

Stoker's very adherence to what he calls "forms of restraint" runs a deeply anarchic streak. The attraction of forbidden, outlawed, disruptive action is evident enough in *Dracula* as well as in Stoker's other fictions; the same tension between restraint and rebellion may have characterized his relation to the ruling state. It probably also characterized his professional life. Certainly his status as glorified manservant to the autocratic Henry Irving almost uncannily reenacted, on the personal level, the larger cultural pattern of English domination and Irish subservience. Stoker's lifelong passion for Irving had its dark underside: the rumors, persistent in Stoker's lifetime, that Count Dracula was modelled on Irving suggests the deep ambivalence with which the transplanted Irishman regarded his professional benefactor. Like Quincey Morris, Stoker seems finally to stand in alliance with his English companions without ever being entirely of their camp.

*Dracula* suggests two equations in relation to English-Irish politics: not just, Dracula is to England as Ireland is to England, but, Dracula is to England as England is to Ireland. In Count Dracula, Victorian readers could recognize their culture's imperial ideology mirrored back as a kind of monstrosity. Dracula's journey from Transylvania to England could be read as a reversal of Britain's imperial exploitations of "weaker" races, including the Irish. This mirroring extends not just to the imperial practices themselves, but to their epistemological underpinnings. Before Dracula successfully invades the spaces of his victims' bodies or land, he first invades the spaces of their knowledge. The Count operates in several distinct registers in the novel. He is both the warrior nobleman, whose prowess dwarfs that of the novel's enfeebled English aristocrat, Lord Godalming, and the primitive savage, whose bestiality, fecundity, and vigor alternately repel and attract. But he is also what we might call an incipient "Occidentalism" scholar. Dracula's physical mastery of his British victims begins with an intellectual appropriation of their culture, which allows him to delve the workings of the "native mind." As Harker discovers, the Count's expertise in "English life and customs and manners" (p. 30) provides the groundwork for his exploitative invasion of Britain. Thus, in *Dracula* the British characters see their own ideology reflected back as a form of bad faith, since the Count's Occidentalism both mimics and reverses the more familiar Orientalism underwriting Western imperial practices.<sup>16</sup>

### III

To understand fully how the Count's Occidentalism functions, however, we must relate it to the second literary genre visible in *Dracula*, the

<sup>16</sup> See Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979).

travel narrative. Jonathan Harker's initial journey to Castle Dracula constitutes a travel narrative in miniature, and the opening entries in his journal reproduce the conventions of this popular Victorian genre. Critics have occasionally noted the travel motifs in *Dracula*, but have not pursued the implications of Stoker's mixing of genres. To be sure, Gothic has always contained a strong travel component. The restless roaming found in many Gothic fictions — Victor Frankenstein's pursuit of his monster, Melmoth's wanderings, Mr. Hyde's perambulations of London — suggests that an affinity between the two genres has always existed. Stoker's use of travel conventions is new, however. Earlier Gothic writers were interested primarily in the psychological dimensions of travel; the landscape traversed by the Gothic protagonist was chiefly psychological.<sup>17</sup> Stoker on the other hand is interested in the ideological dimensions of travel. Harker's early journal entries clearly reveal his Orientalist perspective, which structures what he sees and what he misses as he travels through the Carpathians. This perspective is embedded in the generic conventions that Harker deploys, conventions familiar to late-Victorian readers. Stoker's disruption of Harker's tourist perspective at Castle Dracula also calls into question the entire Orientalist outlook. Stoker thus expresses a telling critique of the Orientalist enterprise through the very structure of his novel.

Early in his stay at Castle Dracula, Harker to his great surprise finds his host stretched upon the library sofa reading, "of all things in the world," an English *Bradshaw's Guide* (p. 34). We probably share Harker's puzzlement at the Count's choice of reading material, though like Harker we are apt to forget this brief interlude amid ensuing horrors. Why is Dracula interested in English train schedules? The Count's absorption in *Bradshaw's* echoes Harker's own obsessive interest in trains. (Later we discover that Mina, attempting to secure Harker's affections, has herself become a "train fiend," memorizing whole sections of *Bradshaw's* for his convenience.) Harker's journal opens with the terse note: "should have arrived at 6.46, but train was an hour late" (p. 9). The next morning, more delays give him further cause to grumble: "It seems to me that the further East you go the more unpunctual are the trains. What ought they to be in China?" (pp. 10–11).

An obsession with trains — or, as in Harker's case, an obsession with trains running on time — characterizes Victorian narratives of travel in Eastern Europe. Even Emily Gerard, whose enthusiasm for all things Transylvanian seldom flagged, had little patience with its trains. "The railway communications

<sup>17</sup> Critics who do address the travel motifs in *Dracula* generally emphasize travel's connections to psychology rather than to politics. "Transylvania is Europe's unconscious," asserts Geoffrey Wall ("'Different from Writing': *Dracula* in 1897," *Literature and History* 10 [1984], 20). Alan Johnson quotes Wall approvingly, and argues that Harker's journey to Transylvania is a "symbolic journey into his own mind" ("Bent and Broken Necks: Signs of Design in Stoker's *Dracula*," *Victorian Newsletter* 72 [1987], 21, 23).

were very badly managed," she writes of one journey, "so that it was only on the evening of the second day (fully forty-eight hours) that we arrived at Klausenberg. . . . It would hardly have taken longer to go from Lemberg to London" (Gerard, I, 30). Harker immediately invokes a second convention of the travel genre when, having crossed the Danube at Buda-Pesth, he invests the river with symbolic significance. "The impression I had was that we were leaving the West and entering the East; the most Western of splendid bridges over the Danube . . . took us among the traditions of Turkish rule" (p. 9). In crossing the Danube, Harker maintains, he leaves "Europe" behind, geographically and imaginatively, and approaches the first outpost of the "Orient."<sup>18</sup>

Harker's first two acts — noting that his train is late, and then traversing a boundary he considers symbolic — function as a kind of shorthand, alerting readers that Harker's journal is to be set against the background of late-Victorian travel narratives. Once the travel genre is established, there is an inevitability about Harker's subsequent gestures. Not only does he continue to gripe about the trains, he also searches for quaint hotels (p. 12), samples the native cuisine (p. 10), ogles the indigenous folk (p. 11), marvels at the breathtaking scenery (p. 11), wonders at local customs (p. 15), and, interspersed throughout, provides pertinent facts about the region's geography, history, and population. Harker's first three journal entries (chapter 1 of the novel) are so thoroughly conventional as to parody the travel genre. Such conventions constitute what Wolfgang Iser calls the "repertoire of the familiar" that readers can be expected to bring to texts.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, Harker is so adept an imitator of travel narratives in part because he has been such an assiduous reader of them. Like Stoker himself, Harker "had visited the British Museum, and made search among the books and maps in the library regarding Transylvania" in order to gain "some foreknowledge of the country" (p. 9).

This foreknowledge — the textual knowledge gathered before the fact, the same knowledge that any casual reader of contemporary travel narratives would also possess — structures Harker's subsequent experiences. In assuming the role of the Victorian traveller in the East, Harker also assumes the Orientalist perspective that allows him to "make sense" of his experiences there. For Harker, as for most Victorian travel writers, that "sense" begins with the assumption that an unbridgeable gap separates the Western traveller from Eastern peoples. The contrast between British punctuality and Transyl-

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, the opening of Noyes's *Roumania* (1857). Noyes, an American surgeon living in Vienna, ascends "a lofty mountain" overlooking the city and gazes across the river at the "Orient": "There, looking into the purple distance eastward . . . I resolved to visit that mysterious Orient whose glowing portals seemed to open just beyond" (p. 1).

<sup>19</sup> Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. 34. See also Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982).

vanian tardiness stands, in Harker's view, as a concrete instance of more fundamental and wide-ranging oppositions: between Western progress and Eastern stasis, between Western science and Eastern superstition, between Western reason and Eastern emotion, between Western civilization and Eastern barbarism. The "backwardness" of the Carpathian races displayed itself most surely in what one traveller called their inability to "[settle] themselves down to the inexorable limits of timetables" (Crosse, p. 342). As Harker moves further east toward Castle Dracula, he leaves even the railroads behind and is forced to travel by stagecoach. Simultaneously, he leaves Western rationality behind: "I read that every known superstition in the world is gathered into the horseshoe of the Carpathians" (p. 10).

Harker may marvel and wonder at this strange world he has entered, but he does not expect to be disconcerted. He trades extensively on his "foreknowledge," which allows him to retain a comfortable distance from the scene. He views it simply as a diverting spectacle, imagining the "barbarian" Slovaks he sees by the roadside as "an Oriental band of brigands" performing "on the stage" (p. 11). At first, Harker's descent into the dark heart of the Carpathians serves only to titillate, not to unsettle. His favorite word in this first section is "picturesque," that stock term of the travel genre. Throughout his journey, he is able to reduce everything he encounters to an example of the picturesque or the poetic.

Until he reaches Castle Dracula, that is. There, everything is disrupted. Stoker undermines the conventions of the travel narrative, just as Dracula undermines all the stable oppositions structuring Harker's — and his readers' — foreknowledge of Eastern and Western races. For the fact is, by Harker's own criteria, Dracula is the most "Western" character in the novel. No one is more rational, more intelligent, more organized, or even more punctual than the Count. No one plans more carefully or researches more thoroughly. No one is more learned within his own spheres of expertise or more receptive to new knowledge. A reading that emphasizes only the archaic, anarchic, "primitive" forces embodied by Dracula misses half the point. When Harker arrives at the end of his journey East, he finds, not some epitome of irrationality, but a most accomplished Occidentalist. If Harker has been diligently combing the library stacks, so too has the Count. Harker writes: "In the library I found, to my great delight, a vast number of English books, whole shelves full of them, and bound volumes of magazines and newspapers. . . . The books were of the most varied kind — history, geography, politics, political economy, botany, geology, law — all relating to England and English life and customs and manners" (p. 30). Displaying an epistemophilia to rival Harker's own, Dracula says: " 'These friends' — and

he laid his hand on some of the books — ‘have been good friends to me, and for some years past, ever since I had the idea of going to London, have given me many, many hours of pleasure. Through them I have come to know your great England’ ” (p. 31).

The novel thus sets up an equivalence between Harker and Dracula: one can be seen as an Orientalist travelling East, the other — unsettling thought for Stoker’s Victorian readers — as an Occidentalist travelling West. Dracula’s absorption in *Bradshaw’s* timetables echoes Harker’s fetish for punctual trains, just as the Count’s posture — reclining comfortably on a sofa — recalls the attitude of the casual Western reader absorbed in a late-Victorian account of the exotic.

But of course Dracula’s preoccupation with English culture is not motivated by a disinterested desire for knowledge; instead, his Occidentalism represents the essence of bad faith, since it both promotes and masks the Count’s sinister plan to invade and exploit Britain and her people. By insisting on the connections between Dracula’s growing knowledge and his power to exploit, Stoker also forces us to acknowledge how Western imperial practices are implicated in certain forms of knowledge. Stoker continually draws our attention to the affinities between Harker and Dracula, as in the oft-cited scene where Harker looks for Dracula’s reflection in the mirror and sees only himself (p. 37). The text’s insistence that these characters are capable of substituting for one another becomes most pressing when Dracula twice dons Harker’s clothes to leave the Castle (pp. 59, 64). Since on both occasions the Count’s mission is to plunder the town, we are encouraged to see a correspondence between the vampire’s actions and those of the travelling Westerner. The equivalence between these two sets of actions is underlined by the reaction of the townspeople, who have no trouble believing that it really is Harker, the visiting Englishman, who is stealing their goods, their money, their children. The peasant woman’s anguished cry — “Monster, give me my child!” (p. 60) — is directed at him, not Dracula.

The shock of recognition that overtakes Harker, and presumably the British reader, when he sees Dracula comfortably decked out in Victorian garb is, however, only part of the terror of this scene. The truly disturbing notion is not that Dracula impersonates Harker, but that he does it so well. Here indeed is the nub: Dracula can “pass.” To impersonate an Englishman, and do it convincingly, is the goal of Dracula’s painstaking research into “English life and customs and manners,” a goal Dracula himself freely, if rather disingenuously, acknowledges. When Harker compliments him on his command of English, Dracula demurs:

“Well I know that, did I move and speak in your London, none there are who would not know me for a stranger. That is not enough for me. Here I am noble . . . I am master . . . [In London] I am content if I am like the rest, so that no man stops if he sees me, or pause

in his speaking if he hear my words, to say 'Ha, ha! a stranger!' I have been so long master that I would be master still — or at least that none other should be master of me."  
(p. 31).

To understand fully how disquieting Dracula's talents are, we have only to remember that in Victorian texts non-Western "natives" are seldom — I am tempted to say never, since I have not come up with another example — permitted to "pass" successfully. Those who try, as for instance some of Kipling's natives do, become the occasion for low comedy or ridicule, since Kipling never allows the possibility that their attempts could succeed to be seriously entertained. Grish Chunder De in "The Head of the District" (1890) and Huree Babu, the comic devotee of Herbert Spencer, in *Kim* (1901) are two examples. Kipling voices a common assumption, one that structures British accounts of non-Western cultures from Richard Burton to T. E. Lawrence. The ability to "pass" works in only one direction: Westerners can impersonate Easterners, never vice versa.

Dracula is different, however. A large part of the terror he inspires originates in his ability to stroll, unrecognized and unhindered, through the streets of London. As he tells Harker, his status as "master" resides in this ability. So long as no one recognizes him as a "stranger," he is able to work his will unhampered. Like Richard Burton travelling disguised among the Arabs, or like Kipling's ubiquitous policeman Strickland passing himself off as a Hindu, Dracula gains power, becomes "master," by striving "to know as much about the natives as the natives themselves."<sup>20</sup> The crucial difference is that in this case the natives are English.

Links between knowledge and power are evident enough in Kipling's work; his two great impersonators — Strickland and Kim — both work for the police, and each uses his talents in the service of colonial law and order. Dracula, too, understands how knowledge and power are linked. In this case, however, knowledge leads, not to the stability envisioned by Kipling's characters, but to anarchy: it undermines social structures, disrupts the order of nature, and ends alarmingly in the appropriation and exploitation of bodies. Stoker's text never explicitly acknowledges the continuity between Dracula's actions and British imperial practices, but it continually forces us to see the first as a terrifying parody of the second. In the Gothic mirror that Stoker holds up to late-Victorian culture, that culture, like Harker peering into the glass at Castle Dracula, cannot see, but is nevertheless intensely aware of, its monstrous double peering over its shoulder.

Dracula not only mimics the practices of British imperialists, he rapidly becomes superior to his teachers. The racial threat embodied by the

<sup>20</sup> Rudyard Kipling, "Miss Youghal's Sais," in *Plain Tales from the Hills* (1886; rpt. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 24.

Count is thus intensified: not only is he more vigorous, more fecund, more "primitive" than his Western antagonists, he is also becoming more "advanced." As Van Helsing notes, Dracula's swift development will soon make him invincible:

In some faculties of mind he has been, and is, only a child; but he is growing, and some things that were childish at the first are now of man's stature. . . . That big child-brain of his is working. Well for us, it is, as yet, a child-brain; for had he dared, at the first, to attempt certain things he would long ago have been beyond our power.

(p. 360).

Van Helsing's metaphor of the child growing into manhood is a familiar and homely way to explain Dracula's progress, but the image deflects attention from the notion of racial development that is the real source of the vampire's threat. Since Dracula's growth is not bound by a single lifetime, but instead covers potentially limitless generations, the proper analogy for his development is not that of an individual. He is in effect his own species, or his own race, displaying in his person the progress of ages. Dracula can himself stand in for entire races, and through him Stoker articulates fears about the development of those races in relation to the English.

A passage from Emily Gerard is relevant here, since Stoker seems to have had it in mind when he made his vampire a Roumanian. In discussing the various races in Transylvania, Gerard singles out the Roumanians as representing what she calls "manhood in the future tense":

It is scarcely hazardous to prophesy that this people have a great future before them, and that a day will come when, other nations having degenerated and spent their strength, these descendants of the ancient Romans, rising phoenix-like from their ashes, will step forward with a whole fund of latent power and virgin material, to rule as masters where formerly they have crouched as slaves.<sup>21</sup>

Gerard's "prophesy" sounds much like Van Helsing's metaphor for Dracula's development. What Gerard again allows us to see is that the anxieties engendered by Count Dracula do not derive wholly from his vampirism. He is dangerous as the representative or embodiment of a race which, all evidence suggested, was poised to "step forward" and become "masters" of those who had already "spent their strength." Even Dracula's destruction (which, if he stands in for an entire race, becomes a fantasized genocide) cannot entirely erase the "moral" endorsed by the rest of the story: that strong races inevitably weaken and fall, and are in turn displaced by stronger races. The novel provides an extraordinarily long list of once-proud peoples, now vanquished or vanished — not just the Huns, Berserkers, Magyars, and others who have passed through Carpathian history, but the Romans who gave their name, and perhaps their

<sup>21</sup> Gerard, I, 211. Gerard accepts the idea, common in the nineteenth century, that the Roumanians possessed a Roman heritage. This defuses some of the potential anxiety of her observation, since the Roumanians are thereby reclaimed as a "Western" race.

blood, to the modern Roumanians, as well as the Danes and Vikings who, Mina tells us, once occupied Whitby (pp. 80–81).

Do the British evade the fate of Huns, Danes, Vikings, and others, since Dracula is destroyed by novel's end? Critical consensus follows Christopher Craft when he suggests that *Dracula* embodies the "predictable, if variable, triple rhythm" characteristic of Gothic novels: it "first invites or admits a monster, then entertains or is entertained by monstrosity for some extended duration, until in its closing pages it expels or repudiates the monster and all the disruption that he/she/it brings" (Craft, p. 107). This triple rhythm also characterizes many narratives of reverse colonization. The mingled anxiety and desire evident in these texts is relieved when the primitive or exotic invader — Haggard's Ayesha, Wells's Martians, Kipling's Silver Man — is at last expelled and order is restored. *Dracula*, however, is finally divided against itself; it strives to contain the threat posed by the Count but cannot do so entirely. The novel in fact ends twice. The narrative proper closes with a fantasy of revitalized English supremacy: his invasion repulsed, the Count is driven back to Transylvania, and destroyed there. Along with this is what David Seed calls the "diminishment in stature" suffered by Dracula over the final third of the novel, as he is transformed from the essence of evil to a "disappointingly conventional embodiment of Nordau's and Lombroso's criminal type."<sup>22</sup> But the satisfaction of closure brought about by Dracula's diminishment and death is immediately disrupted by Harker's "Note," which constitutes *Dracula's* second ending.

Dracula, appropriately, is subdued by the weapons of empire. Harker's "great Kukri knife," symbol of British imperial power in India, and Morris's bowie knife, symbol of American westward expansion, simultaneously vanquish the Count (p. 447), apparently reestablishing the accustomed dominance of Western colonizer over Eastern colonized. The triumph extends even further for the British, since Dracula is not the book's only fatality. The American Quincey Morris dies too. His demise is not simply gratuitous, for the American represents, however obliquely, a second threat to British power hidden behind Dracula's more overt antagonism.<sup>23</sup> A shadowy figure throughout, Morris is linked with vampires and racial Others from his first appearance. When he courts Lucy, Morris reminds her of Othello; both aroused and frightened by his words, she compares herself to "poor Desdemona when she had such a dangerous stream poured in her ear, even by a black man" (p. 74). Morris's dangerous hunting expeditions are a modern

<sup>22</sup> Seed, p. 75. See *Dracula*, pp. 405–407, for Van Helsing's description of the Count as a Lombrosian criminal. We should beware, however, of equating Van Helsing's views with Stoker's.

<sup>23</sup> Aside from Moretti's essay, little has been written on Morris. Hatlen gives the majority view when he says that Morris's function is to become "an honorary Englishman," whose "reward" is "the privilege of dying to protect England" (p. 83).