), which was translated into English as *Degeneration* and reprinted in England no less than seven times solely in 1895, precisely when Stoker was writing his vampire opus. An excerpt from this book, quoted by Kline (13), is worth quoting here as well:

> To him, who, with Nietzche, is enthusiastic over the "freely-roving, lusting beast of prey"; we cry, "Get you gone from civilization! […] There is no place among us for the lusting beast of prey; and if you dare to return to us, we will pitilessly beat you to death with clubs.

To put it simply, Kline's main argument is that Stoker's *Dracula* is a fictionalized fantasy of driving this 'lusting beast of prey' away from 'civilization' and pitilessly beating it to death all the same.

## 3. The Novel

### a. the Plot

It is naturally necessary to go over the plot of *Dracula* as it would be helpful for discussions of the movie adaptations in the further chapter(s). First, it should be pointed out that, as Salli Kline forcefully argues, *Dracula* is not really a late-Gothic novel as it is often referred to, for instance by Leatherdale who calls it "Bram Stoker's Gothic masterpiece" in the subtitle of her work and as "almost *the* Gothic novel *par excellence*" at the beginning of its introduction (9). Rather, only the first four chapters, set in Transylvania, out of the novel's total 27 chapters are gothic fiction par excellence. The remaining bulk of the novel is set in then-contemporary London until its finale, set again in Transylvania, and is more like a modern crime novel albeit admittedly with a supernatural villain. The fiction is presented as a collection of written testimonies, largely compromising personal diaries and letters of various

characters, occasionally supplemented with newspaper clippings and other 'documental' material.

The story begins in Transylvania where a British solicitor named Jonathan Harker working for a London-based real estate agent travels to the castle of Count Dracula who is planning to move to the British capital. It does not take long for Harker to realise that he has become a de facto prisoner rather than a guest at the castle, where he is menaced by three uncanny female apparitions among other ghastly experiences. Since these Transylvanian episodes of the novel are its most widely known parts because almost all Dracula movies have depicted them on the screen to some degree or the other, it would be doubly useful to recount them here at some length:

Harker doesn't heed the warnings of worried locals and takes a haunting night ride to Dracula's castle. He is welcomed by his host, "a tall old man, clean-shaven except for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him everywhere" (25), to the castle conspicuously absent of any servants. Dracula reacts to the sound of howling wolves as "Listen to them - the children of the night. What music they make!" (29). The Count talks about his admiration of England ("I long to go through the crowded streets of your mighty London, to be in the midst of the whirl and rush of humanity, to share its life, its change, its death, and all that makes it what it is" [31]) and also warns his guest that "we are in Transylvania; and Transylvania is not England. Our ways are not your ways, and there shall be to you many strange things." (32) The first strange thing Harker comes to realize is that Dracula does not cast a reflection in mirrors. He makes this observation while shaving and slightly cuts himself in amazement upon which

Dracula makes a thrust towards his neck only to be repelled by a crucifix in his neck. At an evening chat (Dracula is always mysteriously absent during daytime), the Count tells that he is from the same lineage of a past 'voivode' who had fought the Turks – this being an implicit reference to the real-historical 15th century Wallachian ruler known as 'Voivode with the Stakes'. At night, Harker witnesses Dracula scaling down the castle walls like a lizard. He falls asleep in a room where three female vampires loom over him in probably the most discussed scene of the novel (movies adopted from it almost never miss recreating it). Harker's feelings about the experience are worth quoting at some length:

> "There was something about them that made me uneasy, some longing and at the same time some deadly fear. I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips. […] I lay quiet, looking out under my eyelashes in an agony of delightful anticipation […] There was a deliberate voluptuousness which was both thrilling and repulsive […] I closed my eyes in a languorous ecstasy and waited –waited with a beating heart." (51-52)

The female vampires are halted at the last moment by the sudden appearance of Dracula who orders them to wait for their time. Meanwhile, the Count has brought a bag for his concubines to satisfy themselves in the meantime. Harker hears the wail of a child coming from inside the bag and, next night, witnesses a poor woman crying for her child outside the castle, only to be devoured by wolves herself. One evening, Harker discovers Dracula lying in a box full of earth; he tries to kill the immobile Count with a shovel but fails as he feels himself almost paralyzed. The Transylvania saga ends with a band of gypsies making final preparations to move Dracula from the castle apparently on his journey to Britain and Harker planning an improbable escape rather than face the female menace once again.

In London, the reader is introduced to the other British characters: Jonathan's

fiancée Mina Murray and her friend Lucy Westenra, who shortly afterwards falls prey to Dracula who had apparently arrived in London. It should also be noted that one inmate named Renfield at an insane asylum has also fallen under Dracula's spell. Despite the best efforts of a team of a gentlemen, led by a continental European occult expert named Professor Abraham van Helsing (and joined by Jonathan who had escaped from the castle, swiftly wedding Mina in London), Lucy dies, becoming a vampire herself which preys on small children, only to be staked by the men. When Dracula next targets Mina, the vampire hunters eventually succeed in forcing him to flee back to his homeland where he is nevertheless pursued and destroyed.

b. Characters

Most movie adaptations downgrade the role of the individual members of the vampire hunting team besides Van Helsing, often merging the remaining western male protagonists into two characters or even a single character, probably in an effort to simplify an overburdened list of supporting characters, and hence there is no need for the purposes of this study to go over each of them. It would suffice simply to list those not named in the above plot summary for the sake of completism: Lucy's fiancée Lord Arthur Hollmwood Godalming, her other suitors Quincey Morris from Texas, USA, and Dr. John Seward who runs the nearby insane asylum.

The most noteworthy and significant characters of the Dracula saga, besides the Count himself (and, to some degree, Van Helsing), are indeed the female cast: Dracula's Transylvanian concubines and especially the British victims. Almost all of the movie adaptations preserve the presence of Dracula's concubines at the castle and

also the duality of his female British victims: one which cannot be saved and the other which can.

Needless to elaborate, the Transylvanian concubines are femme fatales par excellence. On the other hand, the case of the British victims call for elaboration. The differences between Lucy and Mina are structured in a such a way that the former is endowed with several characterial attributes which make her liable to fall under 'evil' influences. Mina on the other hand is an ideal late-Victorian woman in many respects. These points shall be elaborated in a special section of the below chapter on female figures.

## D. An Historical Overview of Vampire Cinema in General and Dracula Movies in Particular

While the main body of this study will also inevitably integrate an historical dimension to its discussions to see how the sets of connotations in Dracula movies evolve across time, which is one of the main concerns of the study overall, the discussions themselves will not necessarily proceed with a step-by-step analysis of each movie covered simply in a chronological order. Rather, the discussion will largely entail discussing several aspects of the movies collectively with references to several movies in each case. In other words, rather than first discussing all aspects of Universal's *Dracula* from 1931, then all aspects of Hammer's *Dracula* from 1958, and so forth up to finally all aspects of Coppola's adaptation from 1992, the study will undertake, for instance, discussing the presentation of Dracula's brides in different movies, tying it up to other issues, all discussed in similar fashion. Hence, since the discussion will not necessarily proceed in chronological order per se, there is a need to

briefly go over the historical overview of the genre in very broad strokes as an introduction.

1. The Early Classics

Written records show that several featurettes were made in the early years of cinema which had the word 'vampire' in title, however these are currently considered as lost movies. Secondary information indicate that these movies featured stories about femme fatales which lacked any supernatural element (Mc Nally and Florescu, 257) and the usage of the word 'vampire' was euphemistical when figurative 'vamp' and literal 'vampire' distinction had not yet become established.

The first Dracula movie appears to have been made as an Austrian-Hungarian co-production in 1920 and while this is also a lost movie as of now, recently discovered secondary information suggests that it was not really an adaptation of Stoker's novel but had an original story with a 'was it dream or reality' plot about eerie ongoings at an insane asylum (Hernadi, 6). The first ever confirmed *Dracula* adaptation is the highly-acclaimed German classic *Nosferatu* (1922, Prana Film) directed by F.W. Murnau. *Nosferatu* was a liberal adaptation which shifted the setting of the larger part of the plot from London to Germany, changing the names of all characters and presenting a completely different finale where the heroine sacrifices herself to lure the vampire to his doom. Since *Nosferatu* was an unauthorized adaptation, Stoker's heir sued and finally succeeded in getting a German court ruling which ordered the copies of the movie to be destroyed (Skall 1990: 43-44, 57-60). Hence its influence was initially very limited if at all and it would earn its place among

canons of classic cinema only retrospectively as some prints which somehow survived became available subsequently (a full restoration by film preservationists could be carried out only very recently). In 1979, another German director, Werner Herzog, would make a color remake of *Nosferatu* and recently, an independent American production *Shadow of The Vampire* (2001) presented a highly fictionalized account of the making of Murnau's film.

The first authorized screen adaptation of *Dracula* was produced by Hollywood's Universal Studios which bought the film rights of the novel. Earlier, it had also been adopted to the stage, and the script of Universal's *Dracula* (1931) was actually based on the stage adaptation rather than directly on the novel. *Dracula* was directed by Tod Browning and starred Hungarian émigré actor Bela Lugosi in the title role. It should also be noted that *Dracula* was the first ever talkie horror movie and since it was made at a time when synchronized sound was a novelty and studios did not yet consider dubbing (or subtitles) as viable options, a Spanish-language version was shot simultaneously from the same script on the same sets using a Spanish-speaking cast for the Latin American export markets (Skall 1990: 153-173).

*Dracula* was a huge success commercially and paved the way for the 'golden age of horror' in Hollywood during the Depression era years. Not only was Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* immediately adapted to the screen the same year, *Dracula* itself spawned a sequel, *Dracula's Daughter*, which could be realized and released only in 1936 due to interventions from the censors (Skal 1993: ). This sequel, which picked up on where the original movie left with Dracula staked, introduced her daughter as the screen's first female vampire, excluding Dreyer's art-house *Vampyre*

(1931). Striking for its relatively overt lesbianism, *Dracula's Daughter* is also noteworthy for being one of the first movies where the vampire is presented as a tragic figure who strives to be cured of vampirism but fails (An obscure low budget B-movie from 1935 titled *Condemned to Live* apparently also entailed a similar theme).

In 1940s, Hollywood's horror boom had ran out on steam and gave way to all-monster assemblies where Dracula, Frankenstein's monster and the Wolfman were thrown in together and pitted against each other in movies like *House of Frankenstein* (1944, Universal) and *House of Dracula* (1945, Universal) which cashed more on the entertainment value of presenting the monsters in such amazing combinations rather than as straight horror cinema. This trend expectedly gave way to the outright comedy *Abbott and Costello Meet Frankenstein* (1948, Universal) -which also featured Dracula as a supporting character in its monster assembly.

Horror was effectively sidestepped in Hollywood in the following years, as science-fiction became the dominant genre of fantastic cinema for nearly a decade. Meanwhile, Turkish cinema produced a *Dracula* adaptation, *Drakula Istanbul'da* (1953, And Film) as an isolated horror effort. Beginning with mid-1950s, Mexican popular cinema had its own golden age of horror (Wilt 1997: 142-144), which included several vampire movies although not any *Dracula* adaptation. However none of these had any -immediate- bearing on the global cinema audiences (some of the Mexican horror movies would later be released in the U.S in 1960s only after a new horror boom, stemming from elsewhere, created a demand for horror movies).

## 2. The Crossroads: the British Hammer Studios' Series

Horror revival originated from Britain and just like Hollywood's golden age of horror had began with *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*, this British-led revival also began with new screen adaptations of these two horror classics (although Britain's *Frankenstein* adaptation preceded its *Dracula* one whereas the reverse order was the case in 1931). The propeller of the new boom was Hammer Studios, a B-grade British production company. Hammer's Dracula movies, most of which starred Christopher Lee, were in color and -even though they would look tame in today's standards when considered out of historical context- pioneered the exploitation of  the presence of on-screen gore. In addition to the exploitation of on-screen gore and other gross visuals, Hammer's Dracula outings also broke new ground in exploiting the erotic component of the vampire imagery, as will be discussed in detail in the relevant chapters below. Hammer's first Dracula movie (1957; originally titled simply as *Dracula* but better known under its American release title as *Horror of Dracula*) spawned a long-running series which lasted until early 1970s. The first was an adaptation of Stoker's novel which, while revising the cast of supporting characters just like Universal had done decades ago, nevertheless stuck close to the basic plot formula as well. The first three sequels were even more decidedly gothic than the novel and its screen adaptations and were solely set in Transylvania with largely repetitive plots of unsuspecting English travelers falling prey to Dracula but the Count never venturing into London. On the contrary, the fourth was set solely in Victorian London, and the next two in contemporary England. The final sequel, the only one which did not star Christopher Lee, was a co-production with filmmakers from Hong Kong and was set in the Far East, featuring martial arts.

With each new Dracula sequel and with the gradual easing of censorship accompanied by a growing sexual revolution, eroticism dose increased from suggestive attractions to onscreen nudity. By 1970, Hammer introduced female vampires to its agenda, beginning with a *Carmilla* adaptation which started a short-lived but influential series known as the 'Carmillla trilogy'. Whereas Hollywood itself stayed away from producing domestic horror films, preferring instead to strike distribution (and occasionally co-production) deals with Hammer ensuring global marketing of Hammer productions, low budget exploitation filmmakers in America as well as in continental Europe churned out their own productions which went further than their British counterparts in merging eroticism and horror with titles such as *Dracula: the Dirty Old Man* (1969) and *Does Dracula Really Suck?* (1969). Hardcore pornography itself shortly afterwards would incorporate vampires into its stack of characters as well. On the other hand, female vampire movies flourished especially in continental Europe in movies titled as *Viol du Vampire* (Rape of the Vampire; 1968), *La Vampire Nue* (The Nude Vampire; 1969), *La Rouge aux Levres* (Red Lips; 1970), *Vampyros Lesbos* (1970), *La Novia ensangretada* (Blood Spattered Bride; 1972), *La Fille de Dracula* (Daughters of Dracula; 1973), *Comtesse aux siens nus* (Barebreasted Countess; 1973), *Levres de Sang* (Lips of Blood; 1975) and the like which blended not only eroticism with horror but frequently also merged exploitation requirements with distinctive auteur-ial personal trademarks to varying degrees (Tohill and Tombs, 5-7).

On the other hand, just like it had happened in Hollywood in 1940s, monster assemblies came forth from both sides of the Atlantic as well with *Dracula vs Frankenstein* (1971) and *Dracula contra Frankenstein* (1973). Meanwhile, it should

also be noted that during the horror revival of 1960s, Roman Polanski directed one horror-comedy incorporating some themes familiar from Dracula movies such as a vampire count living in a Transylvanian castle hovering above a village of fearing peasants, *Fearless Vampire Killers* (1966).

Amidst Hammer's seemingly never-ending Dracula sequels and in-name-only Dracula movies from elsewhere, not to mention countless female vampire movies, there was one isolated adaptation of the original novel in 1970, the international co-production *Count Dracula*, which again starred Hammer's Christopher Lee. Despite being highly publicised as allegedly being the first truly faithful adaptation that stuck close to its literary source, this effort, marred by budgetary constraints, was considered a disappointment and failed to turn out to be a box office hit.

### 3. Revisionist Takes

Excluding some television works in 1970s, the next adaptation came this time from Hollywood with the big-budget *Dracula* (1979, Universal) which did become a box office hit. This was also in tune with changing times and again played upon erotics like Hammer, actually even more so. However, unlike Hammer's Dracula movies with Christopher Lee, this new adaptation opted for a far more subtle sensuality, presenting the Count as explicitly a romantic figure for the first time. Hence it was no coincidence that for the first time an handsome actor (Frank Langella) in the vein of matinee idols was cast in the title role. This adaptation which put forward a romanticized Dracula was quickly followed by a comedy titled *Love at the First Bite* and a hardcore porn theatrical release titled *Lust at First Bite*, all in 1979.

Hollywood auteur F.F. Coppola's adaptation *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992), an even bigger budget box office hit than the adaptation from 1979, was in the similar romanticized vein as the previous one, but the two movies markedly differed in their plot resolutions, as will be discussed in detail in the relevant chapters below. The non-Dracula vampire movie *Interview with the Vampire*, adopted from Anne Rice's best seller book, can also be seen as part of this trend, actually an even further step as the vampires are the sole protagonists in the absence of any vampire hunters. Just like 1979's *Dracula* had initiated the comedy *Love at First Bite*, Coppola's adaptation was followed by Mel Brook's outright parodic adaptation *Dracula: Dead and Loving It* (1995).

The latest theatrically released Dracula movie at the time of writing, *Dracula 2000*, is actually an in-name-only Dracula movie. The current fad in vampire cinema seems to be focusing more on vampire hunters than vampires, as evidenced by *Blade* and its sequel, as well as John Carpenter's *Vampires*, in all of which vampires are presented as antagonists per se. It can very tentatively be said that the trend about romanticizing the vampire appears to have been reversed for the time being.

# III. The Dracula Figure and the Transylvania Setting

## A. Introduction

In main part of this chapter, the presentation of the central figure in the Dracula movies, that is Count Dracula himself, will be analyzed from Hollywood's first up to the latest major adaptations, including the British Hammer studio's Dracula movies and another Hollywood adaptation from 1979 in between. As stated in the thesis' introduction, the key point of this study is the assertion that the Dracula figure is an ambivalent figure in the sense that both fear-inducing and fascination-inducing factors are embedded in it. The analysis of the Dracula figure in the movie adaptations will explicate this ambiguity by pointing out the manifestations of presence of the fear and fascination dimensions in each adaptation. Furthermore, the analysis of each case will also show the shifting trends in the balance between these two dimensions of the ambiguity. It will be seen that basically, on one hand, the fascination dimension was always present, being somewhat nascent in the first adaptation and gradually being amplified with new adaptations over the time. On the other hand, the shift in the manifestations fear dimension provide a less linear trend over time, with the 1979 eliminating it altogether while other amplify it.

The last part of this chapter will entail analysis of the presentations of the homeland of Dracula, that is the Transylvania setting. It will involve studying the presentation of the country of Transylvania as well as of Count's castle itself. This discussion will be carried out with a view to contributing to the discussion on the 'foreignness' of the Dracula figure.

## B. Dracula Figure in Major Screen Adaptations

### 1. Dracula in Hollywood's First Adaptation

The Hungarian actor Bela Lugosi became Holywood's first Dracula in 1931 by starring in Universal Studio's screen adaptation of Bram Stoker's novel. Previous noteworthy screen vampires were Max Schreck's portrayal of Count Orlock in the German production *Nosferatu* (1921), the unauthorized pseudo-adaptation of *Dracula*, and Hollywood's silent era horror icon Lon Chaney's role in the now-lost *London After Midnight* (1925) where the vampire in question is revealed in a twist ending to be a fake. Both of these two movies present physically repulsive-looking vampires which, by the simple fact of their appearances, connote an unambiguous feeling of evil and threat, and even of pestilence in the case of *Nosferatu*. As seen from the available publicity stills, Lon Chaney, a horror star known for going to great lengths at distorting the way his face 'looks' by a combination of props, make-up and gestures for the sake of grotesqueness, sports bulging eyes and madly grinning pointed teeth in his portrayal of the 'vampire' in *London After Midnight*.

*London After Midnight* was directed by the same Tod Browning who would later go ahead and direct *Dracula*. Ironically, it was Chaney himself who was initially cast for the title role in *Dracula*, but the star actor's health problems culminating in his death eventually prevented this from happening. It would naturally be sheer speculation how Chaney would have portrayed Count Dracula and how such a portrayal would have shaped the public image of Dracula in popular culture.

The non-speculative point relevant for the purposes of this study however is that Count Dracula, as portrayed by Bela Lugosi in Universal's *Dracula* in 1931, differs significantly from the previous major vampiric screen portrayals by Schreck in

*Nosferatu* and by Chaney in *London After Midnight*. As stated in the introduction and elsewhere numerous times, the key point of this study is the assertion that the Dracula figure is an ambivalent figure in the sense that both fear-inducing and fascination-inducing factors are embedded in it. In this context, Universal's *Dracula* from 1931 being the first-ever (authorized) adaptation does indeed turn out to present the least fascinating, in the sense of being sexually charged, Dracula figure compared to all other subsequent adaptations. However, the point to be made in this section by mentioning the pre-*Dracula* vampiric portrayals is that Universal's 1931 Dracula as portrayed by Lugosi, while standing pale next to Hammer's Dracula from the next decades, was by no means utterly devoid of ambiguity, which becomes more evident when compared against previous decade's vampiric portrayals in the white screen.

This is precisely the point missed by leading horror genre historian David Pirie in the analysis of *Dracula* (1931) in his pioneering study, *The Vampire Cinema* (1977). According to Pirie, "if there is one adjective that describes the director's handling of the Count it is 'grotesque'" and that the character is "[pushed] to the most extravagant shores of theatrical melodrama (53)." Pirie tries to substantiate this claim of his by a comparison of Stoker's depiction of Dracula, who, for example, is described in the novel as motioning "with a courtly gesture" upon which Harker reflects "the light and warmth of the Count's courteous welcome seemed to have dissipated all my doubts and fears." According to Pirie,

> The fact is that Stoker was well aware of the danger of making Count Dracula into a ludicrous and stagy caricature, but Browning and Lugosi were not. The Dracula they invoked is simply a cardboard villain who, by virtue of the new technical resources of the cinema and Lugosi's unusual qualities as a personality, was able to make an enormous impact on the picture-going public. But in doing so, he sacrificed the one quality Stoker had consciously or unconsciously sweated to instill into his creation: the quality of ambiguity. Because Count Dracula in the novel is a charming, intelligent and fascinating host, he poses a real moral and sexual threat to the community he is

> bent on destroying. But Lugosi's *Dracula* announces his glowering brutishness from the first time he opens his mouth. He is a thug, and as such his capacity to threaten is drastically limited (54)

Cynthia Freeland, on the other hand, is of the opinion that Universal's "*Dracula* was crucial in transforming Bram Stoker's villain into an erotically compelling figure." Such divergent views on the same movie seem incompatible at first glance. However when the axis of comparison of the Dracula figure is shifted to previous vampire figures in cinema, the Dracula of 1931 can both be seen as yet lacking the full potential of the novel which was more fully realized in Hammer Studio's adaptation to come and also as a step in that direction. As Tudor, in his historical overview of horror cinema, notes,

> the Chaney figure is patently evil and physically repulsive, a recognizable descendant of Max Schreck's extraordinary vampire in *Nosferatu* (1921). Lugosi, however, is essentially human in all outward signs, comporting himself as a stereotypically stylized foreign aristocrat. Constantly clothed in full evening dress, only the strange rhythms and accents of his verbal delivery ("I am ... Draacula') and the studied lighting of his 'hypnotic' close-ups serve as permanent reminders that he is both malevolent and alien. Simultaneously monstrous and human, he represents a force of evil supernature concealed behind a sophisticated and conventionally attractive human exterior, a force that coexists with and preys upon our secular world. (163)

It should be noted that the 'strange rhythms and accents' of Dracula as portrayed by Lugosi stem from the fact the actor in question was indeed a foreigner whose grasp of the English-language was far from perfect, to the point that Lugosi has widely been reported to frequently resort to memorizing and speaking his lines phonetically. It is especially this aspect of Lugosi's performance which leads Pirie to categorize it as caricaturistic. However, this is not a case of extra-diegetic excess as it is made plain clear that the other characters in the movie are manifestly aware of the eccentricity of Dracula's accent and Dracula's first victim even symphatically mocks it, making it clear she finds this aspect of Dracula charming.

Some extra-filmic evidence in the form of reports of female fan mails to Lugosi massively outweighing his fan mail from males also suggests that Dracula as portrayed by Lugosi was indeed perceived as an "erotically compelling figure" in the eyes of at least some of its then-contemporary spectators. Even if these reports were part of a publicity promotion hype, it would still be crucial for the purpose of this study as, in that case, they would show that Dracula of 1931 was at least intended to carry an erotic attraction rather than intended to be utilized as a sheerly repugnant terror factor. It is poignant in this regard that the original theatrical posters and other publicity material of the movie carried the tagline 'the strangest love story of all'. In addition, the original theatrical trailer starts with the narrator exclaiming, "Dracula... the mention of the name brings to mind things so evil, so fantastic, so degrading!" as the title of the movie hits the screen. It is striking that the adjective 'fantastic' has been used in the same line as 'evil' and 'degrading'; Dracula is being presented to the audiences as a figure which is evil and degrading and yet at the same time fantastic.

Hence, to reiterate the point that has been developed in this section so far, while the Dracula figure in the 1931 adaptation falls short on its fascination factor compared to the Dracula figures in the adaptations to come in the coming decades, which will be discussed at length below, it was not utterly conceived as devoid of any lure either. At a most basic level, Dracula was clearly a human-looking monster at least, in sharp contrast to the disgustingly rodent-looking vampire of *Nosferatu* or the uncannily maniacal-looking one of *London After Midnight*. At a subsequent level, there were some ingredients, however weak they may be, of lure on the part of Dracula in this first (authorized) adaptation.

As Tudor notes, there are even "brief appeals to our sympathy in *Dracula* – most notably in Lugosi's melodramatically tragic declaration that 'to die, to be really

dead, that must be glorious'". However, Tudor is rightly cautious in warning that "none of this humanizing of the vampire means that we are constrained to become positively involved with him in the way in which we are with, say, [the monster of] Frankenstein (164)." In the same vein, Freeland also sees the very same 'to be really dead...' replicas of Dracula as "some of the first steps taken here toward a sympathetic portrayal of the vampire that acknowledges more tragic dimensions of being undead", but she also underlines that "in the end, the film asks us to celebrate Dracula's destruction as an act that restores the normal order (128)".

Indeed, *Dracula* (1931) ends with a shot of the vampire's would-be victim and her fiancée walking up a ladder of stairs from the crypt of Dracula's lair, where he has been slain by the vampire hunting team, to a door opening outdoors, with light pouring in as the sound of church bells are heard. In Freeland's words, Dracula's death has "released the romantic couple [...] from darkness into light (128)."

Dracula's destruction is presented as a relief factor because he was presented as a force which had come between a romantic couple, as a seducer and as a catalyst which awakens the sexual libido of women. The sexual overtones of vampirism in *Dracula* are subtle but yet unmistakable.

First of all, the first full-fledged onscreen appearance of Dracula is truly phallic. Initially, we see a coffin's lid being parted and his hand coming out. The next shot of Dracula brings him to the screen standing upright. All his body save his head is wrapped around his cloak, making him look very much like an erect penis.

Even more tellingly than this introduction scene of Dracula as a phallic figure, numerous instances of Dracula's attacks on his victims also have obvious sexual overtones. Tudor states that

> Almost unique among classic horror-movie threats, that posed by vampirism presumes a particularly intimate relation between vampire and victim. Sucking blood from the throat – though it can, and would later, be presented as both bloody and violent – puts the two parties in an unusually extended and close relationship. Unlike the normal run of death-dealing monsters, classic vampires are therefore permitted a degree of apparent delicacy in their activities, and the physical form in which it became conventional to represent the moment of blood-taking has many of the external signs of the loving and erotic embrace. Here is no need, therefore, to construct elaborate analogies between blood and semen, as do some psychoanalytical accounts, to establish the irreducibly sexual character of the vampire/victim relationship. Once given a presentably human figure as the vampire, demonstrating parallels with sexual activity does not require esoteric symbolic interpretations; it arises quite routinely from straightforward similarities in situation, posture and action. (163)

There are almost half a dozen of such moments in *Dracula*, one each with Renfield, the flower seller girl and Lucy, and two with Mina. Of these, Dracula's victimization of Renfield is the least eroticized one, which is not surprising as this is the only instance in the movie of Dracula setting his eyes on a male character. In this scene, Renfield has already fainted prior to Dracula's appearance and collapsed on the ground. Dracula crouches over him in a medium-long shot, stretching his hands like a claw as the scene ends with a dissolve before any physical contact is seen onscreen. Dracula's first victim in London is a very young street girl selling flowers and, even though this scene also ends with a dissolve, there is some degree of physical contact between the Count and his female victim this time. First, Dracula mesmerizes her with his stern and fixed gaze, almost like a hypnotist. He then opens his arms and holds her. She leans submissively back in his arms as he leans on her. As the two figures go off-screen, we hear the girl's scream.

Dracula's attacks on Lucy and Mina on the other hand have even more clear sexual undertones. Even though all of these, like the attacks on Renfield and the flower seller, end with dissolves without showing what Dracula actually does to his

victims, the attacks on Lucy and the first attack on Mina take place in the women's bedrooms, the former while the woman is in her bed.

It should also be noted that it is precisely this bed scene which was featured predominantly in the theatrical trailer of the movie. The trailer shows a clip of Dracula leaning over Lucy lying on bed and moving closer to her, accompanied by the narrator announcing "... lured innocent girls to a fate truly worse than death!" The double meaning of the phrase 'a fate truly worse than death' is clear. On one hand, it of course refers to the diegesis of the movie in the sense that Dracula turns his victims to living -dead like him. On the other hand, the easiest and most straight-forward association of 'a fate worse than death' for a young woman is her moving out of social acceptability because of a sexual sin committed by and/or on her. Hence, the sexual connotation of vampirism is clearly at work here by the overlapping of these diegetic and associative references of 'a fate worse than death' tagline used over the image of Dracula leaning over a female figure in bed.

Dracula's second -and more decisive- attack on Mina does not take place in her bedroom, but is nevertheless still full of sexual associations. Freeland goes as far as to say that "Dracula's conquest of Mina is the one moment from the book realized with some erotic flair in the film." In her words, Dracula's second assault on Mina "transpires in a sequence with the surreal quietness of a dream (130)." This scene has all the resemblance to a clandestine rendezvous between, for instance, a married woman and her extra-marital seducer/lover. Dracula is first seen awaiting her on the lawn, eyes glowing. Mina leaves the house in her flowing nightdress. The film cuts to a long shot that shows an erect Dracula clothed in his cape with only his head visible, just like in the opening scene of the movie. Mina approaches to embrace him, and in a swift, silent gesture, he wraps her within his dark cloak.

2. Dracula in Hammer Studio's Series

a. Hammer's 1957 Adaptation

In the British Hammer Studio's adaptation from 1957, the role of Count Dracula went to Christopher Lee, a hitherto little-known actor whose previous career had consisted mostly of supporting or bit parts. The image of Christopher Lee as Dracula is very different than that of Bela Lugosi in the same role from quarter of a century ago. First of all, Lee was a much taller figure and hence commanded a greater sense of physical grandeur on screen. Second, by virtue of being a native speaker of the English-language, his verbal performance was devoid of the foreign-sounding eccentricity of Lugosi.

The two movies, Universal's adaptation from 1931 and Hammer's from 1957, also introduce the Dracula character in very different presentations. As mentioned in the above section, Universal had brought Dracula in the first moments of the movie by showing him rising from his coffin in the castle's crypt. In other words, the 1931 movie had introduced Dracula as an uncanny figure right from the start. Hammer's *Dracula* on the other hand delays bringing the title character onto the screen well into the first reel. As British Film Institute's (BFI) Special Film Study Extract Supplement states (12), the opening is deliberately constructed so that we seem to wait a long time for the title character's appearance. The credit sequence shows a gush of blood inexplicably being spilled over a tomb bearing the name of Dracula, but the opening scenes follow Harker's journey to the castle and his encounter with a mysterious woman in fright there. Dracula is then first seen as a grand silhouette appearing between pillars at the top of a staircase from which he descends. As Pirie says, the audience is induced to expect the entrance of a fiend at this moment. The silhouette

glides down the stairs in a prolonged take, merging long-shot and close-up to reveal on the contrary an attractive, “crisply charming” in Pirie’s words, and highly charismatic-looking aristocrat, clearly in a move by the filmmakers to throw the audience into an uncertainty on how to react. Pirie states that the “ambiguity [in this introduction] is precisely as Stoker intended (75).”

Beyond his physique, the acting of Christopher Lee is also almost diametrically opposed to that of Bela Lugosi. This Dracula moves around very fast and also speaks very fast; hence he is presented as being full of energy, in marked contrast to the stiffness of Lugosi’s Dracula. This energetics of Lee’s Dracula adds to his attractiveness, making him more of a fascinating persona.

The fearful aspect of Dracula is nevertheless made visible soon. In Harker’s second encounter with the mysterious lady of the castle, Dracula makes a second sudden and unexpected appearance, but this time he is shown sporting fangs at his grinning teeth as two lines of blood trickle down from the sides of his mouth. It should be noted that this was the first-time ever a vampire’s fangs had been brought to the screen in a horror movie made in the West as Lugosi’s Dracula was fangless. In addition, the above-noted energy of Dracula is also soon given an explicitly violent turn to add to the fear aspect. Unlike Universal’s Dracula who had dispelled the female vampires’ attack on the British guest with a commanding hand gesture, Hammer’s Dracula literally grabs the female vampire by the arm and hurls her ferociously to the ground with a shriek.

Tudor, referring to these instances of Dracula’s portrayal as a fanged, bloody and violent figure, notes that “the vampire’s bestial nature here [is] given expression for almost the first time.” According to him, “there is no need for this Dracula to establish animal connections by metamorphosing into a bat or making mawkish

remarks about ‘the children of the night’: it is quite clear that in his unrepressed physicality he *is* a beast as well as an apparently sophisticated human being (172).”

The point to be made from the observations noted in this section so far is that Hammer’s adaptation amplifies both the fear and fascination components of the Dracula figure compared to the Universal’s classic one. The sexual undertones of this fear and fascination dichotomy is of course also manifest in Hammer’s adaptation. Once again looking at the promotional material of the movie in question, one easily finds such signs. For instance, the advance poster of the movie asks ‘who will be his bride tonight?’ besides a portrait of Dracula partially hidden in darkness and the general release poster carries the tagline ‘the terrifying lover –who died –yet lived!’ besides an illustration of Dracula in close contact with a woman whose eyes are closed. The verbal expression on the first poster clearly signifies the promiscuity of Dracula, suggesting that Dracula is a sexual predator who takes different women as his ‘bride’ each night. The expression on the second poster on the other hand emphasizes the inescapability from Dracula’s advances; in addition, the illustration on this poster is a far cry from all the instances of vampiric attack in Universal’s movie where the Count was never actually seen in this much close contact with his victims.

Dracula’s attack on Lucy in Hammer’s *Dracula* is also more suggestive than in the Universal movie. Even though both scenes take place in the victim’s bedrooms, in the 1931 movie Lucy was asleep when Dracula materializes. In Hammer’s movie on the other hand, she is seen waiting for him in anticipation, almost getting prepared for the encounter by opening the windows and then lying in the bed. Moreover, she seems confused at her own anticipation. When Dracula finally materializes and approaches her, she does not react neither in fear nor in over-eagerness but more of a calm resignation. As the BFI Supplement says, “her sheer passivity evokes a sense of terror

and desire similar to the dreamer who finds that their limbs will not respond (13).” The entry on Hammer’s *Dracula* in the horror volume of *The Aurum Film Encyclopedia* reports that the film was “acclaimed –and condemned- for the way it conveyed the erotic aspects of the vampire’s relationship with his female victims, especially in the scenes in which Lucy [...] readies herself, somewhat apprehensively but with real sensuality, for the Count’s nightly visits (113).”

In addition to the amplification of such themes and motifs, one marked deviation of the narrative in Hammer’s *Dracula* from all other cinematic adaptations, and from Stoker’s source novel for that matter, is regarding the motivation of the Count. As discussed previously, it is Dracula himself in the novel and in most adaptations who sets the events in motion by setting up plans and executing them to come to Britain in search of new victims. For instance, it is Dracula who invites the British solicitor to come to his castle in Transylvania with the purpose of making arrangements for his eventual move to Britain. However, in the Hammer movie, it is Jonathan Harker who arrives at the castle purportedly as an employee to catalogue Dracula’s library but actually with a clandestine purpose in the first place: that of destroying Dracula on orders from the chief vampire hunter Van Helsing. As leading British horror film critique Kim Newman notes, “the Count’s actions in the remainder of the film are motivated by revenge” for Harker’s staking of his vampire companion which is why he goes after Harker’s fiancée and sister-in-law. Newman is correct in pinpointing that this “approach puts the Count on the back-foot as a villain: undoubtedly evil, he is also someone whose open hospitality is sorely abused by an employee, treated as a guest, who [was] actually out to kill him (37).”

Another novelty of the narrative of Hammer’s *Dracula* is the nuance on the locations of the residence of Dracula and his foreign victims. The location of the home

of the protagonists is left vague, but definitely is not the British Isles but an awkward and rather implausible European town with British residents, in riding distance from Dracula's castle. As the *Aurum* entry underlines, this might have been intended simply as a money-saving budgetary alteration, but it had "felicitatious thematic consequences" in the sense of playing down the Count's foreign ancestry and making Dracula more of a domestic phenomenon, especially for British audiences. This last aspect is in tune with the metaphorical implication of another plot device, another novelty introduced by the Hammer movie in deviation from the source novel and other cinematic adaptations, where Dracula's hiding turns out to be none other than the British protagonists' own basement cellar rather than a separate mansion. These noteworthy deviations of narrative from the narrative of the source material -and narratives of other adaptations- does indeed compromise seeing the Dracula of Hammer's film as an Other embodying foreign cultures, it should be acknowledged.

b. Hammer's Sequels

As noted in the above chapter, the Hammer Studio would continue the Dracula saga with several sequels throughout the 1960s and into the early 1970s. Actually, Hammer's first follow-up to 1957's *Dracula* was not a sequel, but a separate vampire movie which did not feature the Dracula character despite its title, *Brides of Dracula* (1960). Nevertheless, even the title indicated that it was the erotic angle of the Dracula myth which was to be played upon in the public consciousness and pursued more and more. It should also be added with regards to this movie that the vampire baron here (played by a different actor than Christopher Lee; one David Peel with boyish handsomeness, who, in the words of *Aurum* horror volume, "looks like a young mod in Transylvanian garb") vampirizes even his mother, introducing an incest undertone

to add to the roster of sexual taboos to be associated with ‘Dracula’/vampire. The first real sequel which brought back Dracula himself (and Christopher Lee) to the screen, *Dracula: Prince of Darkness* (1965) deprived the Count of any speaking lines, limiting his verbal performance to animalistic hissings and the like. This choice undoubtedly underscored the ‘bestial’ nature of the vampire which was already present in the 1957 movie, as discussed above.

As Pirie notes, the next sequel, *Dracula Has Risen From the Grave* (1968), points “the overtly sexual path the vampire [cinema] would now take [with] its overt exploitation of the sexually obsessive aspect of the vampire’s victim (88)” Among other things, it portrays a “semi-orgasmic” reaction to the vampire’s bite (one female victim of Dracula dies “with an expression of satisfied lust,” in the words of the *Aurum* entry) and jealousy for Dracula among his victims. *Dracula Has Risen From the Grave* is also interesting narratively as it has a plot where Dracula enslaves a priest and seeks to destroy a Bishop who had sought to exorcise his castle. The leading protagonist is an atheist whose staking of Dracula fails apparently because he does not have the faith which is necessary in anti-vampire crusades; in the end, Dracula is destroyed only by falling on a big cross which impales him. This narrative clearly indicates that it is religion that stands against what Dracula stands for, that is sexual libido, and vice versa, namely it is Dracula that stands against what religion stands for.

*Taste the Blood of Dracula* (1969) also has a narrative with noteworthy implications. The plot of the movie, which by the way is one of the most acclaimed entries in Hammer’s Dracula series by both the critics and fans, has Dracula vampirizing the daughters of a group of British gentlemen and setting them up against their fathers. Moreover, the movie presents these father-figures not only as tyrannical figures against their children but as morally-corrupt and hypocritical figures

themselves (for example, they themselves frequent brothels while imposing a puritanism on their daughters). Pirie is correct in that *Taste the Blood of Dracula* "uses the spectre of Dracula to subvert the facade of Victorian society, or more precisely the facade of Victorian family. [...] As a chronicle of Dracula's ability to replace the ordered sexual stability of a society with a chaotic and dislocating eroticism, the movie is disconcertingly consistent (90-91)." In similar vein, the *Aurum* entry on the movie says that Dracula "stands for the forces that threaten the laboriously constructed ideal of the Victorian family; he represents an aristocratic, spendthrift notion of sexuality which must be repressed if the family is to survive (212)." What was said of *Dracula Has Risen from the Grave* above with regards to the institution of religion can be said even more strongly of *Taste the Blood of Dracula* with regards to the institution of family.

By the time 1960s ended and a new decade ushered in, the potentials of the Dracula myth seems to have been depleted for the time being with the ground-breaking *Taste the Blood of Dracula*. The next sequel, *Scars of Dracula* (1970) did neither add to nor develop any of the available motifs and was a routine gothic entry, except that Dracula was presented as a more directly sadistic figure with a scene where he whips a crippled servant -and it was a commercial flop.

It should be noted that as the Hammer series was still continuing, another adaptation of the novel was filmed, the European co-production *El Conde Dracula* (1970), again starring Lee in the title role. However, beyond some trivial aspects such as depicting the Count with a moustache for the first time in cinema, the portrayal of Dracula in this adaptation did not add anything substantial to previous adaptations and hence is not noteworthy for the purposes of this study.

Hammer next tried to re-invigorate its Dracula series by bringing the Count to contemporary ages with *Dracula AD 1972* (1972) where Dracula is revived in 'swinging London' and establishes a colony of young vampires, all in their late teens or early twenties. While the movie is interesting for linking vampirism with the young generations and hence for being a precursor for a trend in the 1970s horror cinema where the public's fear and anxieties towards the rebellious young generations who are restless against adopting the role models expected from them seems to have been translated into monstrous children, a trend best epitomized by *The Exorcist* from the next year, it is nevertheless marked by a shortcoming in adapting the Dracula figure itself to contemporary times. In other words, whereas vampirism as a motif did find a specifically new phenomena, a new Other, to link up to and Dracula was projected as a catalyst for this linking, Dracula himself was not re-designed in a novel manner to adequately seem appropriate for this function –rather, Dracula was presented involuntarily as an anachronism which undercut his fascination potential severely.

As Pirie says,

> filmmakers have not even attempted to come to terms with the starting problem of any Dracula, which is how to relate the vampire figure to contemporary society. Stoker, in fact, did this marvelously well. His *Dracula* was set in the present and he did everything in his book's opening section to emphasize that this formidable gentleman *was* equipped to deal with legal matters, railway timetables, etc. Hammer do the exact opposite: they bring Dracula to modern London in the first few minutes, but do everything to make it clear that this snarling and anachronistic dandy would be quite incapable of putting one foot outside the [desecrated church where he has been in hiding] without attracting the attention of the whole metropolis. The characterization of Dracula has never been feebler than here. (93-94)

The last entry in Hammer's Dracula series featuring Christopher Lee, *Satanic Rites of Dracula* (1973), diverges from the by-then-standard answer to the 'what does the monster stand for' question. Dracula in this movie disguises himself as a property

millionaire and allies himself with a group of over-ambitious businessmen. Hence, this movie is the closest match in horror cinema to Moretti's reading of the Dracula as a metaphor for monopoly capital. Pirie celebrates this central notion of *Satanic Rites of Dracula* as "what better role for a modern vampire in London than a property speculator?". On the other hand, *Aurum* argues that the movie

> confirms that the Dracula myth is unsuitable to convey the anxieties attendant on the use of monopoly capitalism [...] The notion that property developers or business moguls are bloodsuckers is too shallow a metaphor to sustain the complexity of the phenomenon condensed in the vampire myth (282).

*Satanic Rites of Dracula* indeed did fail to generate any revival of public interest in the series and became the last entry –except for an odd final one with a token appearance of 'Dracula' (played by a different actor), a martial arts movie made as a co-production with Hong Kong filmmakers. However interesting the central concept of *Satanic Rites of Dracula* might be from a purely academic point of view, the fact that it could not revitalize the series and failed to strike a chord with the audiences does indicate that the Dracula myth has by then indeed been inescapably attached to sexuality-related notions and other metaphors could not really work, in the sense of striking a chord with mass audiences. As for the sexual dimension, that had found an even more suitable venue in the off-shoot of the vampire genre featuring female vampires by the early 1970s, which will partially be covered in the next chapter. In the words of Pirie, "by this point in the history of the horror movie, all real sexual potency and imaginative vitality seemed to have been usurped by the female sex-vampire (95)." This sub-genre will be covered and discussed at the last section of the next chapter.

### 3. Dracula in Hollywood's 1979 Adaptation

As it has been noted in the first subsection of the above section, British Hammer Studio’s take on Dracula featuring Christopher Lee had amplified both the fear and fascination dimensions regarding the vampire figure, which were present in a diluted form in Hollywood’s classic 1931 adaptation with Bela Lugosi. When Hollywood returned to Stoker’s novel decades later, it opted for an approach which, on one hand, almost diminished the fear dimension, and on the other hand, developed the fascination dimension to a qualitatively new level, that of an overt object of desire.

The actor chosen for Hollywood’s 1979 adaptation, titled once again simply as *Dracula*, was Frank Langella, who had played the title role in a commercially successful Broadway revival of the stage adaptation of Stoker’s novel two years ago (which apparently had persuaded Hollywood to try the character once again in cinema). Langella was not as statuesque as Lee and yet the onscreen attraction he commanded was equally high but of a different quality: he had a matinee idol look with his high check bones, sensuous-looking lips and soft-styled hair.

The introduction style of the Dracula figure in this movie is also notable. The film “teases the viewers by revealing only parts of his body in a gradual process that builds anticipation (Freeland, 134).” At first, we glimpse only portions of the vampire’s body as he sails through the sea to England. Then, we see just his hair and elegant hand after he has been shipwrecked and found on the coast by Mina. We finally see him full view as he is announced at the British protagonists’ house. Framed in a doorway, Dracula strides into the room and dashingly tosses away his long black cape. The editing emphasizes its heroine’s perceptions of the vampire as it immediately cuts to show Lucy’s reaction shot in which she takes him with obvious admiration. In Freeland’s words, the 1979 adaptation shows Dracula “as the sensuously beautiful object of [the heroine’s] gaze [and makes] the vampire into a

spectacle, permitting women characters (and the film's viewers) to glean certain pleasures of looking and fantasizing (134)."

The sexuality-related connotations enmeshed to the Dracula figure in Hammer's adaptation had centered on lust. On the other hand, the sexual dimension of the Dracula figure in Hollywood's 1979's adaptation is decidedly romantic. As Wood notes, the film presents the Dracula/heroine relation "in terms of romantic passion (377)." Holte is correct in emphasizing that, unlike the Dracula characters in the 1931 and 1957 adaptations; this Dracula really falls in love and experiences all of the uncertainties of that emotion (80)."

For instance, Dracula tells the British heroine that "If at any time my company does not please you, you will have only yourself to blame for an acquaintance that seldom forces himself but is difficult to be rid of." After they literally kiss, he warns her that 'perhaps she should go' – which she refuses. The different enacting of the bedroom scene between Dracula and the British female heroine in this movie than those in the previous movies, which were discussed in the above sections, is striking. At the outset, the scene begins in similar fashion as the Hammer movie. She removes her cross and sits waiting for Dracula, who materialize from fog outside her window. The mist dissipates to reveal him standing there, with his white short open at the throat, in a composition which tempts Freeland to call "pure harlequin romance (135)." He calls her his "best beloved one", and, as the music swells, picks her up to carry her onto the bed. There follows a somewhat impressionistic sex scene showing vortices of red light and silhouettes of bats. Next, Dracula gashes his chest and offers it to her (not forcing her head, as in novel). These scenes are handled with suggestion: when Lucy moves towards his chest to drink, her face is hidden so that we actually see no blood: instead, we see him looking exhausted, even drained. Actually, throughout

the movie, there is very little, if any, gore or other grotesque imagery when Dracula is onscreen. Even Dracula's famous line regarding the howl of the wolves, "children of the night – what sweet music they make" has been altered into "what sad music they make."

Indeed, the keywords encountered in studies of this movie are, first and foremost, romance, and additionally, tragedy. Holte notes that

> In his romantic portrayal of Dracula, Langella would infuse the modern gothic horror film with the romantic element that had been an essential part of the early gothic horror novel. Lugosi's performance suggested romance; Langella's achieved it, and in the process made Badham's *Dracula* one of first successful examples of the most recent development of the vampire genre, the dark romance, in which the violence and authority of the vampires are downplayed and their suffering and sympathy become the central themes of the narrative, it is the vampire who becomes the sympatric character for the audience. Langella as Dracula […] emerges as a full-blown romantic hero – powerful, sensual, intelligent, attractive, and ultimately doomed. […] Langella plays Dracula as a vampire without fangs but with an awareness of his semitragic situation. […] Langella, unlike the earlier Dracula performers, portrays a vulnerable vampire, as much a victim as a victimizer. […] The elements of terror that lie at the heart of Stoker's novel, and especially the Christopher Lee performances that emphasize the physical presence of the vampire and the violence that is an essential part of his nature, are diminished and replaced by conventions of tragedy. Langella's performance firmly established the vampire as a tragic figure in the popular imagination. (79-82)

Holte cautions that this, of course, was not an entirely new development. He correctly notes that even Stoker's Dracula, as well as other classic vampires of 19th century literature, "had elements of tragedy in their characters (82)." However, he misses one crucial point when he claims that vampires in the modern popular culture had been primarily creatures of horror. By the time of the 1979 movie, the vampire imagery in popular culture had already taken a decisive turn into presenting the vampire as a tragic figure with Anne Rice's bestselling first entry in her 'Vampire Chronicles', *Interview with the Vampire* (1976); even earlier antecedents of this trend

can be seen in horror comics with *Vampirella*. The 1979 movie was cinema's first direct excursion into this territory, but not the first one in popular culture; on the other hand, it was in harmony with a trend which had already began in popular culture outside cinema.

Another novelty of 1979's *Dracula* is that, in the words of Freeland, "it is subversive of the classic thrust toward a narrative resolution that restores the patriarchal order (133)." Not only it is the vampire hunting team's chief, Van Helsing, who dies by way of staking and not Dracula, but the finale of the movie is indeed very ambiguous. Dracula appears to be destroyed by being pushed into sunlight and yet the final shots of the movie show the heroine (Dracula's lover in the case of this movie, as discussed above) happily looking at his cloak floating away in the air, taking the shape of a bat. Freeland reads this as hint that Dracula has after all managed to escape full destruction. Wood also correctly points out that Dracula was not daunted by crucifixes throughout the movie and hence could have been immune to sunlight as well. More importantly and more certainly, in the heroine's content smile upon watching Dracula's cloak floating away, the "film makes it clear that Lucy is still his (376)," in the words of Wood, and that she "anticipates further meetings with her lover (Freeland, 135)."

## 4. Dracula in Coppola's Adaptation

Freeland notes that in Coppola's movie from 1992, "the cloying Harlequin-romance imagery [from *Dracula* (1979)] will reappear." This fact is even underscored in theatrical posters and other promotion material of the movie which carried the tagline "Love never dies". *Bram Stoker's Dracula* not only presents the relation between Dracula and Mina as a love affair, but also provides a background on Dracula

making him a tragic figure right from the start. The movie starts with a prologue explaining Dracula's vampirism in his outburst of outrage against God when his wife commits suicide mistakenly believing he had been killed in battle (it should be noted that despite the movie's title, this explanation has no place in Stoker's work and is a novelty introduced by the filmmakers). Dracula is played by Gary Oldman, once again an actor with good and attractive looks.

After this prologue, Dracula is presented as an old but strong man (played by Oldman under heavy make-up) during the scenes of Jonathan Harker's visit to his castle. He becomes young like in the prologue after coming to England.

Freeland says that the 'cloying Harlequin-romance' imagery in *Bram Stoker's Dracula* is "tempered by the vampire's acknowledgement of his monstrousness, so the woman [Mina] faces correspondingly more complex choices (137)." Indeed Dracula warns Mina that he is "nothing, lifeless, soulless, hated and feared" and he undergoes a last minute hesitation ("I can't") before the blood exchange with Mina, who nevertheless goes ahead and sucks his blood, becoming his bride, on her own account. As is clear, this scene of *Bram Stoker's Dracula* is very similar to Universal's 1979 adaptation in the sense that Mina willingly becomes Dracula's bride. In both movies, Dracula does not force Mina (unlike in the source novel), but in Coppola's movie he even hesitates. Beyond this similarity (Dracula not forcing Mina in both movies) and difference (Dracula's hesitation in one) at the narrative level, the same scene in the two movies is very different visually. As described above, this scene in the 1979 movie was presented without any on-screen gore and with pseudo-surrealistic romantic imagery obscuring what's really going on, but the depiction in the 1992 movie is more straightforward.

Actually the real difference between the two movies is that *Bram Stoker's*

*Dracula* repeatedly drives home the point about Dracula's 'monstrousness' to the eyes of the spectators by presenting Dracula also in beastly and/or other grotesque manifestations throughout the movie as well. For example, he is seen as a hairy-beast which almost resembles a wolf-man during his first victimization of Lucy and he is glimpsed as a hideous old monster on several occasions. It is striking that when Mina witnesses Dracula's attack on Lucy as a hairy beast, he mentally commands her "do not see me", apparently erasing this memory from her consciousness. Subsequently, when he has become young again and walking the streets of London in a with long hair, top hat and spectacles, he issues another mental command to her, this time to "see me now", that is makes her notice her among the crowds.

In other words, whereas the 1979 adaptation had diminished the fear dimension of the Dracula figure while elevating the fascination dimension to an henceforth unprecedented level, Coppola's adaptation literally separates the visual manifestations of both dimensions and amplifies both of them to great extent.

Mina directly siding with Dracula in the vampire hunters' final confrontation with the count is another point where the narratives of the 1979 and 1992 adaptations collide. However, the final resolution of the narrative is very different with regard not only to Dracula's fate, but also to Mina's role in that. In *Dracula* (1979), the Count's destruction was left in doubt. However in *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, his final demise is carried out at the hands of none other than Mina. As described above, *Bram Stoker's Dracula* repeatedly drives home the point about this 'monstrousness' to the eyes of the spectators by presenting him in beastly and/or other grotesque manifestations throughout the movie. This is why it makes sense for the narrative of this movie to have Dracula unambiguously destroyed at the final moment.

The motivation for Mina to carry out this destruction is indeed very complex

and not easy to decipher at first glance. When the seriously wounded Dracula sighs to Mina that “it is finished”, she initially refuses to acknowledge that all is over, crying “no, my love!” Then she kisses him and suddenly the room they are in becomes inexplicably bathed in light –this sudden burst of light must be expected to be seen as some sort of a heavenly manifestation as Mina’s overnarration from her diary at this point in this scene begins with “then in the presence of God…” The important aspect of this scene and hence this moment in the scene as well is that Dracula is no longer the handsome young gentleman as he had always appeared to Mina beforehand but the old and hideous monster he was occasionally seen throughout the movie. In other words, Mina now kisses Dracula in his hideousity. After this kiss, which brings forward the heavenly manifestation of light upon which Dracula becomes young once again, Mina does indeed stake and decapitate her lover upon his request.

C. The Transylvania Setting

1. Transylvania as ‘the East’

Throughout the several movie adaptations of Stoker's novel, the Transylvania setting has been depicted with an emphasis on its difference from the West, to the point of underlining its non-Westernness. This is most upfront in Coppola's adaptation where Harker, on his train journey to Transylvania, writes in his journal as he observes the changes in the landscape which becomes visually more and more menacing with domineering mountains in the horizon and dark clouds in the sky, that "the impression I have is we are leaving the West and entering the East. ... one of the wildest and least known portions of Europe." It is clear that the conception of "West" at work here is not concomitant with the geographical boundaries of the European continent and does not allow being 'of Europe' to be a sufficient precondition for being

'of the West'; in other words, being 'of Europe' does not necessarily preclude being non-Western and being Eastern.

The keyword here in this regard in Harker's journal seems to be "least known" - even more than "wildest." What plays a crucial part in Harker's marking of Transylvania as 'outside' the 'West' and of the 'East' is that he and those like him do not 'know it well', it is by and large outside his/their knowledge. Of course, he phrases this in such a wording as "least known" rather than 'I/we know least about it'. This grammatically passive tense which hides away the issue of 'least known by whom?' is conditioned by the vulgar ethnocentric assumption that it would go without saying that the only knowing-subject in the universe is the West. The 'West" defines itself as the knowing-subject and relegates what is beyond this knowing-subject, what is beyond itself, as an object, as its object to be known - and defines that as the 'East'.

It should be noted that precisely at the moments when Harker scribes down the above-quoted remarks in his journal, the movie brings to the screen a vision of a pair of gigantic eyes (those of Dracula) materializing over the landscape in the skies overhead as if of a corporeal entity watching Harker's train moving in but unseen by Harker himself. Whereas Harker’s subject position was based on his self-assumption of a knowing position which was threatened when encountered by a ‘least known’ object, this encounter also simultaneously entails him becoming the object of a subject which he denies the existence of as such, which he only assumes to be an object to be known, yet least known but nevertheless to be known. However, as the corporeal eyes watching Harker without him being aware of clearly indicates, what Harker designates as ‘the East’ is not simply something to be known and henceforth mastered by the Westerners, but has an autonomy and agency of its own.

There is a similar scene early in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* where the narrator recounts that the jungle surrounding the river on which his boat travels appears to be alive as undeciphered sounds abound in it. Edward Said, in his analysis of this scene in his *Culture and Imperialism* (1992) argues that the author/narrator is intuitively aware that "what they call darkness has an autonomy of its own" but fails to recognize that what they see as "darkness is a non-European world resisting imperialism." Harker, in his journey to the heart of darkness, is aware that he is facing something 'least known', something not yet really mastered, but fails to recognize that it is not something passively waiting to be mastered eventually, but that it has an agenda of its own.

2. Dichotomies between the West and Transylvania

The dichotomy between the West and Transylvania as non-West, as the East is built around several oppositions which are introduced in several adaptations. First and foremost is the unfamiliarity of Transylvania in the eyes of the Westerners, manifested in such expressions as 'strange' and 'eccentric'. For instance in Coppola's adaptation, Harker's boss calls their foreign client as "rather eccentric." Mina, writing in her journal while reflecting on her fiancée's mission to abroad, refers to his destination as "strange countries." Similarly, Dracula himself also drives the point home by speaking to Harker that "We are in Transylvania and Transylvania is not England. Our ways are not like yours and to you, here shall be many strange things" line taken verbatim from the source novel.

However, what is at stake is not simply a matter of familiarity versus unfamiliarity, but is furthermore embedded in various connotations of superiority versus inferiority. In Universal's first adaptation, the Transylvanian folk, while trying

to dissuade the foreign visitor against going to Castle Dracula by warning him against vampires, humbly refer to themselves as “we, people of the mountains.” The British protagonist on the other hands retorts by saying that “but these are nothing but superstitions,” without failing to add that he is “not afraid.”

The dialogue between Van Helsing and the Transylvanian folk in Hammer Studio’s adaptation is even more telling. Referring to his colleague, Van Helsing says that “He came here with a purpose, to help you” to which the villagers reply as “We did not ask for help.” Van Helsing is still adamant, “You needed it all the same. ... Not only you, but the whole world will benefit.” The Transylvanians are equally adamant as well, as they reply, “Leave and leave us in peace.”

Even Dracula himself, in Coppola’s movie, expresses an acknowledgment of the West’s superiority by telling Harker that “Victories of my great race are but a tale to be told.”

### 3. The Depictions of the Castle

It should also be noted however that while the depiction of Transylvania as an Other of the West, including as its depiction as the non-West, as ‘the East’, is a constant in many movie adaptations, the physical depiction of Count’s castle in Transylvania does seems to have evolved in a certain specific manner across different movies over time, just like and parallel to the evolution in the physical depiction of Count Dracula, as discussed in the above sections of this chapter. To briefly put it, the gothic morbidness of the castle has been toned down.

Universal’s *Dracula* from 1931 opens with an exterior shot of the castle which then cuts to an indoors scenery at the castle’s underground crypt which is almost in

ruins. The place and everything inside is covered in cobwebs and  the only thing alive are a bunch of rats moving around skeletons. When the British protagonist arrives at the castle, he is so perplexed by the ruined state of the castle's entrance, which is completely devoid of any furniture and is, just like the crypt, covered with cobwebs that he thinks for a moment he had arrived at a wrong place.

Hammer Studio's *Dracula* from 1957 also starts with an exterior shot of the castle only to cut to the indoors scenery at the crypt. However, this crypt is not shown to be in ruins and there are no rats, skeletons, cobwebs or other similar paraphernalia in sight on the screen. This pre-credits crypt scene ends with a gush of bright red blood (inexplicably) pouring down over Dracula's coffin as the music score rises to a crescendo. The dynamism integrated into the opening scene of Hammer's adaptation is in sharp contrast with that of Universal's which was marked with a frozen-time feeling.

Actually, Dracula's castle has never been shown in any adaptation to be as much in ruin as it was in Universal's first adaptation. The European co-production from 1970 shows the castle as a barren place but in good shape with cobwebs manifested only on candle-holders. The castle in Coppola's adaptation, while devoid of the highly saturated color plate of the Hammer movie, is again nowhere as much in ruin as it was in Universal's 1931 movie and manifests a sense of grandeur.

# IV. The Female Figures

## A. Introduction

Whereas the presentations of the pivotal figure of the Dracula movies were discussed in the previous chapter, presentations of the secondary, complementary characters, that is the female figures, will be studied in this chapter. While the previous chapter had ended with a discussion of Dracula's Transylvanian homeland and his castle, this chapter will begin with looking at his Transylvanian brides across different movie adaptations over time. Then, the presentations of his British female victims will be covered and discussed. It should be noted that the 'figure of Dracula's British female victim' is not unitary. Taking its root from the source novel, there are two different types in question: one victim who can not be rescued and one victim who can eventually be saved. Each of these types is endowed with certain characteristics, elaborated at length in the relevant sections, which predetermine their fate. However, despite these differences, there is the fundamental common ground that both are women and hence both are victims of Dracula. In other words there is a continuum from Dracula's Transylvanian brides to his British female victim who cannot be rescued and onto his other British victim who can eventually be rescued. The differences determine whether they can be rescued or not while the act that all are women determine all of them becoming victims.

The chapter also includes a final section on female vampire movies which had emerged at a period in horror cinema when Dracula movies had reached a (temporary) impasse. The amplification of the (fear and) fascination components of the Dracula figure had reached a saturation from where the emergence of female vampire movies

occurred as a logical next step. While most of these female vampire movies follow the narrative closure pattern of most Dracula movies in the sense the destruction of the vampire and hence the restoration of the established order is presented as a relief factor, some movies made outside mainstream cinema provide contrary patterns.

B. Dracula's Transylvanian Brides

In Universal's classic *Dracula* (1931), the spectators are introduced to Dracula's concubines very early in the movie, in contrast with all other adaptations, where the concubines first come to the screen during their attempted assault on the British visitor, in keeping with Stoker's novel. In *Dracula* (1931) however, right after the exterior shot of the castle and the following tracking shots down and into the castle's crypt, three silent and eerie females are also seen coming out of their coffins besides Dracula himself. Whereas Dracula stands up tight and erect, his concubines stand in a meek posture with their heads bowed down and hands clutched upfront. This distinctively submissive posture of the concubines in *Dracula* (1931) contrasts not only with the dominant posture of the Count in the same movie, but also with the concubine figures in all other adaptations, as will be shown shortly below. The explicitly submissive presentation of Count's concubines in this first movie shows them as lacking any noteworthy autonomy from their master. In addition to their posture; their dresses, long gowns which don't reveal any bare body skin, also lack any hint of promiscuity whatsoever. Hence, both in terms of their posture and of their dresses, the threat from their potential sexual aggressiveness is significantly diminished here.

Even their next appearance in *Dracula* (1931) in the assault against the British guest can also be seen in a similar context. While the fact that they tentatively set their

eyes upon a man signals a potential for sexual aggressiveness, this is nevertheless in a very diluted form than in all other movie adaptations which depict the same scene from the novel. Here, all that is brought to the screen is the batch of three ladies slowly moving towards the British man who had shortly earlier fainted when he had hit his head against a window while trying to ward off a bat. They are again in their non-promiscuous gowns and in their meek posture with bowed down heads and upfront-clutched hands. Not surprisingly, when Dracula materializes in the scene, he orders them back with a single hand gesture and they withdraw silently and slowly without any single protest.

Poignantly, such a diluted presentation of their sexual threat contrasts not only with those in other adaptations from later decades, but even with the depiction of the same scene in Universal's Spanish-language twin movie shot simultaneously with this English-language one. As noted in the previous chapter, Universal had also produced a Spanish-language *Dracula* movie for export to the vast Spanish-speaking markets, filmed in the same sets from the same script but with Spanish-speaking casts and crews. In the Spanish-language version, the presence of the female vampires in this scene is first signaled by a sudden reverse-angle shot showing them standing behind the foreigner and secretly watching him. The utilization of such a cinematic device functions to create a jolting effect on the spectators and hence serves to introduce the female figures as a fear factor.

Moreover, the female vampires of the Spanish-language version are dressed in markedly more revealing outfits, have flowing hair and their bodily contortions of grinning teeth and clawed hands explicitly portray them as predators. Significantly unlike any other *Dracula* movie adaptation, Dracula does not materialize here to dispel them as the scene ends with the women closing in on the foreign guest. This

last aspect is especially surprising in the face of the fact that Dracula does indeed ward them off in the original novel. Hence, while the English-language adaptation dilutes their threat by depicting them in non-promiscuous outfits and meek postures, the Spanish-language version not only presents them as aggressive predators in keeping with the novel, but also goes one step further than its literary source by excluding Dracula from the scene and henceforth eliminating any hint to the limits of their power.

Hammer's *Dracula* (1958) showcases only one female vampire at the Count's castle and presents her in an explicitly sexualized manner who sport puffed-up breasts almost bursting out from her very revealing dress. Her first appearance is as a mysterious woman who secretly pleads the British guest to help her get away from the castle. The reason to decrease the number of Dracula's concubines down to one from the customary three is apparently the filmmakers' desire to cast doubts on the spectators as to her motivations: If the movie had presented three concubines as in the novel and in the previous adaptations, spectators familiar with the plot would immediately recognize her as a vampire herself trying to trick the doomed protagonist, dispelling any suspense. Her vampiric nature is revealed in her second screen appearance when she once again asks the British guest for help. The man is apparently taken off guard by her seductive approach and her fangs become visible when she bites him in the neck.

In other words, in this movie, the female vampire is presented as a figure who is both overtly sexy and a trickster. Whereas men had become vulnerable to the female vampires' assault when they were literally unconscious in both of Universal's adaptations from 1931, the female vampire in Hammer's *Dracula* exploits a male weakness in the face of sexy-looking women. Thus, this *Dracula* adaptation adds one

layer to the depiction of the figure of the female vampire as a sexual threat in the sense that men are vulnerable to this threat because they can be tricked by appearances: The sex appeal, the attractiveness of the woman is a trap to blindfold the man; it is a cover to temporarily hide and disguise the predatory nature of woman which becomes evident only when it is too late.

Oddly, the next movie adaptation which came in 1970, the low budget international co-production *El Conde Dracula*, is not remarkable at all in the regard of the evolution of the depiction of the figure of Dracula's concubines at his castle as the scene of the concubines' attack on the British guest is brought to the screen in a haphazard manner in this film. This is surprising given the fact that its director, Jesus Franco, had provided a critically much praised depiction of a literal *femme fatale*, a figurative *femme castrata* in a non-vampiric movie (*Miss Muerte* [1966]) earlier in his career and would later go on to make several lesbian vampire movies as well. While *El Conde Dracula* is worthy of a discussion with regard to Dracula's British female victims which will be covered in the below relevant section of this chapter, it is a negligible entry in this section on the depiction of the concubines (The unevenness of the movie apparently stems from tight shooting schedules due to budgetary restraints). Universal's 1979 adaptation also has to be naturally omitted in this discussion since that movie omits the entire Transylvania episode.

Hollywood's 1992 adaptation, *Bram Stoker's Count Dracula*, on the other hand picks up the evolution of the representations of the concubines as threatening female sexuality and fully develops it to its ultimate embodiment as far as it can go short of hardcore pornographic content. Cynthia A. Freeland cites (138) this seduction scene, which she labels as "close to pornographic", as one of the "three key scenes of erotic transgression in Stoker's novel" (the others being Dracula's vampirization of

the two British women) which for the first time has been "faithfully" portrayed on screen "with real emotional force" here in Coppola's adaptation. James C. Holte also calls (86) Coppola's execution of this key scene of the novel as "perhaps the most effective ever filmed, combining terror and eroticism nearly unmatched in film history." The scene is indeed presented explicitly as a seduction bordering on rape leading to an orgy. The scene ends abruptly with Dracula's appearance. Several of its aspects are noteworthy. In Universal's twin adaptations from 1931, the female vampires had approached him as he was lying unconscious on the floor and the single female vampire of Hammer's adaptation had assaulted her victim when both were standing. Coppola's is the first depiction of this scene *on a bed*, the customary habitat of sexual intercourse: the British guest sitting on a bed first hears a female whisper apparently coming from nowhere telling him to "lay back". More tellingly, the first female vampire materializes not anywhere randomly in the room as her counterparts had done in the 1931 adaptations, but under the sheets right between his legs. Furthermore, whereas the English-language *Dracula* of 1931 had presented its female vampires in non-revealing dress, its Spanish-language twin in relatively more revealing outfits and Hammer's *Dracula* with puffed-up breasts almost bursting from but still trapped by her gown, the vampires of this movie are completely topless with bare breasts. After these introductory signs which quickly make the sexual nature of the scene more evident with each sign (first the bed as setting, then the woman materializing between his legs, then her bare-breasted appearance), the vampires' assault on the man has all the outer trappings of sexual foreplay prior to an orgy as the women force themselves over him, licking various parts of his body and sucking his nipple and eventually setting down to opening his zippers; they also kiss each other while caressing, kissing and biting him.

### C. Dracula's Western Female Victims

#### 1. Detour for Elaboration with Regard to the Source Novel

As several analysts such as Leatherdale (140-152) point out, the differences between Lucy and Mina are structured in such a way in the novel that the former is endowed with several characterial attributes which make her liable to fall under evil influences; in Kline's words, she is "predestined to fall" (115). First, her most obvious and literal liability is her somnambulism; it is in the course of one of her nocturnal unconscious strolls that she falls prey to Dracula for the first time. However, Lucy's somnambulism, that is her unwelcome and uncontrolled forays into the night, makes even more sense in the light of and is in tune with her other attributes all of which combine to portray her as a perfect candidate for transformation into a female vampire.

Unlike Mina who holds a professional job at a school, the featherheaded Lucy, living in luxury within a household with no father figure (he is deceased) shows no inclination to work and spends her time with leisure, and is suited by three different gentlemen. Even though she does accept the proposal of one of her suitors and rejects the others, she nevertheless does not decline one last kiss with one of them. More significantly, she confesses an outright dissatisfaction for monogamy and longs for polygamy: "Why they can't let a girl marry three men or as many as want her and save all this trouble?" (76) Hence, while she may not be an explicit *femme fatale* in deed per se, she nevertheless harbours corrupt inclinations at her heart.

Kline (112), pointing out to fake scientific theories prevalent and influential in late 19th century which claimed delinquent behaviour was a form of clinical illness inherited at birth from lineage, reminds that Lucy's moral corruption at heart is

interestingly accentuated with the fact that there is a history of chronic clinical heart ailment in her family as well: both her deceased father and widowed mother are noted to be afflicted with precisely such health problems. In other words, she is not only clearly a degenerate, but, with some stretch of interpretation, can also be seen as a degenerate by birth.

Mina on the other hand is an ideal late-Victorian woman in many respects. There has been some confusion in this regard in some *Dracula* studies. The fact that she holds a professional occupation and has gained some practical skills such as stenography has led some analysts such as Dematrakopoulos (quoted in both Leatherdale and Kline) to see her as an example of a proto-feminist figure. However, as Kline persuasively argues, this is very misleading. Mina's occupation is being an assistant mistress at a girls' finishing school teaching etiquette and Kline points out that such employment in education were the only jobs the Victorians society allowed middle-class women. Further, any slight hint of economic independence aspirations in Mina are quickly dispelled as she quits her job once she marries Jonathan. Moreover, she explicitly states (in her personal diary) that she had learned those skills such as stenography with the sole intention of assisting her prospective husband in *his* job when they would eventually marry. Hence, Mina's occupational career and skills enhance her as an ideal woman from a patriarchal viewpoint rather than present her as a proto-feminist. Actually, on several occasions in her diary, she explicitly expresses her disapproval of the ways of the "New Woman", a euphemism for the feminists of her time.

Mina herself is very obedient towards men even to the point of going to bed like a child when she is told to. In addition, she is very puritanical. For instance, she is uncomfortable with holding hands of Lucy's fiancée to console him and even with

walking arm in arm with her own fiancée before they get married. In brief, she is almost the opposite of Lucy in many regards and Kline is largely correct in insisting that while Lucy stands for everything the Victorian patriarchal mentality distrusted or rather outright detested in the New Woman, Mina is the ideal feminine the Victorians stood against this New Woman.

On the other hand, there is indeed one single instance where Mina displays a progressive sentiment when she writes in her diary that in future "I suppose the New Women […] will do the proposing herself. A nice job she will make of it, too! There is some consolation in that" (). Thus, while it would be wrong to see her as a New Woman herself for all the reasons discussed shortly above, she is not completely immune to New Woman tendencies and is not the *complete* opposite of Lucy either as Kline sometimes sounds like wanting to present her. Actually, such a complete dichotomy would not make sense in the novel's scheme either. It is true and must justifiably be stressed at every relevant point that Lucy could not be rescued and was connoted to be predestined for such a fate and that Mina could be rescued and was connoted accordingly. However, it is also true that *both* women after all become victims of Dracula. Accordingly, both women should share certain tendencies to a little degree while diverging at a larger degree. Hence, at a primary level, there is a continuum from Dracula's Transylvanian concubines to Lucy and on to Mina. After all, all are Woman; and their Otherness first of all stems from right there before any historical/socio-cultural elaboration would work on *what kind of women* they are from which other Otherness attributes accumulate.

## 2. Female Protagonists in *Dracula* Adaptations

Like in almost all movie adaptations of the novel, the contrast between

Dracula's female British victims between one female victim who cannot be saved and another victim who can eventually be saved is also present in Universal's first adaptation. However, in this movie, some of the opposing characterial traits between the two women which were intricately designed in the novel have been eschewed. As described in detail above, in the novel, the female victim who cannot be saved –Lucy- possesses several attributes which connote her to be 'predestined to fall.' On the other hand, the female victim who can eventually be saved –Mina- possesses signs which put her in a position of being the feminine ideal of her times to a large, though significantly not complete, extent.

First of all, in *Dracula* (1931), Lucy's somnambulism, which makes her a 'creature of the night' right from the start and makes her far more vulnerable to Dracula, is not present. Second, the multitude of suitors for this character is also absent, leave alone her fibrousness with all of them. However, the movie compensates Lucy's lack of somnambulism and multitude of suitors as well her as her flirtousness with them with her explicit fascination for and even flirtousness with none other than Dracula himself. The scrapping of her somnambulism naturally call for an alternative channel for Lucy's encounter with Dracula and the movie entails this with a social encounter, albeit one engineered by Dracula himself.

Dracula plans and organizes what appears to be a chance meeting at an opera and introduces himself to the company of Lucy, Mina, her father and her fiancée as a foreign count who had bought an abbey adjacent to their mansion and moved there. At this meeting, he recites a poem with macabre as well as romantic imagery upon which Lucy responds in kind by reciting some lines in similar tone. Later in the evening, when the two girls are alone in their restroom at home, Lucy sympathetically mocks Dracula's awkward foreign accent. When Mina teases her by calling her "romantic",

she retorts by saying “Laugh all you like; I think he is fascinating!” Mina responds by stating that she would prefer someone “a little more normal.” Lucy questions her whether she means someone like her fiancée Jonathan and Mina says yes.

Hence, in this first movie adaptation of the novel, Dracula has seduced his potential victim by impressing her at a social encounter rather than attacking her during a somnambulistic stroll, as in the novel. While this change has deprived Lucy of the metaphors of being a ‘creature of the night’ via her somnambulism, it has nevertheless presented her as more of a gullible young girl open to literal seduction.

The difference between Lucy and Mina in this movie adaptation works in the dichotomy of being a single or not. Mina lives with her father and is engaged to a man. Lucy, on the other hand, is presented simply as a friend of Mina who appears to live with her and no background information is supplied; in other words, there is no father figure for her and it can be said that it is this lack of a male anchor in her life which makes her more vulnerable to Dracula’s advances. She attempts to substitute this lack with Dracula, rather than with someone “more normal” in Mina’s words - with disastrous results for her. Actually, it should be said that it is Dracula who sets out to make advantage of this lack of hers. After he dispenses with her, Dracula next sets his eyes on Mina, but this time he cannot succeed fully and it turns out to be himself who perishes as a result of his harassing of Mina. While he had succeeded in wasting a fatherless and bachelor gullible girl, he cannot succeed with another one who is endowed with familiar and marital ties to men; on the contrary, he himself pays a heavy price for setting his eyes on such a girl.

However, this does not mean that even such a girl could completely be immune from the influences of Dracula. Her safe place in the patriarchal network could save her only at the last resort, but could not protect her from Dracula’s

advances altogether. Dracula does succeed not only in getting ‘easy girls’, but also in penetrating the protective shields of patriarchal networks and reaching the ‘secured’ women there. He succeeds in ‘getting the girl’, but not in ‘making her his.’ As noted in the above discussions on the degrees and limits of the differences between female victims who can and cannot be rescued, after all both Lucy and Mina are females and by virtue of being female alone, they are vulnerable to Dracula’s influence. The differences between them in terms of being secured by patriarchal networks matter in the sense of whether Dracula will completely succeed in his conquest of these female figures, but the fact that both of them are females in the final analysis set a limit to the effect of this difference of protection and enables both of them to be subject to Dracula’s influence nevertheless even though one can be saved and the other not.

A far larger portion of the movie is devoted to Dracula’s advances towards Mina and its effects on her than the portions devoted to his conquest of Lucy. This makes sense as Lucy was a far more easy target and Mina was more of a challenge. Dracula’s relation with Mina and, even more significantly, the effects of this relation on Mina indicate clearly that what is going on is not simply a matter of blood sucking but that it stands for the seduction of a young woman engaged to a ‘proper’ fiancée by an eccentric third party into a pseudo-adulterous affair.

For instance, one scene at a point in the plot where Dracula has already clandestinely vampirized Mina twice has all the outer trappings of an encounter between a woman who cheats on her partner, that partner and the third party. When Dracula pays a visit to the British protagonists’ mansion, Mina throws fleeting glimpses at him; she also suddenly and conspicuously becomes very merry in contrast to her prior mood before Dracula’s arrival. When Van Helsing requests Mina to retire, she initially resists, but accepts only when Dracula also expresses his approval of

Mina's retiring. Dracula adds fuel to the British men's, especially Jonathan's frustration by revealing that he has been frequently meeting with Mina and telling her stories from his "far-off country" to amuse her. Upon hearing this, Jonathan especially expresses his surprise and dismay.

Subsequent scenes involving Mina seem to perfectly display the fluctuations in the mood of such a young women betraying her partner stemming from her inner conflicts. At one point, she exclaims to her fiancée as such: "Oh, John, you mustn't touch me or kiss me ever again. It's all over John. Our love, our life together…" On the other hand, at another point, Jonathan observes the radiance in Mina and says, "Mina, you are so... like a changed girl. You look wonderful" upon which she replies "I feel wonderful. I've never felt better in my life." At another point, she tells Jonathan that she "loves the fog [and] the nights with fog." Jonathan is surprised and reminds her that only yesterday she had said that she was afraid of the night. Mina refuses to acknowledge this inconsistency of hers and retorts that not only that she "loves the night", but, more remarkably, night is "the only time I really feel alive."

As noted above, Universal had also produced a Spanish-language *Dracula* movie simultaneously with the far more famous English-language one. It should be reminded that this twin movie aimed at the Latin American markets was shot with a Spanish-speaking cast shot but from the same script and on the same sets. A comparison of these two movies yields some surprising and very interesting results with regard to the portrayal of the female protagonists, just like in the portrayal of Dracula's concubines at his castle, which was discussed in the related above section.

Like the portrayal of the vampiric concubines in the Spanish-language version as aggressive predators in promiscuous outfits had contrasted sharply with their portrayal in the English-language version, the portrayal of the female protagonists are

also markedly different in both movies. First of all, in the scene at the opera where Dracula first establishes contact with his prospective victims, the Lucy figure's (called as Lucia in this Spanish-language version) dress is more revealing. It should also be noted that this scene brings to the screen the shot of Dracula and the young woman looking at each other for a longer duration. Mina-figure's (named as Eva in this version) dress in the scene of her encounter with Dracula outdoors during the night is also much more revealing than in the English-language version. Mina-figure's assault on her fiancée is also presented with a wilder twist as we see her actually biting his neck.

The two versions differ not only in these visual cues, but there are two striking instances of script variance as well. In the Spanish-language version, Dracula's female victim says that she had felt very weak as if she had lost her virginity in describing her ordeal whereas in the English-language one, the same character has simply stated that she had felt weak, omitting any sexual reference. The Spanish-language version also features a scene which is completely absent in the other version. The English-language adaptation had left vampirized Lucy's fate unresolved, omitting her beheading from the source novel. In the Spanish-language version, we first hear an off-screen scream amidst a cemetery scenery and then see the vampire hunters leaving the cemetery grounds as they talk about how they staked her. These two instances of variation apparently indicate the points where the shooting script of the English-language version must have been self-censored.

These points show that the sexual connotations of vampirism are more accentuated in the Spanish-language version than the English-language version. Such connotations are also more evident in the British Hammer studios adaptation of *Dracula*, as has already been raised in the above chapter on the presentation of the

Dracula figures, but interestingly the dichotomy between the victims who can and who cannot be saved is very vague in this British adaptation. Lucy is not given much of the attributes of being more promiscuous than Mina. She does not have somnambulism nor is she in any way flirtous. The only difference between her and Mina is that one is engaged while the other is married.

One major novelty which Hammer's brings to the screen in contrast to the two previous twin adaptations is the vampirized Lucy's abortive attack on a male protagonist at the cemetery prior to her staking. This scene is actually an adaptation of a similar scene from the source novel which was omitted in Universal's twin movies. However, in the novel, Lucy assaults her fiancée. In this movie, she assaults her brother: Lucy opens her arms and sports her fangs as she approaches him, saying "Dear brother.. Why didn't you come earlier? Come, let me kiss you.." This deviation from the novel is very striking as it manifests an incestuous motif, thus adding one more extra level of social unacceptability on female sexuality. Lucy's incestuous advance is halted by the vampire hunter team leader Van Helsing holding up a crucifix, showing that only religion can prevent such transgressions.

In Hammer's *Dracula*, Van Helsing's certain remarks also needs to be pointed out. At one point, he says that "victims consciously detest being dominated by vampirism, but are unable to relinquish the practice, similar to addiction to drugs." As discussed in the above chapter on Dracula figures, the Count's first onscreen nocturnal visit had been preceded by showing her eagerly waiting him in anticipation and even getting prepared for this visit. Van Helsing's remarks can be seen on one hand has as an acceptance of the concomitance of fear and desire. On the other hand, it can also be seen as an attempt to 'explain away' this concomitance by an analogy to drug addiction without facing it up.

Another important remark of Van Helsing comes up when the vampire hunter team is about to stake the vampiric Lucy. He asserts that “This is not Lucy but only a shell! We must destroy that shell.” This remark is tune with the belief that the body is a shell harbouring the soul and it is the body where corruption takes place. In this very scene, Lucy’s breasts are shown extremely puffed-up beneath her revealing dress, accentuating her appearance as a sexually-aroused figure. Furthermore, for the first time in a cinematic adaptation, her staking is brought to the screen and it is presented with all the sexual codes from the source novel complete with her facial contortions.

In Universal’s movie, the effect of Dracula’s destruction on Mina as her liberation was presented as her coming back to her senses from her mesmerized looks. In Hammer’s movie, her liberation is presented with more physical tones as a stigmata on her hand disappears when Dracula is destroyed. This makes sense in that as all the sexual codes which were latent or implied in Universal’s first adaptation had become more pronounced in Hammer’s adaptation, the fact that the last vestige of Dracula’s hold on Mina to have been of physical nature as well is in tune with the overall carnality of vampirisizm emphasized in this adaptation.

On the other hand, the co-production *El Condé Dracula* from 1970 is very different from all previous –and subsequent- adaptations in its portrayal of the female victims. The dichotomy between the victims who can and who can not be saved is not only devoid of its attributes from the source novel, but, in a sense, it is reversed. In this movie, Lucy is presented as a very timid and fragile young woman as in one occasion she becomes scared of wolves’ barking and in another occasion even literally faints from the cries of lunatics at an asylum. Mina on the other hand is presented as a more assured woman and she takes it on herself to comfort her friend. Lucy is very pale and sick-looking even before Dracula’s attacks on her. In other words, she is very

far from the flirtous, promiscuous and energetic Lucy of the source novel. It can even be said that director Jesus Franco seems to have deliberately intended to play with and subvert the established codes regarding the Lucy-figure. This same director's even more direct and comprehensive subversion of the vampire narrative in another movie will be covered in the below section.

The Lucy character is much underplayed in the 1979 adaptation, so that movie will not have a place for discussion in this section. On the other hand, the contrast between the characterial attributes of Lucy the female victim who cannot be saved and Mina the female victim who is saved is very pronounced in Coppola's *Bram Stoker's Dracula*. As noted at the beginning of this section, Universal's first adaptation of *Dracula* from 1931 had diluted or eliminated some aspects of this contrast from the source novel while preserving it in other aspects. It can be said that that Coppola's *Bram Stoker's Dracula* from 1992 goes to great lengths to underscore it to a degree even more extensive than in the literary source.

For instance, this movie includes a scene, not derived from the novel, where Mina clandestinely flips through the pages of a copy of *Arabian Nights* belonging to Lucy and mutters to herself that the book's pornographic illustrations are "disgustingly awful." Furthermore, when Lucy shamelessly teases Mina by saying that his fiancée "should be forcing you to perform unspeakable acts of passion", Mina retorts that "there is more to marriage than carnal pleasures." Subsequently, she naively says, "I don't understand. Can a man and woman really do that?" with regard to a non-missionary sexual intercourse position depicted in the *Arabian Nights*' illustrations upon which Lucy reply is "I did last night - in my dreams."

All of Lucy's multiple suitors from the novel are present in this adaptation and she flirts with them in more outrageous manners. For instance, referring to the knife of

one of her suitors with clear sexual hints, she says “please let me touch it - it’s so big.” Lucy’s somnambulism is also present in this movie and she is first attacked by Dracula during a somnambulistic stroll. However, Van Helsing explicitly states that Lucy should not be seen as “a random victim attacked by accident.” The filmmakers make sure that they drive home the point that Lucy’s characterial traits they had depicted make her ‘predestined to fall’ by making the vampire hunter declare that “she is a willing recruit - a wanton follower. I dare say a devoted disciple - Devil’s concubine.”

On the other hand, *Bram Stoker’s Dracula* also amplifies Mina’s vulnerabity to Dracula’s influence despite her differences from Lucy. We hear her confess to herself that while Lucy’s “free way of speaking shocks me sometimes [,] the truth is I admire her. I wish I was pretty and adored as she.” Later on, when her fiancée asks for marriage unknowing that she has been seduced by Dracula and began seeing him with all the outer trappings of a clandestine ‘affair’, she leaves a note to the Count that his fiancée must never know their relation and that they shouldn’t see each other anymore. At the same time, she writes in her diary that “with [Dracula], I felt more alive as never I felt. Now, without him, soon to be a bride, I feel confused and lost. Perhaps, while trying to be good, I am bad.”

This last sentence of Mina, even though she still frames it with a ‘perhaps’ clause, is crucial in that it sheds light on the difference and the similarity between Lucy and Mina: they are different in the sense that Mina is ‘trying to be good’ while Lucy acts out on her impulses, but they are similar in the sense that both are ‘bad’. This way of putting the difference between the two women brings us right back to the conclusion of the discussion between the two figures in the above section that both characters above all women and are open to temptations of the flesh in the final

analysis.

As the narrative of the movie progresses, Mina eventually gives up her ‘confusion’ and acknowledges her feelings to herself without any reservation, that is without any ‘perhaps’ framing anymore. After her marriage, she confides in her diary about the “tiny hope that lives in me that I’ll see my prince [i.e. Dracula] again. Now that I am married, I begin to understand the nature of my feelings for my strange friend.” When her wish is realized and Dracula comes back to her, she welcomes her saying, “You’ve found me. I wanted this to happen. I know that I ought to be with you, always.” Even after she learns Dracula’s connection to Lucy’s fate, she exclaims “I love you. God forgive me, but I do. I want to be what you are.”

### D. The ‘Other’ Female Vampire Movies

In providing a genre history of the horror cinema, Andrew Tudor labels the first half of the 1970s as the “boom” years. He states that 45 percent of the horror movies of these years were of supernatural content and that half of these featured vampires, which gives us roughly the figure of 20-25 percent, compared to 10 percent between 1931-84. Tudor notes that a major novelty of the vampire movies of this era was not only their large number and proportion, but also the fact that most of these were female vampire movies (64). Even though female vampires had occasionally appeared as leading characters in movies as early the 1930s, such as *Dracula’s Daughter* (1930), figures such as Carmilla Karnestien from Sheridan Le Fanu’s novella (mentioned in the 2nd chapter) or the real-life historical figure Countess Elizabeth Bathory, who had reportedly bathed in virgin girl’s blood, rivaled Dracula in popularity in the first half of the 1970’s as noted in the relevant points in chapters 2 and 3.

At this point in this thesis, a discussion of some of these movies would be helpful because, even though they are not Dracula movies, their emergence had come at a time, as noted in the above chapter, when Dracula movies, largely manifested in Hammer's sequels, had come to a point where their development had reached an impasse by maturing the fear and fascination dimensions but still imprisoned in the same narrative formula while Hammer's attempts to add new dimensions had failed to generate interest necessary to rejuvenate the series. As seen in the above chapter, it would take Universal's new adaptation romanticizing the title character as an overt object of desire to break this impasse on the part of the Dracula movies towards the very end of the decade. What happened in the meantime between Hammer's stagnation and the 1979 movie was that all the sexual potency of the vampire was taken up by the female vampire figure.

The female vampire movies which proliferated in the early 1970's have largely been seen as a manifestation of male fears, anxiety and insecurity in the face of the women's liberation movement. Tudor himself says that "It is tempting to see in this remarkable development fears about predatory female sexuality. These were, after all, the years in which the 'women's lib' (as it was abusively labeled in the popular press) was much publicized and much maligned. Why should this not find devious expression in the vampire movie." (65) He elaborates that "Women, the films seem to suggest, lack the will necessary to resist the vampire's temptations. They can be all too easily transformed by desire, no longer safely domesticated by the restraining structures of family and marriage. Destruction of the vampire, and hence of unbridled sexuality, restores social as well as natural order." (174)

One of the influential authors who has linked the female vampire movies boom to the feminist movement is Bonnie Zimmerman:

> The lesbian vampire, besides being a Gothic fantasy archetype, can be used to express a fundamental male fear that female bonding will exclude men and threaten male supremacy. [...] Although direct parallels between social forces and popular culture are risky at best, the popularity of the lesbian vampire film in the early 1970's may be related to the beginnings of an international feminist movement, as a result of which women began both to challenge male domination and to bond strongly with each other. Since feminism between 1970's and 1973 was not yet perceived as a fundamental threat, men could enjoy the sexual thrill provided by the images of lesbian vampires stealing women and sometimes destroying men in the process. The creators of these image - like the pornographic filmmakers who appeal to male fantasies with scenes of lesbianism - must have felt secure enough of their power and that of their primarily male audience to flirt with lesbianism and female violence against men. (381-382)

Andrea Weiss, while taking her lead from Zimmerman in linking the female vampire movies of the early 1970s with the rise of the feminist movement, qualifies Zimmerman's analysis:

> The relationship which Zimmerman seeks to establish between the early 1970s feminist movement and the appearance of so many lesbian vampire films rests not on the security but on the insecurity that the feminist movement generated in male spectators at the time. Feminists were angrily demanding sexual autonomy from men and control over their bodies. Strengthened by participation in consciousness-raising groups, many women across the United States and in Europe demanded sexual pleasure and sexual equality with their husbands and boyfriends, many more left these men and proclaimed their lesbianism. Under such circumstances, men understandably felt their dominant social position to be dangerously threatened. Although psychic fears and historical circumstances rarely coincide so directly or neatly, and it would be reductive to explain the former as solely the product of the latter, the emergence of the lesbian vampire in this period does, in some measure, symbolize this threat. The lesbian vampire provokes and articulates anxieties in the heterosexual male spectator, only for the film to quell these anxieties and reaffirm his maleness through the vampire's ultimate destruction. The lesbian vampire is at once attractive and threatening to man, in part because she expresses an active sexual desire, which men may fantasize safely in the cinema even while being threatened by its prospect at home. (90)

This framework has largely been developed from analysis of the 'Carmilla' trilogy of female vampire movies, produced by Britain's Hammer studios, beginning

with *Vampire Lovers* (1970). However, both authors acknowledge that certain female vampire movies do not fit into this pattern and, far from it, they actually subvert it. Zimmerman says that "The myth of the lesbian vampire, however, carries in it the potential for a feminist revision of meaning: [...] that in turning to each other, women triumph over and destroy men themselves" (382). The case both Zimmerman and Weiss concentrate on is *Daughters of Darkness* (original title: *La Rouge aux Lévres*; 1970), directed by the Belgian director Harry Kumel. Zimmerman states this movie is "considerably ambiguous about the lesbian vampire and thus lends itself particularly well to a feminist interpretation" (382). Weiss says "in many ways it tends deliberately to subvert the lesbian vampire genre" (101). Briefly, the plot of *Daughters of Darkness* is about a newly-wed bride turning away from his sadistic and psychotic husband, who is also revealed to be the lover of an older man, into the embrace of a beautiful female vampire countess. The women murder the husband and, after the countess gets killed in an accident, the younger woman takes up her mission of hunting down on young couples. Zimmerman reaches the conclusion that *Daughters of Darkness*

> shows lesbianism as attractive and heterosexuality as abnormal and ineffectual. It carries a subtle message justifying men-hating [...] It suggests women have good reasons for turning away from sadistic men to other women and even justifies, to a limited extent the elimination of men. It suggests finally that the lesbian vampire theme - although originally misogynist and antilesbian - can be revised and reinterpreted, thus opening it to use by feminists. (386)

Weiss extends this interpretation to a few other movies, such as *Blood and Roses* (original title: *Et Mourir de Plaisir*; 1960) and *The Hunger* (1983), all of which draw on art cinema conventions, in contrast to the Hammer movies, which are said to be pornographic (which is, by the way, clearly an overstatement; exploitative would

be a sufficient label to contrast the Hammer with the former movies). Weiss says that *Daughters of Darkens* and the others

> use higher production budgets, well-known actors and directors, and don't rely on violence and nudity to hold the viewer. But it is not their art-film statues so much as their more ambiguous endings (which is, after an art cinema characteristic) which allow for a wider range of readings. In these conclusions, the vampire is still physically destroyed but the woman whom she seduced becomes a vampire herself through the transmigration of the vampire's soul. And as the vampire lives on in a new body, the cycle that is set in motion by her first appearance continues beyond the film's ending. Because of this, these films can be seen as departures from the genre, even as they draw heavily from it. (104)

Actually, the mentioned art-films are not really isolated exceptions. Several other female vampire movies coming from the 'sex and horror' cinema of continental Europe have so far been largely ignored by film theory, probably assuming they should simply be poor imitations of the Hammer formula hastily produced to cash-in on the latter's box-office success since they have even lower budgets than the Hammer movies, are made by obscure directors and feature obscure players and incorporate sex and violence even more exploitatively than the Hammer movies. To her credit, Weiss acknowledges that the films she discusses "are but a small sampling of the many horror films that feature female vampires with lesbian tendencies. [...] The European films, with such titles as *Vampyros Lesbos - Die Erbin des Dracula* [...] sound enticing, yet must await further study." (84)

While Hammer's Carmilla trilogy was indeed very influential, an obscure French director actually pioneered the trend with a series of female vampire movies, three of which will be analysed below. Tudor states that Jean Rollin is "usually invoked as a key innovator here - but his work can hardly be said to have featured prominently in the commercial mainstream" (172).

Rollin's *Le Frisson des Vampires* (1970) seems to follow the conventional narrative structure of the vampire movies in general, and female vampire movies in particular. Weiss notes that the "fluctuations between desire and fear generated by the vampire seems to require a formulaic management of narrative material":

> the vampire is first introduced in order to disrupt and invert the 'natural order' and provoke anxieties in the characters and spectator alike; the vampire then engages in vampirism as entertainment and sexual titillation for the prolonged middle section of the narrative; and finally the vampire is destroyed and the 'natural order' reaffirmed. In the case of the lesbian vampire, a more specific narrative formula is further imposed upon the generic vampire plot: a lesbian vampire and a mortal man compete for the possession of a woman. In this bisexual triangle, the man is aligned with the forces of good, the vampire with the forces of evil, and the woman whose fate hangs in the balance is usually a 'nice, sweet girl' with no intrinsic moral value attached to her but who is merely a receptacle to assume the values of the either one (91-92).

*Le Frisson des Vampires* begins with a newly-wed couple arriving in a castle to visit the bride's twin cousins. They are initially informed that the cousins have deceased, but nevertheless encounter the twins at the castle, accompanied by a mysterious woman, who seduces the bride, to the much distress of the husband. On the outset, the bisexual triangle Weiss talks about is there in the plot. And yet, *Le Frissons des Vampires*' conclusion is far away from the Hammer formula. While the female vampire which initially seduced the bride is indeed killed, the female hero does not go back to her husband, but opts union with her vampiric twin cousins, with a pseudo-incestuous passion. The finale has the husband calling her back and yet the trio (bride and the twins) commit suicide by perishing in the morning sun on the beach, embracing each other lovingly. While *Le Frisson des Vampires* does not sanction lesbianism over heterosexuality, as *Daughters of Darkness* does, it nevertheless does not end with the 'natural order' being restored by a patriarchal blow of the stake, as in most movies. In *Le Frisson des Vampires*, the conclusion defies the 'natural order' of husband-wife marriage and in the face of the odds against this

defiance, it presents self-destruction to prevent the triumph of 'the natural order', i.e. of the husband-wife marriage.

It is ironic that such a radical movie has simply been dismissed in passing by Zimmerman as a "striking articulation of the male fantasy of the "butch" lesbian" (381). Actually Zimmerman is not alone in making highly dubious readings of Rollin movies which makes one to suspect that they rely on looking at a few publicity stills which were widely published in vampire cinema anthologies rather than watching the movies themselves which were unavailable to public viewing to a large extend until recently: Weiss talks about Rollin's iconography featuring "shocking" and "jarring" imagery such as leather and metal chains, and the like, departing significantly from "that of the typical, more romantic lesbian vampire film, which has certain fairly consistent characteristics: Gothic themes and imagery, large empty castles and dark, romantic landscapes" (85). She is clearly unaware that Rollin's movies, together with their sado-masochistic imagery, are also highly saturated with exactly these same romantic imagery of ruined castles and others as desolate beaches.

The next installment of the Rollin's female vampire movies also feature the destruction of the vampires in a tragic manner, rather than celebrate it. Even the title of the movie, *Requiem pour un Vampire* (1971), testifies that the impact is a sorrowful and melancholic one. The plot has two runaway girls arriving at a castle inhabited by the 'last of the vampires.' The girls' initiation into vampirism also means their initiation to heightened sexual awakening as in most other vampire movies and yet the vampire who initiates them is not destroyed by a patriarchal figure but disappears gently into the darkness, portrayed in a mournful way, clearly calling on the audiences to feel sorry for him.

Rollin's next vampire movie, *Lévres de Sang*, came in 1975. *Lévres de Sang* is

similar to the above-discussed two movies of his in many ways, and actually is even more radical from them. The plot has a young man trying to discover a secret regarding a mysterious young girl whom he feels attracted to. It is revealed that she had vampirized his father in the past. In the end, the hero refuses to kill her, disobeying his mother. The movie ends with the young man and girl, both completely naked, getting into an empty coffin on a beach, which is gradually swept away into the distance by the waves. As in *Le Frisson des Vampires*, this movie also has its vampiric heroes carrying out their defiance of the 'natural order' by risking highly possibly self-destruction in order to prevent a triumph of 'the natural order.' To sum up, it can be said that Rollin's movies sanction the threats to the 'natural order' of patriarchal nuclear family.

Compared to those of Rollin, Jesus Franco's female vampire movies may not seem as clearly radical, and yet deserve discussion. Actually, the plot of *Vampiros Lesbos* (1969) is basically an adaptation of Stoker's novel brought up to the contemporary times and with the gender of the leading vampire changed, i.e. as Countess Dracula. The female hero, suffering from dissatisfaction with her male lover, is seduced by a female vampire. However in the end, the hero refuses to join the vampire even though the seducer now begs her to do so and the vampire is killed by the hero. Despite the fact that the 'natural order' is indeed restored by fatal violence against the vampire in clear renunciation of lesbianism, the narrative nevertheless departs to some extent from the generic formula by the fact that this restoration is carried out by the woman, and not by her male lover. More importantly, it seems the spectator is led to sympathize with the beautiful vampire whose voice calling on the other woman's name is heard echoing in the air in the last few frames.

On the other hand, *La Comtesse aux Seins Nus* (1973; released with hardcore

pornographic inserts as *Les Avaleuses* in 1975), Franco's next venture into the subgenre, is clearly more out of tune with the generic formula. In passing, I would like to point that while the international hit *Interview with the Vampire* is regarded as being groundbreaking for making the vampire as the telling-subject of the narrative, rather than as its object, *La Comtesse aux Seins Nus* is actually the first vampire movie ever that I could pinpoint which is told from the point of view of the vampire; the over-narration in this movie is carried out by the inner-voice of the mute vampire. The movie has a male poet who falls in love with a female vampire who kills her lovers during sex. The vampire doesn't want to have sex with the man because she knows she will not be able to control her deadly desires. And yet, the man insists, fully aware of the consequence, and persuades her. Associating sex with death, portraying sexual desires as being fatally dangerous is very common in horror cinema in general, not only in vampire movies. In this way, avoidance or extermination of sexual desires outside the 'natural order' (of patriarchal, heterosexual, nuclear family endorsed by legal marriage) is presented as the cure for fending off this threat. It is very, very rare when such a movie where this association between sex and death has been established ends with sexual desires being portrayed as preferable despite their fatal consequence.

In all these movies, like in most Dracula and other vampire movies, the vampire is indeed presented as a challenge to the stability of the dominant social order with its institutions and norms, be it patriarchy, monogamy, heterosexuality or nuclear family. However, in these neglected and/or ignored movies, the point of spectator identification is structured to be less with the dominant order and more with the challenge to it. In the end, the lead non-vampiric character, usually initially suffering either from sexual dissatisfaction or some other social frustration, sides with the vampire, either joining her or taking her place. These movies do not end with the

glorious triumph of a patriarchal figure, a vampire hunter beheading the vampire. In cases where the vampire is destroyed (such cases are often cases of intentional self-destruction as in a suicide), it is presented as a tragic event In brief, these movies do not play upon anxiety generated by the threat to the dominant order, but upon frustration generated by the dominance of the social order.

SUMMARY TABLE

| **Title** | **Fascination** | **Fear** | **Presentation of sexuality** | **Narrative resolution** | **Return of repressed sexual energy** | **Suppression of the return** | **Othering of foreign cultures** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Dracula* (1931) | not very great, but still + (least sexually charged, still compelling human-looking in appearance eccentric foreigner) | + | Subtle sexual undertones | Dracula's destruction as relief factor: Established order's triumph presented as positive | + | + | + |
| *Dracula* (1957) | ++ (Lee more attractive-looking than Lugosi) | ++ (More violent, more bestial - sequels continue this trend) | Lust | Dracula's destruction as relief factor: Established order's triumph presented as positive | + | + | - (Foreignness of Count diminished) |
| Hammer's female vampire movies (1970s) | +++ | + | Lust | Vampire's destruction as relief factor: Established order's triumph presented as positive | + | + | Mixed |
| Non-mainstream female vampire movies (1970s) | +++ | + | mixed | Vampire's destruction as grief factor: Established order's triumph presented as negative | + | + | Mixed |
| *Dracula* (1979) | +++ (Matinee-idol looks, romantic - & tragic- figure) | - | Romance | Dracula's possible survival as relief factor: Established order may not have triumphed and this presented as positive | + | +/- | + |
| *Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992) | +++ (Very attractive in human shape) | +++ (very bestial in monster shape) | Romance and lust | Dracula's destruction as relief factor but carried out by her lover with his consent | + | + | + |

# V. Conclusion

It had been noted at the beginning of this thesis that, since the pioneering works of David Pirie on this genre, the predominant approach to horror entailed asking the question 'what does the monster stand for' and that this study would also start with this route, albeit with some nuances to allow for the ambivalence in the answers. Wood's assertation that the main subject of the horror genre is the re-emergence of what the society represses, this (re-)emergence dramatized as an object of horror, was taken as the lead, with what is repressed in contemporary society in this context being sexual energy in general, sexuality of females, bisexuality and sexuality of children.

The analyses of *Dracula* adaptations studied in chapters 2 and 3 did indeed provide ample evidence that what is predominantly at stake in these movies from their earliest to latest examples is dealing with sexuality in general and sexuality of females in particular.

Sexuality of children was not encountered as an issue. There are two instances where children show up in Dracula narratives derived from the source novel. The first one is in the Transylvanian prologue where Dracula brings a child as prey to his concubines at the castle. The other is the fact that the vampirized Lucy preys on children before being destroyed by the vampire hunters. However, in neither of these two instances the children are the subject of vampirism; they are only passive victims. In other words, vampirization of the children - turning the children into vampires - is never in question. Hence, these two instances can not be seen as signifying the sexuality of children, but only as adults' sexual advances towards children, namely

pedophilia. Moreover, neither of these two instances from the source novel is featured regularly in the adaptations. They are either altogether omitted or not underscored, never calling for special attention, unlike for example the scene of Dracula's concubines' assault on Harker which has always been brought to the screen and with increasing explicitness over time across adaptations.

The question of bisexuality (and homosexuality) does not predominate either in Dracula movies. The one and only instance of same-sex vampirism is Dracula's assault on Jonathan Harker and even there, Dracula does not turn him into a vampire. Again, this scene is also much underplayed in the adaptations. It goes without saying that bisexuality of women did come up to the center stage in vampire cinema at one point in the development of the genre, as seen in the last section of the previous chapter, but the point is that it does not feature in Dracula movies. This does not mean that the Dracula narrative itself is closed to gay versions as a possibility and there has indeed been one single gay Dracula movie, aptly titled *Gayracula* (1983), a hardcore pornographic outing shot on video and released to the specialized market of gay porn videos. In addition, it is possible to read *Nosferatu* (1922) as a borderline gay text, but this is only possible because of the significant deviations its narrative displays from the Dracula narrative which were made it necessary to leave out this movie and its remake from the comparative thrust of this study. To sum up, introducing bisexuality and homosexuality into the genre has called for either abandoning the Dracula figure and replacing it female antagonists as in the female vampires subgenre of the 1970s or significant alterations of the narrative pattern or has been realized in ultra-marginal venues and even there very rarely. Hence, to reiterate what has been stated shortly above, what is observed is that sexuality in general and sexuality of females is at stake in Dracula movies, with regard to the dramatization of return of the repressed.

Furthermore, the Dracula figure and the narrative which it is the centerpiece of also display certain traits attributed to the Otherization of foreign cultures, in addition to the otherization of women, even though to a lesser degree. First, this is manifested in the fact that the Dracula narrative in its bare outline is a rape-rescue narrative of westerners rescuing 'their' women from a foreigner seen in so many Orientalist narratives. Second, it can be observed in the depictions of the Transylvania setting as discussed in the second part of the 2nd chapter, plus the fact that Dracula's Transylvanian concubines resonate with the polygamy attributed to the Oriental cultures.

What needs to be pointed out with regard to the co-existense of these two layers of connotations, one regarding the return of the repressed sexuality and other related to the otherization of foreign cultures is that this co-existence is of a significantly *complementary* nature and not irrelevant, leave alone being contradictory. In other words, these two layers reinforce each other. From one side, the East is seen as a space for the free reign of sexual libido in such discourses. From the other side, the agent for the triggering of the corruption of western women is externalized in the scapegoating of foreign influences. It should be noted however that this is not uniformly observed in all Dracula movies, with Hammer's adaptation from 1957 being an exception in the sense of admitting the domesticity of the issue by downplaying the Count's foreignness.

Beyond these two complementary axises, attempts to introduce other different metaphoric layers to Dracula are rare and unsuccessful. It was seen in the 2nd chapter that one entry, the final one, in Hammer's series of sequels entailed presenting Dracula as a metaphor for monopolistic capital, but it was an isolated case and not a very influential one.

Of the two layers, the one regarding the otherization of foreign cultures is secondary. There is material in the movies sufficient enough to pinpoint the existence of this layer, but it is not massive enough to isolate the changing patterns across the movies over time. On the other hand, the trends regarding the depictions of the return of repressed sexuality have been clearly observed. First, it should be said that sexual connotations gradually became more and more apparent over time. Furthermore, the ambivalence of the concomitance of fear and fascination factors was nascent even in the earliest adaptations. In time, both of these sets of factors were amplified, but there has been one case, the 1979 adaptation, where the fear factor was almost diminished while the fascination factor was raised.

This brings one final and significant issue to the agenda, that is the resolutions of the narratives of these movies. It should be reminded that Wood had noted that happy endings of horror movies signify the restoration of repression whose return was dramatized as a matter of terror in the first place. The endings of Dracula movies are very much linked to the presentation of the Dracula figures, as seen in chapter 2. Even Coppola's movie, where Mina, in marked contrast to all adaptations except the 1979 one, consciously and of her free will becomes Dracula's bride and actively takes his side in the final confrontation with the vampire hunters, has Dracula killed in the end as Dracula in this movie is also endowed with monstrosity together with fascination inducing attributes. Only the 1979 adaptation is open-ended as only in this movie the fear-inducing attributes and their connotations are kept at the minimum. However it should be born in mind that even in this movie, the ending is after all *open-ended*.

It was seen in the last section of the previous chapter that some of the female vampire movies of the 1970s are different in the sense that these movies do not celebrate the restoration of repression. In other words, what is observed is a)

generally, the triumph of the forces, which the vampire had threatened to destabilize, over the vampire and the presentation of this as happy ending (all *Dracula* adaptations except the 1979 one as well as several of the female vampire movies, especially those by Hammer), b) sporadically, the triumph over the vampire but presentation of this as a sad ending (some of the female vampire movies, especially those produced outside the mainstream). Hence the *limit* to variation and ambivalence appears to be in the vicinity of the zone of the *restoration* of repression.

## Appendix: List of Movies with ‘Dracula’

*Abbott and Costello Meet Frankenstein* (1948, USA)

*Ahkea Kkots* (1961, Korea)

*Allen and Rossi Meet Dracula and Frankenstein* (1974, USA)

*Attack of the 60 Foot Centerfold* (1995, USA)

*Batman Dracula* (1964, USA)

*Batman Fights Dracula* (1967, Philippines)

*Billy the Kid vs Dracula* (1965, USA)

*Blacula* (1972, USA)

*Blood* (1974, USA)

*Blood of Dracula* (1957, USA)

*Blood of Dracula's Castle* (1967, USA)

*Bram Stoker's Dracula* (1992, USA)

*Breakfast with Dracula: Un Vampiro a Miami* (1993, Italy)

*Brides of Dracula* (1960, Britain)

*Castle of Dracula* (1968, USA)

*Chi O Su Bara* (1975, Japan)

*Chi O Su Me* (1971, Japan)

*Count Suckula* (1971, USA)

*Countess Dracula* (1970, Britain)

*Dead Men Walk* (1943, USA)

*Deafula* (1975, USA)

*Devil Bat* (1941, USA)

*Die Schlangrube und das Pendel* (1967, West Germany)

*Disciples of Dracula* (1975, USA)

*Doctor Dracula* (1980, USA)

*Dr Terror's Gallery of Horrors* (1966, USA)

*Dracula* (1931, USA)

*Dracula* (1931, USA)

*Dracula* (1958, Britain)

*Dracula* (1976, USA)

*Dracula* (1978, Mexico)

*Dracula* (1979, USA)

*Dracula* (1980, Japan)

*Dracula AD 1972* (1972, Britain)

*Dracula Bites the Big Apple* (1979, USA)

*Dracula Business* (1974, Britain)

*Dracula contra Frankenstein* (1971, Spain-France)

*Dracula: Dead and Loving It* (1996, USA)

*Dracula Exotica* (1980, USA)

*Dracula Has Risen from the Grave* (1968, Britain)

*Dracula Meets the Outer Space Chicks* (1968, USA)

*Dracula, Pere et Fils* (1976, France)

*Dracula: Prince of Darkness* (1966, Britain)

*Dracula Rises from the Coffin* (1982, Korea)

*Dracula Rising* (1992, USA)

*Dracula Sucks* (1979, USA)

*Dracula tan Exarchia* (1983, Greece)

*Dracula: The Dirty Old Man* (1969, USA)

*Dracula, the Great Undead* (1985, USA)

*Dracula vs. Frankenstein* (1971, USA)

*Dracula's Daughter* (1936, USA)

*Dracula's Dog* (1978, USA)

*Dracula's Hair* (1992, Rusia)

*Dracula's Lusterne Vampire* (1970, Sweden)

*Dracula's Wedding Day* (1967, USA)

*Dracula's Widow* (1989, USA)

*Dragstrip Dracula* (1962, USA)

*Dragula* (1973?, USA)

*Dragula* (1994, Canada)

*Drakula* (1921, Hungary)

*Drakula Istanbul'da* (1953, Turkey)

*Du Sang pour Dracula* (1974, France-Italy)

*El Conde Dracula / Nachts, Wenn Dracula Erwacht* (1969, Italy-Spain-Germany)

*El Gran Amore del Conde Dracula* (1972, Spain)

*El Hombre Que Vino de Ummo* (1969, Spain-Italy-West Germany)

*El Imperio de Dracula* (1966, Mexico)

*El Jovencito Dracula* (1975, Spain)

*El Mundo de los Vampiros* (1960, Mexico)

*El Santo contra el Baron Brakula* (1965, Mexico)

*Escala en HI-FI* (1963, Spain)

*Face of Marble* (1946, USA)

*Fade to Black* (1980, USA)

*Fracchia Contro Dracula* (1985, Italy)

*Frankenstein, el Vampire y Cia* (1961, Mexico)

*Gayracula* (1983, USA)

*Graf Dracula Beisst Jetzt* (1979, West Germany)

*Guess What Happened To Count Dracula* (1970, USA)

*Historical Dracula* (1973, USA)

*House of Dracula* (1945, USA)

*House of Dracula's Daughter* (1973, USA)

*House of Frankenstein* (1944, USA)

*House on Bare Mountain* (1962, USA)

*Il Cavaliere Costante Nicosia Demoniaco Ovvera Dracula in Brianza* (1975, Italy)

*Il Risveglio di Dracula* (1969, Italy)

*Kiss Me Quick* (1963, USA)

*Kyuketsuki Dorakyura Kobe Ni Arawura* (1979, Japan)

*La Dinastia Dracula* (1978, Mexico)

*La fille de Dracula* (1971, France)

*La Saga de los Draculas* (1973, Spain)

*Lady Dracula* (1976, West Germany)

*Las Vampiras* (1969, Mexico)

*Legend of the Seven Golden Vampires* (1974, Britain-Hong Kong)

*Les Charlots contro Dracula* (1971, France)

*Mama Dracula* (1980, Belçika)

*Manugang ni Dracula* (1964, Philippines)

*Mark of Dracula* (1997, USA)

*Marx Brothers' Dracula* (194?, USA)

*Men of Action Meet the Women of Dracula* (1969, Philippines)

*Mondo Keyhole* (1966, USA)

*Monster Squad* (1987, USA)

*Mystery in Dracula's Castle* (1973, USA)

*Nocturna* (1978, USA)

*Nosferatu: Ein Symphonie des Grauens* (1922, Germany)

*Nosferatu: Phantom des Nacht / Fantome de la Nuit* (1979, West Germany)

*Nosferatu a Venezia* (1988, Italy)

*One More Time* (1970, USA)

*Passion of Dracula* (1980, USA)

*Return of Dracula* (1958, USA)

*Santo y Blue Demon contra Dracula y el Hombre Lobo* (1969, Mexico)

*Santo y el Tesoro Dracula* (1969, Mexico)

*Satanic Rites of Dracula* (1973, Britain)

*Scars of Dracula* (1970, Britain)

*Sex and the Single Vampire* (1970, USA)

*Son of Dracula* (1943, USA)

*Son of Dracula* (1974, Britain)

*Sundown* (1990, USA)

*Taste the Blood of Dracula* (1969, Britain)

*Tendre Dracula* (1974, France)

*Tiempos Duros para Dracula* (1976, Spain-Argentina)

*To Die For* (1989, USA)

*Vampiros ein la Habana* (1985, Cuba)

*Waxwork* (1988, USA)

# REFERENCES

BFI (1980) *Hammer Horror*. Special Film Study Extract Supplement. London: BFI.

Bhalla, A. (1990) *Politics of Atrocity and Lust: The Vampire Tale as a Nightmare History of England in the Nineteenth Century*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

Belford, B. (1996) *Bram Stoker : A Biography of the Author of Dracula*. New York: Knopf.

Benshoff, H. M. (1997) *Monsters in the Closet : Homosexuality and the Horror Film*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Berenstein, R. J. (1996) *Attack of the Leading Ladies: Gender, Sexuality, and Spectatorship in Classic Horror Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bernstein, M. (1997) *Visions of the East : Orientalism in Film*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Dadoun, R. (1995) 'Fetishism in the Horror Film' in J. Donald (ed.), *Fantasy and the Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing

Dika, V. (1996) “From Dracula – With Love”. In B. K.Grant (ed.) *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Donald, J. (1989) *Fantasy and the Cinema*. London: BFI Publishing.

Freeland, C. (2000) *The Naked and the Undead: Evil and the Appeal of Horror*. Boulder, Colo. : Westview Press

Glover, D. (1996) *Vampires, Mummies and Liberals: Bram Stoker and the Politics of Popular Fiction*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Grant, B. K. (ed.) (1996) *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hardy, P. (ed.). (1996) *The Aurum Film Encyclopedia: Horror*. London: Aurum Press.

Holte, J. C. (1997) *Dracula in the Dark: The Dracula Film Adaptations*. London: Greenwood Press.

Jameson, F. (1982) *The Political Unconscious*. Cornell University Press

Joslin, L. W. (1999) *Count Dracula Goes to the Movies*. London: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Kline, S. (1992) *The Degeneration of Women: Bram Stoker's Dracula as Allegorical Criticism of Fin de Siecle*. Rheinbach-Merzbach: CMZ-Verlag.

Kristeva, J. (1982) *Power of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Leatherdale, C. (1993) *Dracula: The Novel & the Legend*. Brighton: Desert Island Books.

Lenne, G. (1985) *Sex on the Screen: Eroticism in Film* (trans.: D. Jacobs). New Tork, St. Martin's Press.

Mascetti, M.D. (1992) *Vampire: The Complete Guide to the World of the Undead*. London: Viking Studio Books.

McNally, R. T. and Florescu, R. (1994) *In Search of Dracula: The Enthralling History of Dracula and Vampires*. Suffolk: Robson Books.

Melton, J. G. (1994) *The Vampire Book: The Encyclopedia of the Undead*. Detroit: Visible Ink Press.

Moretti, F. (1988) *Signs Taken for Wonders: Essays in the Sociology of Literary Forms*. London: Verso.

Newman, K. (1988) *Nightmare Movies: A Critical Guide to Contemporary Horror Films*. New York: Harmony.

Pirie, D. (1977) *The Vampire Cinema*. London: Hamlyn.

Rice, A. (1976) *Interview with the Vampire*. London: Warner Books.

Said, E. W. (1992) *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus

Said, E. W. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York : Pantheon Books.

Senf, C. A. (1988) *The Vampire in Nineteenth Century English Literature*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling State Univeristy Popular Press.

Shohat, E. (1997) 'Gender and Culture of Empire: Towards a Feminist Ethnography of the Cinema' in Bernstein, M. (ed.) *Visions of the East : Orientalism in Film*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Skall, D. (1990) *Hollywood Gothic: The Tangled Web of Dracula from Novel to Stage to Screen*. New York: Norton.

Skall, D. (1993) *The Monster Show: A Cultural History of Horror*. New York: Norton.

Stoker, B. (1979) *Dracula*. London: Penguin Books.

Tombs, P. (1997) *Mondo Macabro : Weird and Wonderful Cinema Around the World*. London: Titan Books.

Tombs, P. and Tohill, C. (1995) *Immoral Tales: Sex and Horror Cinema in Europe 1956-1984*. London: Titan Books.

Todorov, T. (1975) *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve .

Tudor, A. (1989) *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Weiss, A. (1993) *Vampires and Violets: Lesbians in Film*. New York: Penguin Books.

Wilt, D. (1997) 'Masked Men and Wrestlers: Mexico' in Tombs, P. (ed.) *Mondo Macabro : Weird and Wonderful Cinema Around the World*. London: Titan Books.

Wood R. (1986) *Hollywood from Vietnam to Reagan*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wood, R. (1996) "Burying the Undead: The Use and Obsolescence of Count Dracula" in B. K. Grant (ed.) *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Zimmerman, B. (1996) "Daughters of Darkness: The Lesbian Vampire on Film". In B. K. Grant (ed.) *The Dread of Difference: Gender and the Horror Film*. Austin: University of Texas Press.