

"HARDLY ONE AUTHENTIC DOCUMENT": INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE  
IN BRAM STOKER'S *DRACULA*

BY

CHRIS BROGDEN

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

© Chris Brogden, August 2003

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
\*\*\*\*\*  
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

**"HARDLY ONE AUTHENTIC DOCUMENT": INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE  
IN BRAM STOKER'S *DRACULA***

**BY**

**CHRIS BROGDEN**

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University  
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree  
of  
MASTER OF ARTS**

**Chris Brogden © 2003**

**Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.**

**This reproduction or copy of this thesis has been made available by authority of the copyright owner solely for the purpose of private study and research, and may only be reproduced and copied as permitted by copyright laws or with express written authorization from the copyright owner.**

## Abstract

Title: "Hardly One Authentic Document": Information and Knowledge in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*  
Author: Chris Brogden  
Advisor: Dr. Arlene Young  
Degree: Master of Arts  
Date: August 2003

My reading of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* argues that the process of gathering and disseminating information in the novel is deceptively complex. I concur with those critics who interpret *Dracula* as a narrative of anxiety; however, unlike them, I locate anxiety not primarily in sexual or social concerns, but in the characters' responses to information, writing and related technologies. I argue that the hunters' fear of the displacement or dissolution of the individual self is a function of textual anxieties, and that boundaries between characters and their writing become unstable. Demonstrating how Dracula's power flows from his ability to control people by controlling their writing, I argue for a reading of Dracula as a literate monster, skilled not only at destroying information but at manipulating it. Far from acting as an atavistic throwback, Dracula is actively engaged in the accumulation and use of data, and his textual savvy echoes that of the novel's British professionals. My discussion of the predatory role of editing lays the groundwork for an examination of the role of technology in producing and distributing data. I read the contemporary technologies in the novel as vampiric in nature, and I show how the production of texts in *Dracula* cannot be separated from the vampiric reproduction that it attempts to destroy.

## Acknowledgements

My warmest thanks to Dr. Arlene Young for her support and guidance during the writing of this thesis. Her expert criticisms and extraordinary patience, coupled with an unfailing eye for the passive voice, have been appreciated more than she knows. My effort to ensure that all problematized sites in this thesis are overwritten is entirely due to her keen editorial pen. My gratitude as well to Dr. Robert O'Kell and Dr. Rick Linden for serving on my examining committee, and for appreciating the academic merits of a khukuri. My mother's support has also proved invaluable in too many ways to list, and I owe her more than I could ever repay. Finally, a big thanks to Reverend Ron, who has undoubtedly been waiting patiently for this day to arrive.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
Acknowledgements .....	ii
Chapter One: "Individuals and Writing" .....	1
Chapter Two: "Literate Monsters and their Texts" .....	31
Chapter Three: "Data and its Circulation" .....	55
Works Consulted .....	80

## Chapter One: Individuals and Writing

Jonathan Harker's journey from London to Transylvania, which carries him into the heart of an oral society, is primarily an exercise in writing. As Harker encapsulates his impressions of the country and its people in his characteristic shorthand, he is also writing a private space for himself within an alien culture. Postcolonial approaches to *Dracula* have argued that Harker's journal partakes of the conventions of travel literature, and rightly so. By the time of *Dracula*'s publication, travel writing had long since become an established, and even clichéd, genre. Travel literature lends itself well to discussions of borders, for its authors by definition are crossers of boundaries who return with a record of their experiences. A great deal of attention has been paid to mapping out these boundaries and the cultural, political, and geographical divisions that they reflect. Instead of looking directly at the borders that divide Harker's East from his West, I will focus instead on how the solicitor translates these foreign experiences into a personalized text, and I will argue that Harker, like the other hunters, marks the boundaries of his own identity through his writing. Identity in *Dracula* is inseparable from texts, and characters define themselves through their writing. Harker is the first character in the novel to define himself in such a manner, but he is by no means the last. The hunters reproduce themselves through their texts, creating divided selves that alternately empower them and

leave them vulnerable. Mina's manifold typewriting is the tool that reunites the fractured segments into a homogenous whole, overwriting individual texts to produce a master narrative to which all other texts are subservient.

Nicholas Daly identifies the importance of the bond that is established between the hunters when he writes, "But what if we consider that the real accomplishment of the novel is bringing that 'little band of men' together? What if the threat of the vampire has largely been an instrument for the formation of an association between these men?" (Daly 187). While Daly interprets the formation of the group as an economic phenomenon, "part of the emergence of monopoly capitalism" (Daly 192), I find it more productive to direct attention towards the textual nature of the group. The hunters make frequent use of money, but it is primarily a tool to extract data from people through bribery. By making possible the acquisition of information, money plays a role in developing the novel's texts, which rely heavily on the accumulation of data. Rebecca Pope reads the group as I do--as a predominantly textual entity--and she recognizes that "the novel consistently inscribes language and writing as ways of gaining and keeping power" (Pope 208). However, Pope claims that "there is neither a supreme voice nor a master discourse in *Dracula*" (Pope 200). While Mina is certainly controlled by the men at times, she is also the sole editor of the narrative, and does not so much challenge "traditional structures of authority" (Pope 200) as usurp them. I argue for a reading of Mina as a powerful and active editorial figure who creates a strikingly modern, typed narrative out of segments of individual writing. Mina replaces the vulnerability of individual authors with the collective strength of group writing, using the hunters' "power of combination" (277) to erase their individual insecurities about their own writing. If Harker is initially reluctant

to make his private journal public, Mina offers a way to transform his writing into reams of typing, thus obscuring whatever individuality it originally possessed.

Working with Geoffrey Wall's description of *Dracula* as an "anxious text" (Wall 15), we can productively read Harker's journal as a narrative of anxiety. There is more to this unease than the lateness of the trains, or the unfamiliar surroundings in which he finds himself. What emerges from the pages of his journal is a struggle to maintain a distinct and empowered persona in the face of a disorienting culture. Harker accomplishes this primarily through the act of transcribing and translating, so that the food, the people, and the landscape all pass through his pen to the pages of his journal. Beyond simple description, his writing moves into a cultural appropriation. Harker uses writing to translate the unfamiliar into the familiar in order to understand and control both the alien culture and his own anxieties--to integrate the foreign within the epistemological boundaries of the self. It is this need to encompass the exotic in writing that leads him to record his meals ("*Mem.*, get recipe for Mina"; 31), research the existing maps of Transylvania, record his impressions of the people he meets, and to rely on his polyglot dictionary to translate for him so that he can reproduce its translations in his own hand in the pages of his journal. Harker's need to write about everything that he does not understand allows him to assert his own presence in a land that clearly does not need him in the same way that he is needed in London. The solicitor is far removed from the text-driven society of Victorian London, and so attempts to create his own writing in his journal to remind himself of the London writing that defines his own identity.

The anxiety which Harker exhibits in the opening pages of his journal is a concern with the fragility of the self when operating outside of its customary boundaries. The

solicitor attempts to understand the cause of his anxiety when he says, "Whether it is the old lady's fear, or the many ghostly traditions of this place, or the crucifix itself, I do not know, but I am not feeling nearly as easy in my mind as usual" (36). Faced with the alien experience of a foreign culture, Harker translates the unknown into a characteristically professional writing, and, better yet, into a form of writing that only he and Mina can read. The space where he writes is also the space where he locates himself in relation to the translated subject. Harker places himself within his journal, but is careful to impose limits and boundaries on his interactions with others. Throughout his journal, he is obsessed with creating borders. He notes the transition from the West to the East, divides Transylvania into its component districts and nationalities, contrasts his implied skepticism with the local superstitions, and meticulously notes a multitude of cultural differences. His anxiety often manifests itself at the ontological level of self-definition, and he uses his writing to map out a familiar space that the threatened self can occupy.

Harker's reliance on maps, dictionaries and journals is an expression of his underlying fear of personal instability in a foreign land, and they allow him to define himself in relation to the fixed markers of Victorian texts, even while immersed in an unfamiliar and predominately oral culture. Used in this way, writing becomes a defensive act of self-preservation, insulating not Harker's physical body but his established sense of his own identity. The borders that he draws between himself and his surroundings are borders of language. Even where he crosses these boundaries, as he does with his polyglot dictionary, he is careful to remain in command of the situation by controlling the texts that make the crossing possible. His fear of instability is well grounded, for the difficulty he has in making himself understood at crucial moments and

his inability to control his conversations with Dracula both hint at Harker's true powerlessness within an oral society. Both the act of writing in his journal and the written symbols themselves exist as reproductions of a Victorian preoccupation with texts that Harker nurtures in himself.

When Harker enters into the heart of the unfamiliar, Dracula's castle, he is relieved to discover a transplanted microcosm of Victorian textuality in Dracula's library. The books, he says,

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. There were even such books of reference as the London Directory, the “Red” and “Blue” books, Whitaker's Almanack, the Army and Navy lists, and—it somehow gladdened my heart to see it—the Law List. (50)

Following only two days after Harker's last use of the dictionary, the library scene is an important one in understanding his attitude towards texts. For Harker, the library is an oasis of Victorian culture in a foreign land that admits few outside influences. The library is bounded in a physical sense by its walls and is the only room of its type, with the implication that a discrete space devoted to texts must be contained and kept under control. The room is undoubtedly a powerful presence, for it is where Dracula comes to understand Harker's London. While books may allow for the transmission of knowledge and so act as an empowering force, they are still undermined by certain inadequacies. Harker refers to the impossibility of locating Dracula's castle in the British Museum's reference material, but ascribes this lacuna to the failings of an unnamed other: “there are no maps of this country as yet to compare with our own Ordnance Survey maps” (32).

He is not admitting to any inadequacies in the Victorian system of textual education, and reassures himself that their Ordnance Survey maps are still authoritative and reliable. Dracula, by comparison, recognizes that writing as a means of communication is not to be trusted blindly or assumed to be complete in itself. Revealingly, he points out to Harker, "But alas! as yet I only know your tongue through books. To you, my friend, I look that I know it to speak" (51). Writing, to Dracula, is a tool among other tools, and this attitude allows him to control texts to his own ends, while Harker customarily remains in a subservient position with respect to writing. The Count understands how writing can be manipulated and appearances can deceive, as he demonstrates when he controls the words that Harker writes in his letters home, while the solicitor--at least initially--trusts writing to convey data accurately. As Harker writes only five days later, "bare, meagre facts, verified by books and figures" (61) are to be trusted implicitly.

The investment of writing and books with an inherent truth-value is not peculiar to Harker, of course. Mina consciously records her journals in the style of a newspaper reporter, suggesting an effort to convey facts and information in an accurate and necessarily authoritative manner. She even incorporates clippings from newspapers into her journals, and does not visibly question the veracity of these published accounts. The reporter from the *Dailygraph* openly labels the *Demeter's* captain as delusional because of the fantastic log which he left behind, and Mina accepts the reporter's judgment as valid. She provides no commentary on the article that she pastes into her journal, as though it were necessarily as authoritative and trustworthy as her own writings. Just as Mina unquestioningly accepts the authenticity of the typed article, so does John Seward use writing to summarize and authenticate his theories. Seward, the head doctor of the

asylum, assumes that Renfield “has evidently some deep problem in his mind, for he keeps a little notebook in which he is always jotting down something” (102). The doctor evidently cannot conceive of writing without a purpose or a need to accomplish something. Seward loses little time in imposing labels on his patient, inventing the term “zoophagous maniac” (103) as a way of simulating an understanding of Renfield’s condition. Just as Harker relies on writing to translate the unknown into the familiar, so Seward attempts to imprison an unfamiliar condition within the boundaries of scientific taxonomy.

Seward's reliance on a scientific language to define an identity for Renfield is worth consideration in its own right, for it helps to illustrate a fundamental textual anxiety. If the Victorian world was becoming increasingly shaped by scientific theories, discoveries and inventions, then how do the characters of *Dracula* respond to that which lies outside of a scientific discourse? The answer lies in their response to boundaries and their deeply ingrained fear of anything that might threaten their own sense of identity. When Seward discovers that Renfield will not fit easily into any existing classification, he invents a new one for him. The need to impose a label on the unknown is itself a reflection of an anxiety that Seward, like Harker, uses writing to fight. Names give shape to, and control over, the unfamiliar. It is important to note, however, that Seward conceptualizes Renfield primarily as a scientific case, and discusses him in clinical terms. The doctor considers completing what he calls “the experiment” (104) with Renfield in order to test how far the patient is willing to take his predatory activities, and Seward dreams of using Renfield as a means to achieve scientific glory. The doctor brings the unfamiliar into the folds of a scientific zeitgeist so that it may be poked, prodded and

published in a properly authoritative manner. The idea of treating Renfield as a person distinct from a scientific taxonomy simply never occurs to Seward. As it turns out, Renfield ironically is involved in a complex relationship with Dracula to which the doctor is completely blind. Vampires, of course, exist outside of any logical scientific boundaries for Seward, and he finds it easy to restrict himself to scientific motives and explanations.

The naming of Renfield is not the only instance where the need to construct a scientific discourse blinds Seward to an important truth. His refusal to consider anything other than standard medical explanations for Lucy's illness is one example, and his reluctance to accept Van Helsing's diagnosis of vampirism after Lucy's death is another. In order for Seward to admit the truth of Van Helsing's claim, the doctor must witness Lucy's condition with his own eyes, and it is still no easy conclusion. Van Helsing effectively treats the matter as a scientific problem, leading Seward from point to point and showing him the vampiric Lucy (or her absence from the crypt) as evidence at each stage. It is only after this rigorous process of observation that Seward is prepared to believe that Lucy has become a vampire. The salient implication of this process is that Seward never relinquishes his faith in the scientific process. Van Helsing admonishes him: "you are too prejudiced. You do not let your eyes see nor your ears hear, and that which is outside your daily life is not of account to you . . . Ah, it is the fault of our science that it wants to explain all; and if it explain not, then it says there is nothing to explain" (228). Seward is unable to move beyond the boundaries which separate science and rational thought from the unknown, and when faced with a threat from outside those borders he reacts by expanding the scope of his boundaries. The boundaries owe their

existence to a fundamental anxiety regarding everything that does not have an obvious scientific explanation, and this need to subsume everything that appears to exist outside of those boundaries under the rubric of science reveals the power of this anxiety. The quintessential Victorian love of science which Darwin typified so aptly is very much a crucial constituent of Seward's identity, and he is by no means alone in this dependency. The vampire hunters react as strongly as they do to the vampiric Lucy not only because they fear her as a sexual being or social threat, but also because they fear her as a textual danger. She threatens to destroy science itself--together with its veneration of books and belief in the fundamental authority of the printed word--by breaking down the boundary between science and superstition that the men (and their society) have integrated as a part of their identities. While the hunters eventually isolate and kill every vampiric incursion, their first line of defense is to expand the boundaries of science to encompass this new phenomenon.

Together with the unease that the hunters feel over the need to expand the borders of their modern beliefs is a reluctance to embrace an oral culture. Victorian London is depicted as very much a print culture, where writing and books are invested with an implied authority and power. Societies like Transylvania that have at their core an oral tradition can potentially pose a threat to the Victorian professionals of the novel. Harker copes by capturing the people and his experiences in his shorthand journal, so that their voices are translated, interpreted and recorded through his pen until any notion of direct orality has been beaten out. Like Harker, Seward is quick to dismiss oral superstitions even when they come from his former teacher. Seward, ironically, records his journal orally, but the journal itself is still inscribed in wax; it retains a physicality that a true oral

culture lacks. The translation of the oral to the written—Jonathan describing Transylvania, Mina transcribing Seward's diary—is always an effort to reclaim a threatened boundary and identity. Seward's emotional voice recording of his journal is at odds with the rational, scientific approach on which the hunters rely, and Mina is quick to reproduce his words in a more directly legible form. Dracula himself is primarily an oral presence. He studies and appropriates the texts of others in order to understand and control them, but has no defining texts of his own. In their fight against him, the hunters have only legend and superstition on which to draw. Van Helsing is able to add a book or two from Amsterdam to their arsenal, but the complete absence of any such material in London suggests the extent to which oral narratives have been unable to compete with the Victorian love of textual documentation. The struggle against Dracula, then, is also a struggle to assert a characteristically Victorian London text-based culture against a threatening orality that operates outside of the culture's defining scientific borders.

There is more at stake in the fight to maintain control over texts than cultural identity. While some of the anxiety felt by the hunters over the need to defend their scientific and textual boundaries can be attributed to nationalist concerns, another motive is required to explain the intense personal commitment that they bring to the crusade. This motive, while influenced by nationalism, is located more at the individual level of self-preservation and self-definition. Writing (both as process and product) in *Dracula* is a strategy for differentiating the self from the other, but it also functions as a tool of self-definition. Characters are differentiated by their writing because they are defined by it. Identity as it emerges in the novel is shaped and even created by the act of writing, and writing frequently stands in as a surrogate for characters. Van Helsing makes explicit the

connection between writing and identity when he says to Jonathan (after reading Harker's journal), "I have read all [of Mina's] letters to poor Miss Lucy, and some of them speak of you, so I know you since some days from the knowing of others; but I have seen your true self since last night" (226). Texts can function as extensions of an individual, but this system of displacing identity allows for the characters' own texts to be used against them by others.

The association between texts and identity is particularly evident in the character of Jonathan Harker. As a solicitor, he operates within a professional world which feeds on and regurgitates written documents. Peter Hawkins sets Jonathan in motion towards Transylvania on Dracula's request, and then proceeds to define Harker to the Count in a letter which he makes Jonathan transmit. While Harker is a substitute for Hawkins, the letter functions as a substitute for Harker. Any opportunity that Harker may have had to assert an individuality apart from his profession is instantly negated by the contents of Hawkins's letter, which force the young solicitor to act within the boundaries proscribed by the letter. The text which Hawkins has written defines Harker with an authority that Jonathan cannot question. What is interesting here is not only that Harker is defined by the letter but that neither Hawkins nor Harker questions the propriety or the efficacy of doing so. Like much of the novel's writing, Hawkins's letter is invested by the other characters with an unquestionable power to define an identity. As *Dracula* progresses, the characters' journals move so far towards functioning as distinct identities that the group exchanges diaries in lieu of direct communication. As Harker says, "In the train I had written my diary so far, and simply read it off to them as the best means of letting

them get abreast of my own information” (306). Identity here is constructed by writing and validated by the act of reading.

The question of what constitutes an identity in *Dracula* is very much shaped by the growing popularity of science. Dr. Seward implies the connection between the new codification (and mass publication) of knowledge and identity when he says, “Had I even the secret of one such mind—did I hold the key to the fancy of even one lunatic—I might advance my own branch of science to a pitch compared with which Burdon-Sanderson’s physiology or Ferrier’s brain knowledge would be as nothing” (104). Seward’s conception of his own identity, in which public recognition figures prominently, is very much linked to the knowledge that he has and the writing that he produces. This epistemological definition of identity is a break away from definitions which look only at constituent factors like political, social and religious affiliations. These are undoubtedly important, but *Dracula* presents us with a collection of characters who define their own identities by producing texts, and at the same time validate the identities of others by reading their texts. Harker, for example, sees his journal not only as a representation of himself but as a substitute. He imagines that it might reach Mina before he himself does, and he is comfortable with using writing to stand in for his immediate presence in this way. Mina invests Harker’s journal with enough authority to stand in for him that she writes, “I shall get my typewriter this very hour and begin transcribing. Then we shall be ready for other eyes if required. And if it be wanted; then, perhaps, if I am ready, poor Jonathan may not be upset, for I can speak for him and never let him be troubled or worried with it at all” (216). Reading the journal is evidently sufficient for Mina to judge herself capable of speaking for Jonathan, and the implication is that Harker’s knowledge

and experiences are legible and transferable to others because they have been recorded in a form capable of being reproduced and transmitted. Harker has studied to become a solicitor; Dracula, to pass for a Londoner. If knowledge is crucial to identity, then the journals, as the repository of Harker's experiences and knowledge, are also a key to his identity.

The use of writing, both personal and professional, to define an identity for oneself is not without its weaknesses. On one hand, it is an empowering process for the writer, as it allows for both the inscription and transmission of identity. In this way, Mina cradles Sister Agatha's letter about Jonathan as she would the man himself, and it comforts her because "It is of Jonathan, and must be next my heart, for he is *in* my heart" (133). However, the authority that the characters are willing to invest in written documents can be exploited. That this exploitation can work indirectly is evident in the power of Dracula's writing, which is sufficient to make Hawkins send an employee across the continent, and for Dracula to manipulate Harker by his written instructions to others. Jonathan writes, "I found that my landlord had got a letter from the Count, directing him to secure the best place on the coach for me; but on making inquiries as to details he seemed somewhat reticent, and pretended that he could not understand my German" (34). This power, of course, is not unique to Dracula, as the vampire hunters (notably Van Helsing) instruct each other in a similar manner. Dracula's instructions to Harker concerning the letters that the solicitor is ordered to write are perhaps the clearest indication of the dangers of investing texts with unquestioned authority. The Count says to Jonathan, "I pray you, my good young friend, that you will not discourse of things

other than business in your letters” (63), and later demands that he write, sign and date letters which Dracula uses to mislead the recipients.

Mina identifies this weakness of textual authority when she doubts the authorship of Jonathan’s letters: “I look at that last letter of his, but somehow it does not satisfy me. It does not read like him, and yet it is his writing” (106). The letter does not “satisfy” her because it does not accord with her private knowledge of Harker, and she senses that the identity of the person who constructed it is not exactly that of Jonathan. The implication here is that writing, if it is to function as a major constituent of identity, must necessarily meet certain expectations or assumptions on the part of the recipient before it can successfully stand in for a person. Characters like Dracula who subvert this system are potentially dangerous because they challenge the basic assumption that writing can be trusted to transmit successfully information, knowledge, and authorship. The authenticity of the sender is crucial to every kind of professional discourse in both the novel and in Victorian society. Business, medical, legal and other expressions of professional writing all rely on the implicit authenticity and authority of the sender to function properly, as they operate within a system where a signature represents a person absolutely, and the request of a Lord is sufficient to open the closed books of Mitchell, Sons, & Candy. The danger of Dracula is not that he wishes to destroy this system, but that he wishes to maintain it and then exploit it to his own ends.

If textual documents function as representations of identity, then the root of textual anxiety in the novel becomes more apparent. The codifying of the self in a body of writing results in a division of the self into physical and written identities, each of which claims a vested authority and power in the novel. *Dracula* posits a redefinition of

the concept of identity that recognizes the new technologies of mass production and the individual's ability to inscribe and transmit representations of his/her identity. Geoffrey Wall, in "Different From Writing: *Dracula* in 1987," discusses the concept of the divided self when he writes,

For there are two distinct moments in the process of the narrative. In the first moment, a self duplication, "like whispering to oneself and listening at the same time," a self-displacement effected by "something in the shorthand symbols," a passage from the terrible fluidity of phantasy to the soothing fixity of text. In the second moment, the valorising circulation of what is written . . . . (Wall 16)

Arguing for *Dracula* as "persistently, an anxious text" (Wall 15), Wall reads the bifurcation of the self as evidence of a psychological anxiety, which it undoubtedly is. At the same time, however, it is important to note the complexity of this anxiety, which extends tendrils into the fundamental assumptions of Victorian professional discourse. Anxieties in *Dracula* are often textual in nature, resulting from the division of the self into two distinct parts that can no longer trust each other.

Harker understands this split from the very beginning, when he writes, "If this book should ever reach Mina before I do, let it bring my goodbye" (36). The journal for him becomes a stable presence, a record of his thoughts and experiences that may outlast or outpace his physical body, and which he invests with the power to communicate with Mina. His creation of a new textual self creates problems later when he begins to doubt the truth of the words that he has written. This is a fundamental textual anxiety of *Dracula*—the fear that one's writing will turn on its author, and that the two selves will become irreconcilable. This is the state in which Harker finds himself after returning

from Transylvania. Unable to believe the truth recorded in his journal, Jonathan doubts not only his words but himself:

I was in doubt, and then everything took a hue of unreality, and I did not know what to trust, even the evidence of my own senses. Not knowing what to trust, I did not know what to do; and so had only to keep on working in what had hitherto been the groove of my life. The groove ceased to avail me, and I mistrusted myself. Doctor, you don't know what it is to doubt everything, even yourself.

(225)

The real demon is not the vampire but the text, Jonathan's own journal. Harker alienates the self which took part in the events of his journal, and cuts himself off from the ability to act. His identity as a man of action becomes defined and trapped within the boundaries of his journal. Because Harker is unable to access this part of himself he becomes weakened, and remains in this state until Van Helsing is able to reunite the solicitor with his writing by validating Harker's experiences. Dracula understands the vulnerability of the divided subject in a way that even Van Helsing does not. The Count forces Harker to compose three post-dated letters, and the solicitor later acknowledges their power by writing, "Last night one of my post-dated letters went to post, the first of that fatal series which is to blot out the very traces of my existence from the earth" (78). Later, when Dracula cannot attack the men directly, he goes after them in effigy through their writing. Arthur tells the group, "He had been there, and though it could only have been for a few seconds, he made rare hay of the place. All the manuscript had been burned, and the blue flames were flickering amongst the white ashes; the cylinders of your phonograph too were thrown on the fire, and the wax had helped the flames" (325).

In this case the division of self worked to the hunters' advantage, for Mina had reproduced all of their writings in triplicate. Dracula may have destroyed what texts he found, but Mina's manifold typing outlasted the predatory feeding of the vampire and prevented him from immolating the hunters' entire body of text.

Not all textual selves are in danger of separating violently from the physical bodies that gave them life. Mina, at least through most of the novel, is able to control the division to her advantage. Both author and audience, she writes "I am anxious, and it soothes me to express myself here; it is like whispering to one's self and listening at the same time" (105). The division of the self strengthens her where it weakens Jonathan, for she is not afraid to listen to her own whispers or to read her own writing. As the official stenographer of the group, Mina is at the center of the distribution of all textual documents, directing their flow. Through her, writing becomes an extension of thought, and thought is replaced by writing. After recording her surmise regarding Dracula's escape route in her journal, she reads it back verbatim to the men instead of paraphrasing it. Her journal is speaking through Mina just as she speaks through it, and this gives it an authority and a presence independent of her physical identity. The same principle is at work in the hypnotism sessions, where the Mina who speaks exists in another place than the body which gives a voice to her. This, however, is an uneasy separation, and Van Helsing eventually struggles to contact the distanced half of Mina. It is important to note, though, that Mina responds productively to her division of identity, and transcribes her hypnotic statements, as she is told them, in her journal. In this way she reunites her disjointed halves to the best of her ability, and is in a good position to use her unified knowledge to predict Dracula's movements. Her goal in doing so, exemplified

throughout the novel, is to “try to follow the Professor’s example, and think without prejudice on the facts before me” (391). Mina is still pursuing an elusive objectivity that she tried to capture earlier by attempting to record conversations verbatim and by pasting newspaper articles and other textual documents into her journal.

The concept of an objective writing is the elusive goal that every character pursues, and which has connections to the fear of an uncontrolled written self. The fracturing of a single identity into at least two distinct manifestations—physical and written—creates the potential for conflict between two opposing halves of the same person, as Jonathan discovers. But this anxiety results from more than just the creation of another perspective. While it is in part an anxiety over the death of the indivisible subject, it is also an anxiety for the death of an objective subject. This becomes crucial when read against the social milieu of late Victorian England, where the writing of successful professionals like Hawkins and Harker is expected to be authoritative and unambiguous. When Jonathan doubts the words which he has written, he is questioning not only his sanity but the very possibility of objective writing. If a Victorian professional cannot trust himself to record data objectively, what can he trust? Emerging from this question is a fear that the surrogate selves that the hunters are constructing for themselves in writing will not be equal to the task—that their textual identities will somehow be insufficient to stop the scholar vampire from reading his way to England and overwriting their identities with his own.

In response to this anxiety about the adequacy of their textual identities, many of the characters feel the need to practise their writing, as though it were a skill on which they anticipate being tested. Writing for them is more than an objective recording of

facts and data. It can function anywhere along the continuum from cathartic, soothing process to necessary duty, and it is important as an action in itself. Dracula's hunters seem morbidly fascinated with inscribing a never-ending stream of marks on paper, and it is as much the process as the product that justifies them and their actions. Throughout *Dracula*, Stoker emphasizes the importance of the process of writing, and this fascination with the process is reflected in the characters' insecurity, as writers, with their physical identities. Writing, at times, is their attempt to construct an authoritative self that can stand in for the weaker physical self when necessary. While this does not hold universally throughout the novel, it is evident in several situations. Mina advocates the conceptualization of writing as self-improvement when she writes to Lucy, "I have been practising shorthand very assiduously. When we are married I shall be able to be useful to Jonathan, and if I can stenograph well enough I can take down what he wants to say in this way and write it out for him on the typewriter, at which also I am practising very hard" (86), and "When I am with you I shall keep a diary in the same way . . . . I may show it to Jonathan some day if there is in it anything worth sharing, but it is really an exercise book" (86). Here, writing is a goal-oriented process, and Mina's attempt to reconstruct her identity (also evident in "I shall try to do what I see lady journalists do"; 86) suggests that she is motivated by a feeling that without those skills she is somehow inadequate. Writing, for Mina, is a way to create a new identity for herself as a helpmate to Jonathan, not just as wife but as secretary.

The struggle to shore up personal weaknesses by writing a second self into existence is, ironically, a struggle to hold onto the ideal of a unified and objective self. Dracula undermines the belief that science can explain the unfamiliar, and so the

characters try desperately to reassert the power of science by clutching at any manifestation of authority or scientific objectivity that they can find. Harker reassures himself that he is writing objectively when he records, "Let me begin with facts—bare, meagre facts, verified by books and figures, and of which there can be no doubt" (61) and "The habit of entering accurately must help to soothe me" (68). Mina strives for the objectivity of a journalist, while Seward is reluctant to relinquish what he considers objective fact in favour of Van Helsing's supernatural explanation. While Dracula manipulates their belief in the objectivity of texts by controlling Harker's writing, the group of vampire hunters embrace each other's texts as objective truths even as their patterns of communication change and the limitations of their knowledge become apparent. When Harker actually doubts his own writings, he is weakened to the point of immobility until Van Helsing redefines objective fact for him in such a manner that Harker can insert his journal into that category. When Seward encounters a patient who operates outside of normal scientific classification, he does not question this difference but inscribes it into the standard body of knowledge and psychiatric taxonomy so that it becomes objective fact. While Van Helsing may appear to break down the barriers between the rational and the irrational, the objective and the subjective, he merely expands the scope of objectivity to encompass the unfamiliar. He reconstructs the ideal of the scientific method, with its emphasis on observation and objective recording of data, so that it allows for the introduction of the supernatural by imposing a dominant rationality on the vampire. In effect, he writes Dracula to death and helps the other characters to do the same.

While the characters are busy writing to shore up the integrity of their sense of identity and to overwrite subjective experience with objective language, they are also fighting against all efforts to open their eyes to the subjectivity of writing. Mina is left literally speechless (“I did not know what to say”: 100) after Mr. Swales informs her of the inaccuracies of the tombstones. Mina and Lucy not only trusted the tombstones enough to believe in them, but so much that they give no indication that even the idea of questioning the carved stone had occurred to them. Throughout the novel the hunters are fixated on the need to affirm the accuracy and completeness of their writing. “This is an exact record of what took place tonight” (178), Lucy writes, and she speaks for everyone when she evinces the need to reassure herself and others of that. The British Museum is not able to supply a detailed map of Transylvania; Mina’s last letters to Lucy go unopened; and Harker’s appearance and manner are a surprise to Seward, at odds with the impression that the doctor had formed of the solicitor from reading his journal. These and many other incidents suggest the inadequacy of writing to convey successfully every message and record all relevant data, but the group ignores these warnings, reassuring themselves that their writing is true and objective.

Van Helsing takes it upon himself to authenticate much of the group’s writing, telling Mina that her diary “breathes out truth in every line” (221), saying (of Harker’s journal), “Strange and terrible as it is, it is *true!*” (224), and telling Jonathan (after having read his journal), “I have seen your true self since last night” (226)—and all within a two day span. Even as the chase nears its end, Mina is still investing writing with a definable truth-value which she believes she can extract through diligent labour and the application of scientific, rational principles: “I have asked Dr Van Helsing, and he has got me all the

papers that I have not yet seen... Whilst they are resting, I shall go over all carefully, and perhaps I may arrive at some conclusion. I shall try to follow the Professor's example, and think without prejudice on the facts before me..." (391). She is unwilling to question the authority that she still attributes to the written (or typewritten) word because to do so would be to question herself. The hunters are eager to trust their writing implicitly for fear of acknowledging the fragility of their concept of their own identities. As Harker says to Van Helsing, "Doctor, you don't know what it is to doubt everything, even yourself. No, you don't; you couldn't with eyebrows like yours" (225). By refusing to doubt, they engage in a struggle to make sure that their written and physical identities work together, and that each does not undermine the other.

The hunters' reluctance to make public their private writings emerges from the vulnerability of their written identities. Journal writing is essentially a private form, and *Dracula* is composed primarily of journal entries. Jonathan Harker's diary is a good example of a private writing which is shown to others later, and it immediately complicates the recording and interpretation of information. Harker's use of shorthand marks the journal as both a private and professional document. The solicitor writes in the specialized language of business, which leaves his journal legible to his peers, but which also promises to conceal its contents from Dracula, were the vampire to discover it. Susan Cribb argues that "Harker has, by writing his entries in shorthand, excluded any reader (other than Mina) from reading [his journal]" (Cribb 136). While Mina is the only one of the hunters who can read shorthand, Jonathan's use of the relatively new form of writing places his journal in the context of business documents, thus lending it a certain authority. At the same time, Harker is clearly imitating the public genre of travel

literature, and so the potential is there for a public airing of his thoughts. Private writing in *Dracula* also embodies suggestions of secrecy and resistance. Harker realizes eventually that “it is no use making my ideas known to the Count” (58), and attempts to bribe the Szgany to post some letters secretly. When Dracula discovers that the solicitor’s secret letter to Mina was written in shorthand, he destroys the writing because he cannot understand it or control Jonathan through it. Writing can function as an activity where games of power are played, and these games are crucial in defining the limits of personal power and identity. Dracula controls Harker in part because he can force the solicitor to write what he is told to write; Harker seeks to subvert this power structure by writing in secret. Playing out here is the struggle between private and public knowledge, between a writing of resistance with an intended recipient and a public display of this writing. It is not surprising that textual anxieties find another cause in this unexpected publishing of private thoughts.

Even where private writing does not take form as a literal cloak-and-dagger tool it is still referred to in those terms. Lucy’s first letter to Mina end with the lines “P.S.—I need not tell you this is a secret. Good-night again” (88), and her second letter cautions Mina to “keep it a secret, dear, from *every one*, except, of course, Jonathan” (89). Writing is functioning here as an exclusionary practice, and as a way of reinforcing boundaries between the intended recipient(s) and everyone else. A primary advantage to private writing is the author’s ability to direct the writing to a particular person or audience, with the implication that it will remain private from all other people. Harker passes the receptacle of his knowledge to Mina when he tells her, “The secret is here, and I do not want to know it . . . Here is the book. Take it and keep it, read it if you will, but

never let me know; unless, indeed, some solemn duty should come upon me to go back to the bitter hours, asleep or awake, sane or mad, recorded here” (140). Seward, particularly, is reluctant to share his journal. While it seems logical to assume that he is concerned with protecting the privacy of his patients and their problems, the doctor appears to have no objection to achieving fame by using Renfield to advance his own knowledge and reputation. Seward initially tries to prevent Mina from listening to his wax cylinders, and even after she has heard and transcribed them through her typewriter he does not want his diary to travel any further:

“No one need ever know, shall ever know,” I said in a low voice. She laid her hand on mine and said very gravely:—

“Ah, but they must!” (261)

If writing can divide an identity into two distinct manifestations, then a public declaration can leave the author exposed and vulnerable. Harker survived because he was able to hide his private entries from Dracula, and now Seward needs to be persuaded to allow his own private thoughts to be read by others. To permit this is to leave one’s textual self open to attack, but sharing private writing is a necessary step in forming a social unit with a collective knowledge, as the hunters choose to do.

The act of making the private writings of the group public to each other is not without its attendant anxieties. Combining the distinct texts into one homogenous typewritten and chronological mass results in the dissolution of certain boundaries that had defined the hunters as distinct individuals within the group. Seward’s voice, with all of its emotions and tones, has been reduced to uniform typewriting, as has Jonathan’s shorthand journal and Mina’s private diary. Susan Cribb argues that “in transcribing

these accounts, Mina *silences* emotion. She does the same with the written diaries" (Cribb 138). The emotional tone of Seward's voice is untranslatable into typing, and so the doctor sacrifices his individuality in favour of homogenous typing. The textual uniqueness of each character's records is made subservient to the greater good of a combined narrative. This is done for practical reasons, but the impulse which motivates it is a familiar one. There is clearly a need to construct a rational story and an objective self out of the mass of primary documentation—not only a shared narrative but a unified identity that would act as more than the sum of their individual textual histories. This dissolution of discrete textual selves into one monovocal mass comes at the expense of the autonomy of the individual, and works as a factor in perpetuating text-related anxieties in the novel. This is especially apparent when knowledge is unequally distributed. Mina writes,

Lord Godalming and Mr. Morris arrived earlier than we expected . . . . Poor fellows, neither of them is aware that I know all about the proposals they made to Lucy. They did not quite know what to say or do, as they were ignorant of the amount of my knowledge; so they had to keep on neutral subjects. However, I thought the matter over, and came to the conclusion that the best thing I could do would be to post them in affairs right up to date. (267)

This imbalance is soon rectified, but the fundamental shift in ownership and authorship has shifted to Mina. "Did you write all this, Mrs Harker?" (267) asks Arthur, and Mina nods. The homogenizing typewriter has moved the locus of authorship to Mina, and the previously well-marked boundaries between the group's individual textual selves become blurred. In order to make the collective model work, the group has to relinquish the idea

of the private textual self unless it becomes necessary to resurrect it as a defensive mechanism to protect themselves. Even then, the men exclude Mina temporarily from the textual collective, but they do not lose faith in the ideal of a shared textual identity.

Not all members of the group are reluctant to share their writing. In many cases, private writing alone is insufficient to quell fears of personal instability, and it becomes necessary for this writing to be witnessed and validated by another. Harker's journal is the archetypal example of this need for public viewing and approval. Only by means of Van Helsing's declaration "it is *true*" (224) can Jonathan's identity as it exists in his text be brought back into alignment with his physical self. The split of his identity into opposing physical and textual components, which results from his inability to reconcile a faith in Victorian objective rationalism with his experiences in Dracula's castle, is only healed by the act of reproducing his textual presence and distributing it to other people who can witness his writings and acknowledge their authority. The need for witnessing, then, finds its root in the fundamental insecurity and anxiety of the authorial self. Even Mina, after having read her husband's journal, says of Seward's diaries, "It is all so wild and mysterious, and strange that if I had not known Jonathan's experience in Transylvania I could not have believed. As it was, I didn't know what to believe, and so got out of my difficulty by attending to something else" (262). The reproduction and mass-reading of the group's documents lends them a collective authority that is greater than that possessed by any individual piece of writing, and the characters all derive strength from this mutual power. Once Mina is cut off from the dissemination of writing, the men are no longer interested in her diary, and so do not learn until later that the

vampire has visited her. Their collective is only vulnerable because Mina had been excluded from the sharing of texts; her textual identity was powerless without a reader.

As *Dracula* moves towards its conclusion and Mina is once again admitted into the fold, the idea of the self as an independent and discrete authorial unit is no longer evident. The model becomes one of collective production, and the writings and concerns of the individual become those of the group as a whole. This shift from single to multiple authors also shifts the focus of attention from authorship to editing. With the loss of individual authors comes the evolution of an overriding editor, who redefines individual journals as pieces of a whole and then constructs the whole out of other people's stories. Mina is the one who steps easily into this role, translating Jonathan's shorthand, transcribing Seward's voice, collecting documents and newspaper clippings, and placing the entire mass in chronological order in an attempt to construct a rational narrative out of disparate experiential notes.

The role of editing is important even when the locus of authorship is still with the individual characters. Journal entries are often written at a later date than the events which they describe, and a process of selection is obviously at work. This selection does not always entail leaving things out, for Mina is careful to paste other documents, such as newspaper articles, into her journal. Even before she produces and assembles the master narrative of the group's experiences, Mina acts as an editor in structuring her journal as a polyphonic work. While some of the men experience unease over the translation of their writing from private to public documents, they are quick to perceive the benefits of a collective narrative. At the same time, the emphasis on editing results in the further

displacement of the individual authorial self, so that by the end of the novel we are left with “hardly one authentic document” (419) or authentic individual.

The transition from private to public writing helps to restore the fractured identities of the group. As individual authors, their textual selves were frequently at odds with the social conventions and norms in which they wanted so desperately to believe, and this could have a paralyzing effect on them, as it did on Harker. The immediate solution to this problem of divided identities is the act of witnessing and validating, but while this act unifies the physical and textual identities of each character, it does not unify all of the characters under the same belief system and knowledge base. This is the true importance of the editor. Mina’s ability to bring the hunters together by overwriting their individual journals with her typewriter results in the homogenization of the group and its experiences. The focus on individual writing that Seward took to egotistical extremes has disappeared by the end of *Dracula*, and the writings of each person not only add to the master narrative but reinforce it. It is important to note that the vanquishing of individual ego does not imply a fundamental shift in the characters’ perception of order. While the dominant structure of their writing has moved to a collective model, the group is still engaged in the pursuit of scientific, objective fact. If anything, the validation that Mina provides to them by reproducing their works as part of her master narrative only makes them less likely to question their assumption that all events can be understood and recorded in an objective and authentic manner.

Seven years later, the final “Note” recognizes the irony of “the fact, that in all the mass of material of which the record is composed, there is hardly one authentic document . . . . We could hardly ask anyone, even did we wish so, to accept these as proofs of so

wild a story” (419). Van Helsing attempts to validate their situation by saying, “We want no proofs; we ask none to believe us!” (419), reminding the group that they are a closed authorial system. As such, it is sufficient if their experiences appear complete and accurate to them, regardless of the opinions of others. While this seems to suggest that the collective has come to a gradual awareness of the limitations of their master narrative, the “Preface” makes a contrary claim: “There is throughout no statement of past things wherein memory may err, for all the records chosen are exactly contemporary, given from the standpoints and within the range of knowledge of those who made them” (29). Mina’s transcription of the journals, the delays between the events of the journals and their inscription as narrative, and the almost total absence of the original individual writings are all ignored in favour of a claimed objectivity. The homogenized collection of individuals and their writings has given birth to a child whose “bundle of names links all our little band of men together” (419), and to a document whose quest for objective fact can not reconcile itself with its fragmented roots.

The move from individual authorship to the editing of a work drawn from multiple authors is a method by which most of the anxieties of writing and the division of the self can be ameliorated, but it also suggests the dangers of being an isolated author. Alone, the individual, autonomous self must face both external foes and an internal division between the authorial self and the texts that it produces. The creation of a distinct identity through their writing allows the hunters to use their journals as proxies for direct interaction and communication. However, the redefinition of the self as a divided entity can lead to conflicts between the components of the newly-segmented self, and so the characters may find themselves in conflict with their own writings. The silent

figure here is Dracula himself, whose voice is always mediated through the writings of the hunters. He manipulates their writing whenever possible, but manages to avoid splitting his own identity into physical and textual components. His library is an appropriation of British texts, but these do not represent his identity in the same way that the hunters' journals stand in for theirs. Dracula is a nebulous figure who operates outside of the Victorian taxonomic approach to collecting and collating data, although he has no qualms about using that system when it will benefit him. Unlike the hunters, the vampire does not keep journals, and he does not seek external validation of his writing. In a novel about texts and information, where every thought is recorded and distributed, Dracula appears intriguingly silent.

## Chapter Two:

### Literate Monsters And Their Texts

Geoffrey Wall's characterization of *Dracula* as an "anxious text" (Wall 15) in 1984 neatly summarized the effect produced by the novel and its monster, and opened the door to several competing and interconnected theories of anxiety. This has proved to be a popular and productive approach, as the vampire hunters, while showing an almost complete lack of fear and terror, nevertheless act out of a sense of profound disquiet. There is something fundamentally *wrong* about the vampire's existence that transcends the immediate and personal ramifications of his attacks. As a rush of critics have pointed out, it is not so much what Dracula does as what he symbolizes for the hunters. The vampire is a mirror, reflecting not himself but the fears and anxieties of the Victorian London society in which he appeared. These anxieties have been characterized variously as sexual, political, social, economic, psychological and technological in nature. While these have been valuable avenues of exploration in their own right, I want to examine an aspect of *Dracula* that has been largely overlooked or subordinated in the existing *Dracula* criticism: Dracula's literacy. Because Dracula is working out of a predominantly oral tradition, and is rendered physically as an animalistic, degenerative presence, it is deceptively easy to see him, as the hunters themselves do, as a childlike monster bent on attacking "the language of print culture itself," and embodying "the desire for a primal

relation to texts, and certainly a desire to replace writing with speech" (Wicke 489-90). Dracula may appear to be nothing more than a destructive figure when in the presence of texts and documents, but he is actually much more than this. He can be destructive when such a course of action is advantageous, but he can also be cleverly literate, manipulating texts, communication, and--through their writing--his enemies. The true threat of the vampire, which strikes at the heart of the Victorian reliance on writing and communication, is not that he can destroy texts but that he can create and manipulate them himself. I argue for a reading of Dracula as a textual monster, actively engaged in the manipulation and circulation of texts and information, and fighting a battle with his hunters that is predominantly textual in nature. This approach necessitates moving away from more traditional readings of the monster as a transgressor of sexual norms and colonial or social boundaries towards a theory of textual transgression, where the communication of spoken and written words is at the heart of Dracula's narrative strategy and monstrous power.

Among the more popular theories to account for Dracula's power is the sexual approach exemplified in Christopher Craft's "Kiss Me With Those Red Lips." Craft argues that the anxieties symbolized by Dracula are sexual in nature, and that Dracula is not so much concerned with killing his opponents as with seducing their women and calling their own sexuality into question. While this is true to an extent, the logical progression of this approach results in a reading of Dracula as a "figure of wildly illicit, fecund potency" (Levy 156), which is difficult to support textually. In actuality, Dracula is in many ways a remarkably impotent figure sexually. He is not able to follow through on his implied threat to seduce Jonathan Harker in the castle; he is disobeyed by the three

female vampires and can only make a vague reference to "the past" (71) when they laugh at him and accuse him of never having loved; he appears to have vamped successfully only one woman in history in addition to the three female vampires; and he cannot keep Mina under his control. Dracula exists more as an implied than as an actual sexual threat, and outcroppings of sexuality are frequently bound inextricably with textuality and the flow of information. "The Monster in the Bedroom" (C.F. Bentley) might productively be relabelled "The Monster in the Boardroom."

Political theories have adopted a postcolonial methodology to explain the precise nature of the threat posed by the Count. Critics like David Glover have connected Dracula's mockery of the law to growing political insecurities, and to the omnipresent, looming danger of the Other as represented by foreigners. To a British society obsessed with the hierarchies of colonialism, the fear of reverse colonization is the fear that those who have traditionally been linguistic and political outsiders may become indistinguishable from the English themselves, and may even be thought of as English. While I agree that concerns about nationalism are present in *Dracula*, I prefer to look at the nature of the process of political appropriation, and I find it connected again to textuality. Through his manipulation of writing and communication, Dracula encroaches on the textual proficiency that set Victorian England apart from those countries with more developed oral traditions. Closer to home, social theories have looked at Dracula's physical appearance and primitive nature and identified anxieties of degeneration to explain his monstrosity. Dracula, they say, is dangerous because he is atavistic (Fontana 25), because he is a reversion (Sahay 28), and because he is primal man returned to his earliest, beast-like state (Krumm 10). Following on the heels of Darwin and his Theory

of Natural Selection were Lombroso and Nordau, who raised the spectre of atavism. Lombroso, for example, argued that criminals were born, not made, and that they could be identified by their physical appearance. It is tempting to identify Dracula with these social concerns, as the vampire hunters themselves do, but it would not be entirely accurate to do so. Dracula is not looking to destroy the current social order, or to wage a war on the upper classes. Instead, he intends to join them. The vampire is not dangerous because he has degenerated to a more primitive state, but because his textual prowess has not degenerated. Far from being an atavistic being bent on destruction, Dracula is well-educated in English law and manners and studies to become even more so. Once again, the threat he poses is not in spite of his literacy, but because of it.

It can be productive to look at *Dracula* as a narrative of production and consumption, with the vampire functioning as dead labour, a capitalistic being who takes but does not spend (Halberstam 260). Jasmine Hall's description of Dracula as a "center of circulation" (Hall 105) is fully realized in the wonderful scene in which the wounded vampire bleeds money. Attacked in his Piccadilly residence by Harker's khukuri knife, Dracula leaps back, but "the point just cut the cloth of his coat, making a wide gap whence a bundle of bank-notes and a stream of gold fell out" (346). While the association of Dracula with a circulatory force is certainly appropriate, I would shift the point of focus from money to texts. Money can be read as a text, but it is through writing that money is allowed and even encouraged to circulate. The hunters frequently use currency to purchase information, as they do when they bribe countless workmen. Even the newspaper reporter who interviews the zookeeper is only able to extract information by bribery. Throughout *Dracula*, money is only useful in its ability to purchase texts and

data. Dracula certainly avails himself of the knowledge and labour of others, but he also produces texts, which he uses along with money as a tool. The danger of the vampire is his ability to act as his hunters do, and to manipulate the circulation of both money and texts to his own advantage. Psychoanalytical theories tend to place even less importance on the role of texts in the novel, preferring to concentrate on the psychologically symbolic aspects of the characters. These analyses, however, tend to imply, as David Thompson does in "Supinely Anticipating Red-Eyed Shadows: A Jungian Analysis of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*," that Dracula is a passive figure who is so busy symbolizing various psychic stages that he seems to have no self-will at all. Thompson's approach fails to take into account the vampire's textual proficiency and work ethic.

Dracula is not the passive monster that he is often made out to be, but is instead an active character, continually engaged in the process of acquiring and using knowledge and information. Critical opinion has traditionally argued the contrary, focusing on Dracula's textual absences and silences as evidence for his passivity. David Sandner downplays the importance of Dracula in the novel because the Count never takes up the pen to record his thoughts and experiences. "Dracula," Sandner argues, "never actually becomes anything more than an absent presence, nothing more than hearsay, in the novel that bears his name" (Sandner 301). While it is true that Dracula's role in the novel is no longer foregrounded after Jonathan leaves the castle, this is hardly surprising, given the hunters' (perhaps natural) tendency to privilege their own narratives and perspectives. It is only in the first four chapters that we are able to view Dracula for an extended period, albeit as a textual presence mediated through Jonathan's journals. The vampire whom we encounter clearly believes in the importance of work. "Still at your books? Good!" (55)

he says to Jonathan, and this attitude is evident in the preparations that Dracula has made for his trip to England.

Dracula is, if not a vibrant character, at least an active one. He meets Jonathan at the Borgo Pass and drives the solicitor back to the castle himself, even stopping several times along the way to engage in treasure-marking. He cares for Jonathan without the aid of a servant, cooking and cleaning behind the scenes without drawing attention to himself. More importantly, Dracula is engaged in the process of collecting and processing data, moving the work of the vampire away from the physically predatory to the intellectually draining. The Count sucks Jonathan dry of his knowledge, rather than of his blood, leading the solicitor to remark that Dracula "clearly had studied beforehand all he could get on the subject of the neighbourhood, for he evidently at the end knew very much more than I did" (53). Acknowledging that Dracula "would have made a wonderful solicitor, for there was nothing that he did not think of or foresee" (63), Jonathan provides Dracula with the information that the Count actively seeks. It is hard to imagine Dracula as a passive figure, given that he has procured and, presumably, read books on "history, geography, politics, political economy, botany, geology, law--all relating to England and English life and customs and manners" (50), as well as "such books of reference as the London Directory, the 'Red' and 'Blue' books, Whitaker's Almanack, the Army and Navy Lists" (50), the Law List, and even Bradshaw's Guide to train schedules. We are presented with an active vampiric figure, one who hunts information, drains solicitors, and makes associative connections. Even later, when many critics have written the Count off as a textual non-entity, Dracula is still hard at work concealing his final coffin, attacking Lucy and Mina, spying on the hunters in his bat

form to acquire data, and writing letters to arrange for his transportation back to Transylvania.

While Dracula, as Sandner points out, never keeps a journal himself (at least not that we are ever shown), this is far from proof of his textual absence. The significance of Dracula's apparent textual silence can be found in the fact that he usurps the writings and information of others. Much of Dracula's writing is done through the intermediary presence of a third party, concealing the Count from direct sight and accountability. Dracula's communication with Jonathan Harker through the note sent to the innkeeper, his control over Harker's letters, his vamping of Lucy and his mental link to Mina are all examples of textual displacement, where an apparently absent monster is still able to exert control over the hunters. The virtual disappearance of Dracula from the novel after the fourth chapter is not a mere narrative technique to establish distance between the men and the Count, as Bette Roberts argues in "Victorian Values in the Narration of *Dracula*," or evidence that he is the most secretive character in the novel (Marigny 5), but rather a deliberate strategy on his part to distance himself as much as possible from direct textual contact with the hunters. Working as he does from an oral tradition, Dracula is quick to recognize and take advantage of the weaknesses inherent in writing and in the inscription of thoughts and plans onto a fixed medium, and it is hardly surprising that he should work to deny the hunters the same informational advantages that he has over them. Just as darkness "seemed intensified just beyond the focus of the searchlight" (113), so does Dracula seem even more silent beside the sheer volume of words produced by the hunters, who cannot have a thought without recording it in triplicate and distributing it for five other sets of eyes to read. Their mode of textual production and reproduction

provides them with several advantages, but a reliance on written documents is not without its vulnerabilities, and it is a measure of Dracula's active nature that he continues to exploit these weaknesses even while deliberately obscuring himself textually.

Even those critics who have addressed Dracula's attitude towards texts have, with few exceptions, considered the vampire's role to be a primarily destructive one. On the surface, it is not hard to see why. Dracula destroys Harker's unauthorized letters and, more significantly, burns the notes and manuscripts of the hunters. Monsters are traditionally associated with destruction and with the attempt to undo or attack civilization and its products. Because of his predatory nature, Dracula seems particularly amenable to being read as a destructive presence. Elizabeth Miller provides a concise summary of this critical position when she argues that "Dracula is a destroyer rather than a preserver of text; unlike Shelley's Monster who keep Victor's notebook, Dracula destroys any records he finds. This reinforces his image as the antithesis of civilized Western European culture--the cultural, social, racial, and biological Other" (Miller 153). Jennifer Wicke advances a similar argument when she writes, "Dracula mounts an attack on language, the language of print culture itself" (Wicke 489). David Sandner comes closer to an appreciation of the complexity of textual monsters when he identifies the importance of Dracula's library and of the vampire's attempt to use his knowledge to compete with modernity. Similarly, Rebecca Pope feels that "the novel consistently inscribes language and writing as ways of gaining and keeping power: Dracula believes that his plans to master the human race depend on his ability to master English, and his hunters trust that the writing and circulating of texts will produce knowledge that will help them defeat the vampire" (Pope 208). Missing from both of these analyses, though,

is an indication that Dracula uses texts not just as passive vessels for learning but as active weapons of attack. Texts in the novel move beyond a passive presence as objectified items into a more aggressive role as loci of power in their own right.

Dracula's power as an author is apparent from the moment he uses writing to move a solicitor from London to Transylvania. Harker records Dracula textually in his journal, but the solicitor is himself at the beck and call of the Count, who has brought Jonathan across a great distance by means of a simple written request to Mr. Hawkins. Harker recognizes both the Count's intelligence and the quality of his data ("his knowledge and acumen were wonderful"; 63), and when Dracula probes Harker on the precise way in which English solicitors may be used and asks about the "means of making consignments and the forms to be gone through" (62), Jonathan perceives "a certain method in the Count's inquiries" (62). The most significant early example of Dracula's manipulation of texts for his own ends is apparent in his control over Harker's letters. "Then write now, my young friend," Dracula orders him. "Write to our friend and to any other; and say, if it will please you, that you shall stay with me until a month from now." When Harker balks, the Count informs him, "I desire it much; nay, I will take no refusal" (63). Dracula later repeats this textual coercion, and now insists on dictating the subject of the letters: "the Count asked me in the suavest tones to write three letters, one saying that my work here was nearly done, and that I should start for home within a few days, another that I was starting on the next morning from the time of the letter, and the third that I had left the castle and arrived at Bistritz" (73). As he does when he dons Harker's clothing, Dracula is working through the guise of another to accomplish his own goals. As the peasants are expected to recognize Harker from his

clothing, so are the English expected to recognize Harker from his writing. In a society where writing is implicitly trusted to stand in for the individual, Dracula's willingness and ability to exploit this connection make him a dangerous opponent. He can destroy texts, as he does Jonathan's clandestine shorthand missive to Mina, but he can also manipulate them skillfully.

Shortly before Harker becomes conscious of the vulnerability of his journal and classifies Dracula as a destroyer of texts, Dracula writes several notes, which he leaves where Harker can peek at them. These letters, addressed to bankers and solicitors in Whitby, Varna, London and Buda-Pesth, demonstrate the Count's comfort and facility with written communication. Harker later says,

It gave me almost a turn to see again one of the letters which I had seen on the Count's table before I knew of his diabolical plans. Everything had been carefully thought out, and done systematically and with precision. He seemed to have been prepared for every obstacle which might be placed by accident in the way of his intentions being carried out. To use an Americanism, he had "taken no chances."

(265)

Dracula does not destroy every document he encounters. Like the solicitor whose society Dracula takes as his model, the Count is conscious of the power of the written word to manipulate people, and wary enough of its power to desire control over writing that might be used against him. Dracula, far from evincing qualities of the degenerate, shows a remarkable degree of textual savvy regarding the circulation of potentially powerful documents. After intercepting Jonathan's attempt to mail private letters, Dracula responds, tellingly, by removing "every scrap of paper" (75) that could aid Harker outside

the castle, including his notes on railways and travel and his letter of credit. Even after Dracula arrives in London, the letter that he wrote in Transylvania to the Whitby solicitor, Samuel Billington, has the power to move professional men at a distance, and to ensure that his fifty boxes are transported to his new residence, Carfax, by way of Messrs. Carter, Paterson & Co. Dracula has no qualms about using texts for constructive as well as destructive purposes, and he does so in full accordance with English law and tradition.

When Dracula finds it necessary to destroy texts, there is much more at work than the simple "pyrotechnic outrage," "desire for a primal relation to texts," or "desire to replace writing with speech" that Wicke suggests. The Count's destruction of information is an acknowledgement of the power of writing, and reveals an implicit understanding of the potential for this information to be used against him. Although Dracula operated originally from an oral tradition, he shows no indication of desiring a primal relation to texts; on the contrary, he exploits the potential of the written medium regularly and with the skill of a British professional. In fact, Dracula's awareness of textual nuances and strategies parallels that of the hunters in many ways. Like them, Dracula sees the value of writing in manifold, creating copies that duplicate the function of the original. The most obvious expression of vampiric copying is the creation of new vampires, but the Count's attitude towards textual reproduction is evident from the beginning of the novel. He wears Harker's clothes in a deliberate attempt to impersonate the solicitor, so that witnesses could confirm the presence of Harker outside the castle, and the Count appears to Jonathan as both himself and his driver in order to mislead the solicitor. Dracula recognizes the value of copies long before Mina begins typing in manifold. Similarly, Dracula's duplication and concealment of his coffins, and the hunters' efforts to destroy

them, parallels neatly the hunters' duplication and concealment of their notes, and the vampire's efforts to destroy these notes. Just as the hunters cleverly keep one copy of their manuscript secured in a safe, so does Dracula hide one of his fifty coffins from them. If the hunters seal Lucy's tomb and forty-nine of Dracula's coffins to prevent entry by vampires, it is Dracula who has just destroyed their notes and Seward's wax cylinders. While Friedrich Kittler incorrectly says that Dracula burns Seward's phonograph along with the cylinders, Kittler is still right to point out that the vampire "no longer merely burns secret documents, but also the apparatus that go with them" (Kittler 164). The Count removed all paper from Jonathan in the castle to prevent the solicitor from writing, and now attacks Mina to take advantage of her inside knowledge of the hunters' plans. Dracula is a modern monster, one aware of the power inherent in text and technology and who exploits technologies of inscription when he can, but deprives his enemies of them when he cannot.

Garrett Stewart argues convincingly that Dracula's telepathy is a technology of communication that links the vampire directly to the corresponding technologies of the telegraph and phonograph (Stewart 10), all of which are able to reproduce text that is displaced--whether spatially or temporally--from the original. Mina becomes a text that Dracula can read, a conduit through which the Count can receive information and eavesdrop on the private data exchanges of others. Mina realizes this and duplicates the process of spying, which Dracula did not anticipate, but Dracula was still the first to discover and implement this novel method of data transfer. Operating in a similar manner, Dracula uses texts to project his desires across physical distances, so that his words can be actualized without the presence of his body as a conscious director. He

does so when he directs London solicitors from his Transylvanian castle, and he repeats this process during his rushed escape back to his homeland. Even under the pressure of the escape, Dracula has the forethought to send a letter to Immanuel Hildesheim instructing him "to receive, if possible before sunrise so as to avoid customs, a box which would arrive at Galatz in the *Czarina Catherine*. This he was to give in charge to a certain Petrof Skinsky, who dealt with the Slovaks who traded down the river to the port" (390). These are the plans and actions of a literate monster, not one who is out to destroy literate society, but one who is able to control and direct this society through its own technologies of textual inscription and communication.

One of the most direct ways that texts exercise their power is by limiting and controlling the movement of people within clearly defined physical boundaries. As a manipulator of texts, Dracula understands the confining power that they embody, and is not hesitant to use this on Harker. Jennifer Wicke has discussed how the dialectal language of *Dracula* marks out a national boundary (Wicke 488), and Dracula applies this same principle to the control of smaller spaces by language and writing, putting into effect at a micro level what has successfully defined national political borders. From the moment that Dracula writes the letter to Hawkins that brings Harker to Transylvania, the vampire uses texts not only to manipulate the solicitor, but to control his movements within very specific physical spaces. Until Jonathan arrives at the castle, his spatial movements are dictated solely by the Count. Dracula instructs Harker to stay at the Golden Krone hotel, and reinforces his own authorial power with a letter instructing the solicitor to place himself on a particular coach so he can be picked up at a particular location. The coach driver's attempt to thwart this control by arriving at the Borgo Pass

ahead of schedule is nullified by Dracula, clearly demonstrating that it is the Count, and not the often reticent and incoherent peasants, who is to retain textual control over Jonathan.

Dracula's castle exists as a site where text and architecture work together to order and direct the movement of people. Jonathan's bedroom, for example, can only be reached from the outside after passing up one flight of winding stairs, down two long passages, and through four different doors. While Dracula pays lip service to Harker's freedom of movement, he is careful to qualify it: "You may go anywhere you wish in the castle, except where the doors are locked, where of course you will not wish to go" (51). It is not long before Harker tests the boundaries which Dracula has spoken into existence, and finds "doors, doors, doors everywhere, and all locked and bolted" (57), imprisoning him in a physical space whose borders are defined both by the locked doors and by Dracula's oral warning. Dracula's words, which forbid Jonathan from exploring beyond locked doors, have become literalized in the language of architecture. When Harker discovers "one door at the top of the stairway which, though it seemed to be locked, gave a little under pressure" (66), he takes advantage of this loophole in the Count's instructions, and finds comfort in the thought of free and innocent textual expression through the history he assigns to the oak table, "where in old times possibly some fair lady sat to pen, with much thought and many blushes, her ill-spelt love letter" (67). The solicitor is already conceptualizing his relationship with Dracula in military terms, recognizing that "the old centuries had, and have, powers of their own which mere 'modernity' cannot kill" (67), and he displaces his desire to counter-attack onto his shorthand journal, calling it "nineteenth century up-to-date with a vengeance" (67). Just

as Dracula uses writing to control the solicitor, Harker grants his journal the power of a weapon, which it later proves to be. Harker's subsequent attempts to escape the confines of the space that Dracula has written for him are equally unsuccessful. Visiting the door again, Harker finds it "so forcibly driven against the jamb that part of the woodwork was splintered" (72). What is significant about his confinement is the way in which his physical movement is subject to an architecture of control, where Dracula's warnings are literalized as physical barriers. In a castle where Dracula is able to control the flow of information, the vampire can mail his letters with only minimal spying from Harker, but the solicitor's attempt to slip his own letters through the textual and physical barriers erected by the Count prove unsuccessful. The Szgany return his subversive writings to Dracula, and the borders of the castle contain the circulation of illicit texts within them. Giving literal form to Jonathan's textual confinement, Dracula responds by locking him in the room.

The Count is not the only character to use texts to proscribe and prevent physical movement within and through specific spaces. Van Helsing, who, like Dracula, is a foreigner possessing a specialized body of knowledge and an eagerness to command, also marks out borders of movement. Keeping his true intentions hidden, as Dracula did, the doctor traces a frontier along the walls of Lucy's room with garlic: "First he fastened up the windows and latched them securely; next, taking a handful of the flowers, he rubbed them all over the sashes, as though to ensure that every whiff of air that might get in would be laden with the garlic smell. Then with the wisp he rubbed all over the jamb of the door, above, below, and at each side, and round the fireplace in the same way" (167). Where Dracula was concerned with internal subversion, Van Helsing guards against

external attack, securing the borders of the room by marking out a perimeter with garlic. His strategy is sound, but his walls are undermined from within, and Lucy's mother unknowingly breaches the barrier that denies entrance to the invader. Van Helsing has more success with the door to Lucy's tomb, where his use of garlic and the Host as seals alternately permits and denies access to the vampire. When he later writes the circle around Mina into existence, Van Helsing calls attention to the textual nature of it by his words, "I drew a ring" (407). The act of drawing, of inscribing a subject with symbols whose power extends beyond visible surface marks into an underlying language, is an act of writing which is irrevocably caught up in an architectural system of power and control, where the right marks and the right texts can hold even the undead at bay.

It is no coincidence that death and texts are intertwined so thoroughly in the drawing of Mina's circle, for the vampire is a textual monster, and death in *Dracula* is heavily textualized. Rebecca Pope points out that Lucy is staked in the breast, the place where she concealed the paper as a note to those who would find her after her death (Pope 205). While Pope connects this textual marking with sexual anxieties, I find significance in Lucy's association of death with writing. Lucy intends her last record to serve as a communication of her experience, and she turns to writing almost instinctively when confronted with her final moments. "I feel I am dying of weakness," she writes, "and have barely enough strength to write, but it must be done if I die in the doing" (179). It is not surprising that her subsequent decline is signaled by an attempt to destroy the information by ripping that paper. What the living write, the undead can co-opt. Renfield as well expresses himself textually, documenting a vampiric food chain in his notebook with the meticulousness of a Victorian professional. Like a good accountant,

he writes in numbers, deftly transforming death into columns of text. In doing so, Renfield brings together death and accounting--the need for a written record to explain or quantify death--in precisely the same way as Seward, who says, "to me it seems only yesterday that my whole life ended with my new hope, and that truly I began a new record. So it will be until the Great Recorder sums me up and closes my ledger account with a balance to profit or loss" (104). Seward's God, like the tombstone-examining deity that Swales predicts, understands the value of texts and their relation to death. Similarly, Van Helsing reads the prayer for the dead at the same time that Arthur pounds the three-foot stake into Lucy, inscribing her flesh with the Word made wood.

This is, of course, not the first time that the hunters have written on Lucy's body with their instruments of inscription. Arthur Holmwood, John Seward, Abraham Van Helsing and Quincey Morris have all poured their blood into her through the holes made by Van Helsing's calligraphic needle. The *tabula rasa* that is Lucy receives the vampire's bite and the doctor's needle with equal equanimity. Several critics have emphasized how Lucy's passivity marks her as a (sometimes sexual) site where the hunters can battle Dracula tooth and nail over her body, but I would emphasize the textual nature of their struggle and the way in which her body is literally inscribed with competing marks. The battle becomes a struggle for competing technologies of authorship and authority, and the only question to resolve is whether the docile text shall adopt the language of the vampire or be filled successfully with the blood/ink of good men and traditional narratives. Like the hunters, Dracula leaves his mark on Lucy's body, but his is the original narrative, one that is presumably as old as the three vampire women themselves, and possibly even more ancient. While the penetration of Lucy's body by the stake brings her death and the

medicalized needle/pen offers the potential for life, Dracula's marks promise a nebulous middle ground imbued with possibility. The dead Lucy is silent, but the bloofer lady is finally free to vocalize the passionate text she wrote in confidence to Mina. "My arms are hungry for you," she tells Arthur. "Come, and we can rest together. Come, my husband, come!" (250). The vampiric Lucy is expressing a repressed sexuality, but she is also giving voice to a repressed textuality which, while it echoes Dracula's "This man belongs to me!" (70), cannot be attributed entirely to the Count. The undead Lucy is finally making public the desire that had only existed in her private letters to Mina, and the new vampire has taken a prominent place in the popular media. Literate monsters, Dracula shows us, can liberate textually as well as sexually.

When faced with the threat of a textual monster, the hunters respond in kind. Garrett Stewart argues that "read through once, *Dracula* is about the writing-to-death of the vampiric. Read through once again, even if simultaneously, it is about the reading-to-death of the vampiric, in a calculated reversal of the nosferatu's own territorializing techniques" (Stewart 15). Both writing and reading are integral facets of a larger, overriding concern with texts and communication. For the hunters, that which is written into existence must be read and circulated, and so they create for Dracula a textual existence that can be fixed in the confining borders of language. Vrunda Sahay argues that vampires cannot be catalogued by science (Sahay 29), but they can and they are; Van Helsing sees to that. The struggle of the hunters is the struggle to textualize something that exists largely outside of written language, that has not been captured on paper like other (un)natural phenomena, and that attacks their writing at the same time that it guards its own. When Harker visits the British Museum, he finds himself "not able to light on

any map or work giving the exact locality of the Castle Dracula" (32). British textuality has encountered nothing like Dracula before, and its science finds itself unable to decipher the ravings of a confined lunatic, much less the textual wiles of an undocumented monster. As Kittler points out, Dracula "will neither allow himself to be bought, nor to be made into an image. He remains the Other, whom no mirror can reflect" (Kittler 153). The Count will not permit himself to be recorded in language or fixed into narrative unless he chooses to be, and, even then, if he must be the subject of the narrative, he makes himself also its author. Dracula fills Harker with the history of his country, safeguarding his own identity by ascribing the feats to an ancestor and placing the story within the discourse of oral tradition, thus depriving it of a textual existence which might be actualized into writing and wielded against him. Harker's journal, of course, is secretly undermining the orality of Dracula by writing the Count's words into existence as text--and in a form that Dracula cannot read. The solicitor's diary records a taxonomy of the vampiric from the beginning, translating the vampire into a form that can be studied, circulated, and possessed. Only after textual monsters have been captured in writing can they begin to be understood and destroyed.

A look at the tactics used by the vampire hunters reveals the common thread of textuality that informs all of their actions. Jonathan Harker initiates the textual campaign against Dracula when he attempts to write clandestinely to Mina in shorthand, sneaks an unauthorized peek at Dracula's letters, and diligently records his experiences, also in shorthand, in his journal. Van Helsing's books give more textual form to Dracula, and the process of writing the vampiric into existence is well under way. The hunters need to understand their enemy, and if contemporary British science in the form of Seward

proves unequal to the task, this can always be remedied through the production of writing and the introduction of foreign experts who know the importance of reading the right books. It is no accident that Van Helsing refers to Dracula as "the author of all this our sorrow" (256), for the doctor conceptualizes his opponent and their struggle in textual terms. He insists on examining Lucy's papers after her death, and it is he who burns Dracula's papers in the Piccadilly house. While Harker possesses more direct knowledge of Dracula, Van Helsing sets himself up as the leader of the group, again for textual reasons. Harker seals his journal and abrogates all knowledge of, and responsibility for, his writing; Van Helsing recognizes the importance of reading the enemy when he is trapped in printed form.

For all the textuality of the men, though, it is Mina who insists that all writing be homogenized into typewriting, and she replaces Jonathan's shorthand and Seward's wax cylinders with uniform text. Her efforts survive Dracula's arson, as she types in manifold, triplicating her work to disseminate it all the more rapidly. This textual assault on Dracula effectively reproduces the Count for the convenience of the hunters, and Mina is always on the watch for more ways to construct a textual existence for the vampire so he can be studied. She says, "I remember how much the *Dailygraph* and the *Whitby Gazette*, of which I had made cuttings, helped us to understand the terrible events at Whitby when Count Dracula landed, so I shall look through the evening papers since then, and perhaps I shall get some new light" (263). Mina clearly frames their fight with Dracula as a textual one, and this is literalized when Van Helsing inadvertently brands her forehead with the Sacred Wafer, revealing her vampiric nature at the same time. The quest takes on a dual importance from this point on, with the hunters seeking to kill

Dracula not only because of the threat he represents, but because of the vampiric mark that he, in a roundabout way, placed on their secretary. Corrupt data is dangerous, and the threat to their transcriber of texts is a threat to the group as a whole, for they are made vulnerable by the same reliance on texts and written information that gives them strength. Always the literate monster, Dracula exploits this informational weakness by using the marked secretary as a data channel, attempting to gain access to the hunters' plans by vampiric eavesdropping. Van Helsing, however, emphasizing the textual nature of the struggle, reverses the process after Mina suggests the possibility, and hacks into Dracula's mind, using Mina to read the Count's thoughts and relay them to the men. Dracula constructs biologically an early computer network that depends on the passive transmission of data, but he is unexpectedly countermanded by the medium herself, who can respond to his textual tactics in kind.

When Mina channels Dracula's thoughts to the men, it is significant that Dracula is denied the presence of a body, or, rather, that his body is translated first into information, then into language, and finally, through the journals, into text. The body of the vampire becomes insignificant except for its ability to record and transmit data. While Van Helsing warns the hunters many times that the Count "is of himself so strong in person as twenty men" (276), Dracula never becomes a direct physical threat to the men. On the contrary, he is easily warded off by the crucifixes and wafers in Piccadilly, and the hunters' dogs make short work of Dracula's rats. Dracula appears absent from most of the novel in part because he is more a text than a person. With the rise in authority of Van Helsing, Dracula becomes little more than a case history (Auerbach 82), and Garrett Stewart similarly argues that Dr. Seward records Mina's channeled words so

that "the nosferatu could be translated wholesale and per se to a textual form" (Stewart 13). In many ways, the Count is less a physical presence than a textual one. Harker never sees him eat, and the vampire makes no reflection in the mirror. Dracula exists in his texts; the monstrous presence is revealed to be language itself and the way in which it can turn on those Victorian professionals who depend on it. Even after they meet, Harker and Dracula communicate in writing. The Count reads Harker's letters while the solicitor peeks at those of the vampire; Harker avails himself of Dracula's library; and, when asked by Dracula to relate the details of his discovery of Carfax, Jonathan writes, "I read to him the notes which I had made at the time, and which I inscribe here" (53). Harker's journal, in which he dutifully records Dracula and his habits, becomes so much identified with the Count that Harker places it in Mina's possession when he wishes to forget about Dracula. When the reproduction and circulation of the journal becomes necessary, it is Dracula in textual form who is being circulated and devoured by the hunters. Gary Day points out that the characters "only ever really encounter one another as texts" (Day 88), and this is especially true of the vampire, who becomes a text copied and passed around by others. The creature who once was author of his own narrative has become the inscribed subject, examined and studied in the hands of his enemies.

In the end, the dissolution of Dracula's physical presence is carried to its logical conclusion, and the vampire's body disintegrates as he loses all authorial control to the new masters of texts and their weapons of inscription. Attacking simultaneously with the knife and pen, Dracula's hunters succeed in eradicating the competing narrative once and for all. Defeated by the onslaught of typing and texts, the vampire's "whole body crumbled into dust," Mina writes, "and passed from our sight" (418). Like the records

that he burned, and his own records which were immolated by Van Helsing, Dracula dies less a physical death than a textual one, passing into ashes like burned paper. The Count, who was once an active figure, has been rendered immobile by the confining power of language, fixed in the immutable form of typing, unable to escape the Victorian scientific taxonomy that binds him. He is text now, rather than author, and his silence mirrors the passivity of the inscribed medium, now controlled by the hunters, the new Victorian authors.

Seven years later (the amount of time, coincidentally, required for the body to replace every single one of its billions of cells), the hunters, renewed and regenerated, return to Transylvania to assert their authorship and ensure that the vampire, textually, remains dead. The final Note does not mention the Count at all, and the words "Dracula" or "vampire" are conspicuously absent. The young Quincey Harker's birthday is not referred to as the day that the hunters killed Dracula, or the day that they erased his mark from Mina's forehead, but as the day that Quincey Morris died. If the only information we have comes in the form of a "mass of typewriting" (419), then Dracula's failure to establish a dominant narrative voice has removed him from existence as effectively as his burned papers. Textual monsters cannot survive such denial of authorship. "I have been so long master that I would be master still," the Count once said. "Or at least that none other should be master of me" (51). When his fears come to pass, he is killed easily, without the religious and oral rituals required for Lucy. Dracula dies with the passivity of the injured, having never recovered from the triplicate wound inflicted upon him by Mina's typewriting. Mina's literal/literary vamping of the vampire reasserts the power of modern British texts over those monsters who would usurp it, and turns the vampire's

own co-opted textual weapons against him. In true vampiric tradition, however, Dracula refuses to stay dead, and the monster is reborn textually, cyclically, for succeeding generations. The blood of the vampire flows in the veins of their collective baby, and *Dracula*, since its first publication in 1897, has never been out of print.

### Chapter Three: Data and its Circulation

While *Dracula*, like Harker's shorthand journal, is "nineteenth century up-to-date with a vengeance" in its use of texts and writing, it also anticipates the twentieth century in its fascination with media and technologies of inscription. The product of writing in *Dracula* can never be disassociated from its process, and the "mass of typewriting" (419) that results from the hunters' obsession with recording information owes its existence to emerging technologies of mass production. Above all, this is a novel devoted to the collection, translation, dissemination and editing of data. What Rebecca Pope calls *Dracula's* "flaunted textuality" (Pope 199), however, makes itself felt at the level of both story and structure. The narrative comprises a multiplicity of documents, including shorthand diaries, penned journals, business letters, handwritten notes, phonographic wax cylinders, newspaper articles, telegrams and, of course, Mina's manifold typing. With such a patchwork structure, the creation of a single record of events shifts the necessary mode of literary production from authoring to editing. What emerges in *Dracula* is a move away from the individual as a discrete authorial unit towards a praxis of collective communication, where the texts created by the hunters can only be useful after they have been consumed, translated and homogenized by what Jennifer Wicke aptly refers to as "vampiric typewriting" (Wicke 467). Wicke's description of Mina's work as vampiric suggests that the apparently simple act of recording information is more complex than it

may seem. The collection and circulation of data on which the narrative depends always entails the transformative act of editing. If *Dracula* is about both the writing and reading to death of the vampiric, as Garrett Stewart has suggested, it is also about the predatory role of editing, which inevitably consumes not only the vampiric, but the texts of the hunters and, ultimately, the hunters themselves.

Even before they join forces, the vampire hunters are fascinated with data. Jonathan Harker's role as a solicitor places him in the middle of circulating texts and information, and he incorporates the data he finds into his journal, mixing the British Library's information with his personal observations until the distinction between them blurs. Harker's journal is a site where data coalesces, where people and places are reproduced as marks on a page. The solicitor's "polyglot dictionary" is his own portable British Library. Transforming foreign information into data comprehensible to an English reader, it serves as a model for the assimilation of data. When personal observation proves insufficient, Harker incorporates memos like "get recipe for Mina" (31) and "I must ask the Count all about them" (32) to remind himself to seek out the data he requires. Harker engages in a game with the vampire, trying to suck as much knowledge from Dracula as possible, even while the Count is doing the same to him. "In the meantime," Jonathan says, "I must find out all I can about Count Dracula, as it may help me to understand. Tonight he may talk of himself, if I turn the conversation that way" (59). Harker and Dracula each make unsuccessful attempts to drain the other's blood. Dracula lunges at Jonathan's throat after the solicitor cuts himself shaving (56), only to be repelled by the cross that Harker wears, while Jonathan strikes the sleeping vampire one blow with a shovel before feeling paralyzed by Dracula's gaze. Dracula and

Harker are certainly interested in obtaining each other's blood, but it is knowledge that both seek actively. Dracula succeeds to a greater extent than Harker, as the latter is positioned conspicuously as the object of consumption by his role as solicitor, but it is significant that Harker attempts to bite back through the medium of his journal. By recording information, Harker writes the vampire a textual existence.

This need for a system of data collection is shared by the other hunters. Seward, for example, goes so far as to conceptualize God as the "Great Recorder" (104), and the doctor evidently takes his bookkeeping deity as his model, for he diligently records his thoughts and experiences on wax cylinders. Expressing his desire to be "master of the facts" (93), Seward yearns for "even the secret of one such mind ... the key to the fancy of even one lunatic" (104). The pursuit of knowledge, of course, is one of the defining activities of the scientist, and Seward records what he sees, even while he "sees details without allowing them to be significant" (Greenway 218). It is one of the ironies of *Dracula* that the scientist who exists to observe and record data cannot analyze it successfully. He fails to perceive the importance of Lucy's bites and Renfield's actions, but his recordings help to lay the foundation of the database the hunters will later construct. Van Helsing also works out of a scientific (as well as a legal) background, and comes prepared to gather information. He lectures Seward on the importance of codifying information, telling him, "Remember, my friend, that knowledge is stronger than memory, and we should not trust the weaker" (155) and "I counsel you, put down in record even your doubts and surmises" (156). Van Helsing argues vehemently for the importance of collecting data, and he follows his own advice when he mines Lucy's room for information after her death, asks Arthur's permission to read Lucy's papers, and leaves

for the British Museum to research "ancient medicine" and "witch and demon cures" (313). The overriding need for data finds its ultimate expression in Van Helsing's surgical extraction of information from Renfield's head. Drilling into the patient's skull ostensibly to save his life, the doctor betrays his intentions when he says, "There is no time to lose. His words may be worth many lives" (317).

Once Van Helsing has opened Renfield's mouth by incising a new hole in his cranium, the patient tells what he knows and the hunters rush off, abandoning Renfield when they perceive that his voice is becoming "fainter and his breath more stertorous" (321). A person who cannot provide data is of no use to one engaged in the collection of information, and the hunters do not hesitate to obtain data by any means necessary, even if they must break into houses, distribute bribes and falsify death records. Information and espionage have a long and productive history. Dracula spies on the men in the form of a bat, the hunters spy on the vampire through the hypnotized Mina, and data is obtained through circuitous--and sometimes illegal--methods. The need to gather information which is not easily available points to the strategic importance of data acquisition. Dracula demonstrates his propensity for spying by overhearing the coach driver's words, but Harker comes prepared. The solicitor is soon eager to record his foreign subject in the pages of his journal, peering at Dracula "through the chink of the hinges of the door" (58) to record his appearance, his movements, and even, as Kittler points out, "how many times per evening the Count refills his glass" (Kittler 153).

As I have argued earlier, writing can stand in for an individual, and the hunters in *Dracula* initially write to assert their individual identities; that is, they define themselves through their writing. Harker's position as solicitor requires him to do so, but even

characters like Mina, who writes "to be useful to Jonathan" (86), and Seward, whose recorded cylinders ring "cruelly true" (261), have identities that are constructed in the novel, at least in part, through their writing. The hunters' reliance on writing as a primary means of self-definition can empower them, but it can also leave them vulnerable. Dracula evinces on more than one occasion the ability to use writing to manipulate characters. The need to conceal not just writing but information itself emerges from the related attempt to protect documents and, by extension, their authors. Secrecy in *Dracula* is essentially an effort to retain both individual knowledge and individual identities, to establish and maintain the existence of a unique authorial self in the presence of competing discourses. We are introduced to systems of concealed knowledge early in the novel, when Harker hands Dracula "the sealed letter which Mr Hawkins had entrusted" to him (47). Harker is little more than a courier, a means by which data can be transferred from England to Transylvania. He is a part of a closed system of knowledge transfer, in which Hawkins can communicate with the Count safe from the prying eyes of the messenger. Dracula, "with a charming smile" (47), permits Harker to read the letter but it is clear that the Count here is in control of the movement of data, and is certainly not averse to letting the solicitor discover that he is expected to "be ready to attend" on the Count and to "take [his] instructions in all matters" (48). David Sandner argues that Dracula's castle exists "on the edge of knowledge itself" (Sandner 295), and this is nowhere more evident than in the vampire's fixation with controlling and concealing data. Just as the Count leaves no reflection in the mirror, so he conceals money beneath his robes like the treasure hidden in the surrounding soil. His library is a place where knowledge is geographically confined and sorted, where Harker is allowed to let loose his

lust for data and gush, "In the library I found, to my great delight, a vast number of English books, whole shelves full of them" (50). Information is a precious commodity, as Harker soon discovers, and Dracula is careful to conceal it where necessary, responding with an emphatic "Good!" when Harker assures the Count that he could direct his own affairs, as "such is often done by men of business, who do not like the whole of their affairs to be known by any one person" (62). Dracula considers himself safe as long as information that could identify him is carefully concealed.

Dracula is by no means the only character to advocate secrecy. If anything, he is outdone by Van Helsing. The Dutch expert called in by Seward is quick to hide his theories, leading Seward to write to Arthur, "He would not give me any further clue" (149). When Seward, soon after, argues for the dissemination of knowledge, if only on a small scale, Van Helsing refuses. The professor insists on keeping his thoughts to himself, explaining to Seward,

"You tell not your madmen what you do nor why you do it; you tell them not what you think. So you shall keep knowledge in its place, where it may rest-- where it may gather its kind around it and breed. You and I shall keep as yet what we know here, and here." He touched me on the heart and on the forehead, and then touched himself the same way. "I have for myself thoughts at the present.

Later I shall unfold to you. (155)

Apart from its use as a narrative technique, this withholding of information establishes both the great importance that the professor attaches to data and the similarity of his approach to data transmission to that of Dracula; both characters endeavor to "keep knowledge in its place." This secrecy extends beyond the borders of the hunters' group

into legal matters, as Van Helsing encourages the falsifying of death certificates for Lucy, her mother, and Renfield. While the concealment of knowledge is used to advantage several times, it eventually begins to work against the group. Harker seals himself off from knowledge when he seals his journal, and the resulting fracture in his sense of identity can only be healed after Mina opens the book and Van Helsing authenticates it. Mina later argues, "We need have no secrets amongst us" (261), but soon afterwards she balks at disclosing her comforting of Arthur and Quincey, only telling Van Helsing about it "impulsively" and asking him, "Must it go in?" (275) Later that evening, the professor cuts Mina off from the circle of data exchange, telling her, "When we part tonight, you no more must question" (281). Logical though this seems to Van Helsing, the eviction of the data recorder from the group leaves her vulnerable to Dracula and his data.

If secrecy ultimately fails as a strategy because it does not allow for mass knowledge distribution and shared experience, then it is only by sharing information that the hunters can equip themselves with the knowledge necessary to defeat Dracula. The paradigm shift in *Dracula* is the movement from an individual to a collective body of knowledge, experience and writing. Jasmine Hall identifies circulation as the novel's central device (Hall 98), and this is a productive approach from which to examine the exchange of data that permeates the last half of *Dracula*. While Gary Day argues that the model for the story is the railway timetable (Day 91) because of its emphasis on an ordered sense of time, I would instead shift attention to forms of contemporary data distribution. Newspapers in *Dracula* provide an archetypal model for the mass circulation and the dissemination--even exchange--of information. In her first letter, Mina expresses her desire to, as she says, "try to do what I see lady journalists do" (86).

The group first hears about Lucy's vampiric exploits through the newspaper, which turns the "bloofer lady" (214) into a shared mass-cultural experience. While Dracula prizes and guards carefully his anonymity, the undead Lucy is splashed across headlines, forced into a public identity and given a name over which she has no control. That which is known can be understood, and Lucy's public unveiling in the *Westminster Gazette* provides valuable data to the group at the same time that it transforms her into a household name and cultural icon. It is important to note that, while Van Helsing was the first character to discover Lucy's mass-media existence, it is Mina who recognizes the importance of newspapers as a medium in which information is disseminated, and she takes it upon herself to mine them for data:

I remembered what Jonathan put in his diary of the Professor's perturbation at reading something in an evening paper at the station at Exeter, so, seeing that Dr Seward keeps his newspapers, I borrowed the files of the *Westminster Gazette* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* and took them to my room. I remember how much the *Dailygraph* and the *Whitby Gazette*, of which I had made cuttings, helped us to understand the terrible events at Whitby when Count Dracula landed, so I shall look through the evening papers since then, and perhaps I shall get some new light. (263)

Mina perceives the importance of newspapers as models of shared communication, and her typed narrative bears a striking similarity to the newspaper in its emphasis on chronology and dating, its attention to detail and desire for objective information, and in the distribution network that she implements in order to circulate it.

Once the circulation of journals begins, it gathers momentum rapidly. Mina initiates the process by typing out Jonathan's notebook the very next day after reading it, saying "I shall get my typewriter this very hour and begin transcribing. Then we shall be ready for other eyes if required" (216). Like newspapers, which demand frequent updates, Mina's typed narrative grows at a frenetic pace. Less than a week passes before she has typed out in triplicate and distributed Harker's record, her own journal and Seward's phonographic diary. Mina reads Jonathan's journal, Van Helsing reads Mina and Jonathan's journals, Seward reads Mina and Jonathan's journals, Mina listens to Seward's diary, Jonathan reads the transcript of Seward's diary, Arthur and Quincey both read Mina, Jonathan and Seward's journals and, finally, Van Helsing returns from Amsterdam to have the complete bundle of typewriting thrust upon him. Such is the power of circulating information that the moment that Mina can say "and so now, up to this very hour, all the records we have are complete and in order" (275) is in many ways the effective climax of the novel.

Much like the act of writing, the process of reading the journals is enforced by both Mina and Van Helsing. Mina occupies the position of editor after she establishes her superiority in data transcription over Van Helsing by playfully handing him the shorthand journal, which she knows he is unable to decipher, but the professor is no less rigorous when it comes to ensuring that the circulation of information has the desired effect. "Take these," he says to Seward as he hands him Mina and Jonathan's journals, "and study them well" (257). Just as Mina associates writing with exercising or practising, Van Helsing connects reading with the performance of a duty in an undelivered note to Seward: "Take the papers that are with this, the diaries of Harker and

the rest, and read them, and then find this great Un-Dead" (241). This emphasis on obtaining information is similarly evident in Harker's later decision to trace the movement of Dracula's boxes via business channels before attempting to search or act directly. The hunters are caught up in the flow of data, producing and reading and then producing more information in a continual process.

Data circulation embodies its own problems, however. While the individual author can often guard his writing against prying eyes, as Harker did with *Dracula*, a group that relies on the collective exchange of data is necessarily made vulnerable by the same data transmission that feeds their knowledge. Circulating texts are exposed texts, neither wholly public nor private documents, which can be intercepted or lost, read by unauthorized eyes or overlooked by the intended ones. The first indication that circulating information can be used against its author appears in *Dracula's* castle, when Harker is unable to mail his clandestine letters. The problem reappears later when Van Helsing's telegram to Seward, instructing him to watch over Lucy (and warning him twice, "do not fail"; 178), is misdirected and delivered twenty-two hours late. Lucy's mother dies during that period, and Lucy is attacked for the last time, ultimately resulting in her death and in two undelivered letters to Mina. The oral sharing of information also allows Dracula to overhear his enemies' plans. The vampire eavesdrops on the hunters' conversations in the form of a bat, and spies on the group in Carfax while in his elemental mist form. The borders of circulating knowledge can be impossible to police, and information has a way of escaping its original boundaries.

It is impossible to discuss the circulation of data in *Dracula* without calling attention to the importance of blood. Blood is fluid data, read and analyzed like

information, flowing from one person to another in a corporeal parallel to the circulation of knowledge. Lucy's transfusions, for example, move blood from Arthur, Seward, Van Helsing and Quincey into the body of Lucy, which is then (with the single exception of Quincey's) removed from her body by Dracula and later transferred to Mina. Van Helsing even describes the flow of blood using game terminology, exclaiming "Check to the King!" (185) as he tends to Lucy during the interval between the removal of her blood by Dracula and the insertion of new blood by Quincey. Seward analyzes Lucy's original blood, before it became irretrievably mixed with the men's blood, and concludes that "the qualitative analysis gives a quite normal condition, and shows, I should infer, in itself a vigorous state of health" (147). Blood functions here as raw data, able to be examined, analyzed scientifically and even misinterpreted.

When Dracula forces Mina to drink his blood after consuming hers, he initiates a circular flow of both blood and data, intermingling their fluids and their knowledge simultaneously, for there is no way to differentiate the two. As Kittler says, the fellatio scene "is nothing more than a flow of information" (Kittler 167). It comes as no surprise when Mina, always the editor, perceives in a brilliant insight that data circulation must by definition operate both ways. If Dracula forced her to drink from him so that he might have power over her through the communicative channel of his blood, then so must she have some power over him by means of her blood in his body. Sure enough, Van Helsing is able to hypnotize her and he instigates the movement of information through this new medium. Of course, Mina is only made vulnerable once she is excised from the closed circle of data circulation, and it takes a vampiric attack to drive home the paradoxical lesson that Mina must not be excluded from the circulation of information at

the same time that she now cannot be allowed to know too much. As a breach in their protective wall and an informational link with their opponent, Mina is herself the primary site of data distribution, at the heart of the novel's circulatory network.

Critical opinion regarding the hypnotized Mina moves between two extremes, from seeing her as a passive "living dictaphone" (Stewart 13) to reading her as "productive in her consumptive possession" (Wicke 486). Jennifer Wicke hits closer to the mark, for Mina is able to function as a data recording machine with no apparent identity of her own, and then immediately make the transition to a more analytical mode so that she might examine the words she cannot remember speaking. Wicke, however, argues that Mina is never a passive medium, insisting that "despite the continual attempts both consciously by the characters and unconsciously by the text itself to view Mina as a medium of transmission, it continually emerges that there is no such thing as passive transmission--invariably, intelligent knowledge is involved, and Mina goes to the heart of things analytically and structurally" (Wicke 485). While Mina is very much an analytical presence, in the context of the novel she undeniably adopts a passive position during the actual hypnotism itself, relative of course to the controlling role of Van Helsing. Mina is certainly active in reading Dracula's thoughts, and in conceiving of the potential for hypnotism in the first place, but during the act she is very much a passive medium of transmission, transferring data from one site to another like a telegraph and vocalizing it like a phonograph. Thus bringing the mechanical and the human closer together, *Dracula* blurs boundaries between technology and its user, and, more importantly, between the process and the product of information gathering. Information in the novel cannot be disassociated from its medium of transmission, thus implicating the characters

in their use of technology. The crucial point here is that Mina *does* allow herself to become an acquiescent medium for the transmission of data, conveying vampirically disembodied data with the machine-like objectivity of the telegraph. In her eagerness to be hypnotized and to interpret the results later, Mina situates herself (as the other hunters do) within the vampiric tradition of thought-reading. In a similar way, the men make use of the transmission of disembodied data through the technology of the telegraph, suggesting an unexpected connection between the vampire and the media that the hunters use to destroy him.

The technological element is important here, for the hunters rely heavily on contemporary and bleeding-edge technology in their fight against Dracula. Telegraphs are crucial, both for the messages they deliver on time and for those rare but important ones that they do not. They made their way to London in the mid-nineteenth century, anticipating the Count's later journey to England, and quickly became an indispensable way to transmit data across a distance. Telegraphs are primarily significant in *Dracula* for the immateriality of their messages. Electricity functions as a direct counterpart to Dracula's insubstantiality, for the vampire as elemental mist is no more corporeal than the electric current transmitted over the telegraph lines. Telegraphic data, like Dracula, is information independent of a fixed body, fluid in its ability to permeate spaces and emerge from the most miniscule openings, but vampirically limited in where and when it can travel. The hunters make frequent use of this technology of data movement. The first words recorded by Arthur in the novel are transmitted by telegraph to Quincey (94), and even while pursuing Dracula the men still take advantage of the device to reserve their hotel rooms in advance (388). Powered by electricity instead of blood, the telegraph

allows the hunters to duplicate some of the powers of the vampire. It is worth mentioning the telephone that makes an appearance in the offices of Carter Paterson (266). Combining the telegraph's ability to transmit disembodied data with the phonograph's ability to reproduce disembodied voices, the telephone is a both a cutting-edge technology and a vampiric media that shares much in common with Dracula.

Technology in *Dracula* is both pervasive and diverse, and Harker anticipates this trend by bringing a Kodak with him to Dracula's castle. The name "Kodak" first appeared in 1888 with the introduction of an easy-to-use camera from the Eastman Dry Plate and Film Company called, simply, a Kodak. Kodaks were first introduced in the United States, but George Eastman, perceiving more rapidly than Dracula the potential for expansion, soon began international distribution. He set up a London Kodak distributor in 1889 and built a factory at nearby Harrow, England in 1891. Elizabeth Miller makes a compelling argument for 1893 as the year in which the novel is set (Miller, *Sense and Nonsense*, 103), which places Harker's Kodak at the forefront of contemporary technology. Wicke describes the Kodak as "a celluloid analog of vampirism in action, the extraction out of an essence in an act of consumption" (Wicke 472), which addresses the vampiric nature of the image but doesn't quite go far enough in examining its potential. Like vampires, Kodak negatives embodied an inherent potential for virtually limitless and uniform reproduction. After an image was recorded on the light-sensitive emulsion, the film was developed into photographic negatives, which could then produce prints when light was shone through them onto photographic paper. The potential for the mass production of identical prints is the same principle underlying vampiric reproduction, and the threat of an endless series of identical copies from one

original is embodied not only by Dracula but by the very technologies used by the hunters. As well, the colonizing nature of the emerging multi-national company cannot help but mirror Dracula's border-crossing aspirations. Just as Dracula threatens to turn the British into consumers of blood, so does Kodak threaten to turn them into consumers of celluloid, in addition to the already consumptive power of the image that Wicke discusses. Mass production (of cameras as well as prints) and distribution have much in common with vampiric ambition.

The phonograph (commonly associated in the novel with Seward, although Lucy has one as well) is another contemporary technology that pushed the limits of science at the same time that it allied itself with vampiric data transmission. While Thomas Edison invented the first phonograph in 1877, it wasn't until 1887 that Chichester Bell (the telephone inventor's cousin) and Charles Tainter released the first phonograph to record on wax cylinders instead of ones coated with tinfoil. Edison promptly revised his phonograph along similar lines, promoting it as a machine for business dictation. This is likely the phonograph used by Seward, which emphasizes yet again the progressive nature of *Dracula's* media, given the 1893 setting of the novel. Seward records most of his journals on the phonograph, relying on its ability to preserve his voice as a speaking subject distinct from his physical body. Wax cylinders vampirically disembody voices and allow them to be reproduced at other times and places, just as Mina is able to give voice to the vampiric data she transmits in her telegraph-like state. Jennifer Wicke argues convincingly that the phonograph cannot be dismissed as a throwback to traditional orality, specifying that "we are not dealing here with pure speech in opposition to writing, but instead with speech already colonized, or vampirized, by mass mediation"

(Wicke 471). Even the act of listening to the phonograph is a vampiric operation, although critics have so far neglected this aspect. Mina's description of the "forked metal" (262) which she puts to her ears suggests the twin teeth that are later to be put to her neck, and her reaction to the process again calls to mind her response to Dracula. She writes, "When the terrible story of Lucy's death, and--and all that followed, was done, I lay back in my chair powerless. Fortunately I am not of a fainting disposition .... My brain was all in a whirl" (262). Mina receives Seward's information as she does Dracula's blood, and in both cases there is a transfer of data. The phonograph consumes Mina just as she consumes its data, and Mina shares a similar reciprocal relationship of data exchange with the vampire after their exchange of blood. Seward continues to record his journals on the phonograph until Van Helsing orders him in Varna to use a pen instead, and Mina is both consumer and consumed, vampire and hunter, each time she places the forked metal to her skin.

If vampires are consumers of blood and data, they also can be consumed. I have argued that newspapers function as the model for mass communication in the novel, but they are also sites of consumption. Lucy is consumed by this medium, becoming "currency within mass culture, where she circulates in the mass blood stream with a delicious thrill as the 'bloofer lady' .... The un-dead Lucy is similarly vamped by the press, and vamps all those who come under her thrall by just reading about her in the morning newspaper" (Wicke 474). Newspapers actualize the process of ongoing mass-reproduction that vampires constantly threaten. By daily reproducing the vampiric Lucy in the form of the "bloofer lady," the newspapers engage in a reciprocal act of consumption with their readers more efficiently than even Dracula. Once the vampiric

Lucy has been written into existence through the mass media, she can be consumed like data by the hunters. In this way, the newspapers provide the first clue for defeating Dracula. Vampires are only vulnerable once their victims successfully reverse the process of consumption and consume the undead through the mass reproduction and distribution of data. It is no accident that Mina responds to her vampiring by the "forked metal" of Seward's phonograph by immediately uncovering her typewriter and saying,

Let me write this all out now. We must be ready for Dr Van Helsing when he comes. I have sent a telegram to Jonathan to come on here when he arrives in London from Whitby. In this matter dates are everything, and I think that if we get all of our material ready, and have every item put in chronological order, we shall have done much. You tell me that Lord Godalming and Mr Morris are coming too. Let us be able to tell them when they come. (262)

In this one speech she outlines the consumptive strategy of mass reproduction (she types in manifold to produce three identical copies) organized chronologically like newspapers and intended for mass distribution. Mina is not willing to submit passively to the controlling data that she encounters. She makes herself master of Seward's oral diary by fixing it in typing, translating Seward's "cruelly true" words into the emotionless mechanical form already used for the mass reproduction of data in the newspapers. At the same time, she is the one who advocates strongly the mass distribution of information. "We must have all the knowledge and all the help which we can get," she tells Seward. "We need have no secrets amongst us; working together and with absolute trust, we can surely be stronger than if some of us were in the dark" (261). Mina is almost single-handedly responsible for the shift from individual to collective texts, and

she accomplishes this by turning to the characteristically vampiric strategy of mass reproduction. Mina's strategic thinking here anticipates her very similar reaction after Dracula attacks her. With the help of Van Helsing, the hypnotized Mina reverses the process of consumption and vampirically drains the vampire's data. She attributes her decision to be hypnotized to an inspiration which, vampirically, "must have come in the night" (351). The origin of this insight, however, can be located in the act of typing, which serves as a model on how to drain subjects of their individuality in order to produce and distribute them as mass commodities so that data can be extracted.

Jennifer Wicke argues for such a connection between typewriters and vampires, and uses the phrase "vampiric typewriting" (Wicke 467) to describe this mechanical overwriting of individual expression with mass-produced symbols. "Typewriting itself partakes of the vampiric," she writes, "although paradoxically in this text it can serve also as an instrument used to destroy it" (Wicke 476). The paradox she mentions is a pervasive one, and has significant ramifications for reading the novel. While vampires continually embody the threat of unlimited reproduction by their potential to make multiple copies of themselves, individuals on their own never duplicate their own writing, limiting any bifurcations of their identity to the one body of writing that they produce for personal consumption only and that they conceal from the eyes of others. However, these same individuals find their texts suddenly co-opted by Mina, who consumes and then regurgitates them as mass-produced copies, sterilized and mechanized by the inscribing keys of the typewriter, overwritten by uniform text and mingled with the data of others until any sign of individuality is submerged in the new collective body of identical writing. The threat and power of mass reproduction that the hunters fear in Dracula is

now being used in the fight against the vampire, but to win this struggle the hunters must relinquish control over their data to Mina, the central editor, who translates, rewrites, copies, distributes and interprets it for them. The mass reproductive capabilities hinted at by Dracula's three female vampires finds its technological extension in Mina's manifold typing, which similarly produces three identical copies with each press of her finger. When Harker can read his diary to the hunters "as the best means of letting them get abreast of [his] own information" (306), data has taken on a life of its own. Seward earlier answers a question from Van Helsing with the words, "Excuse me ... but the answer is here," immediately adding to his current diary, "I laid my hand on the type-written matter" (294). People are, if not virtually redundant, at least secondary to data in this new world of typing and circulating information where journals can take the place of individual speech and vampiric typewriting overwrites even the journals.

The transition from unique expression to homogenized typing shifts the primary focus of the text from authors to editors, thus laying the groundwork for the "mass of documents" with which we are ultimately left. This is not to say that authors are any less important, for it is still their thoughts and words which need to exist in order to be consumed and translated. Instead, individual authorship is no longer sufficient to convey information efficiently, and any insights must now be found not in the mere collection of information, but in the collision of data--the process of bringing several disparate elements in contact with each other to extract a conclusion. After Mina hands Arthur the typewritten copies of the journals of Seward, Jonathan and herself, he asks her, "Did you write all this, Mrs Harker?" (267). Tellingly, she nods. The issue is not merely one of transcription, for Mina's acknowledgement of the word "write" positions the act of

editing as the key role in constructing texts. She may not have written the journals, but her act of translating, recording and reproducing them gives her the right to exert both editorial and authorial control over them. With this control, Mina is able to consume the data that comprises her narrative and to interpret it accordingly. Once she has persuaded Van Helsing to supply her with all the papers she has not yet seen so that she can predict the escaping vampire's route, Mina examines them for patterns of behaviour, digesting the data until she can write, "I am more than ever sure that I am right. My new conclusion is ready" (392).

I am not trying to argue that Mina lacks respect for individual writing or that she is unnecessarily dictatorial about enforcing her editorial control. On the contrary, she evinces a considerable degree of modesty, speculating that "perhaps [she] may arrive at some conclusion" and attributing her success to "God's providence" (391). Even after she is "more than ever sure" that she is correct, she still recognizes the need for external judgment when she writes, "I shall get our party together and read it. They can judge it; it is well to be accurate, and every minute is precious" (392). Mina, like typing, embodies elements of paradox in her character. While she is willing to serve as a passive medium for transmission, actualizing Van Helsing's assessment of her as "so little an egoist" (226), she is also the most assertive of the hunters in many ways. She assumes control of the movement of data, taking responsibility for its translation, mass reproduction and circulation. While Seward complains, "How I miss my phonograph! To write a diary with a pen is irksome to me; but Van Helsing says I must" (376), Mina is able to write, "I feel so grateful to the man who invented the 'Traveller's' typewriter, and to Mr Morris for getting this one for me. I should have felt quite astray doing the work if

I had to write with a pen..." (391). Modest though she may be, she is still in control of the distribution and analysis of data, and she finds the thought of recording information with a pen instead of her vampiric typewriter troublesome.

The vampiric nature of the technologies on which the hunters depend helps to explain the precise nature of an underlying textual anxiety. In a novel as prototypically contemporary as *Dracula*, it is peculiar how advanced technologies so often break down or frustrate attempts to communicate data successfully. Letters are undelivered, telegrams are misdirected and fatally late, shorthand is illegible by all but the few, and Seward cannot even locate specific sections of his diary because of the nature of the medium on which it is recorded. To the hunters, Dracula appears as a nebulous body, a threat which exists apart from physical bodies. He can move through the air across distances as elemental mist; he can change shape and appear in many different forms; he can travel through the tiniest spaces yet still have physical limitations on his movement; and he can read Mina's thoughts. Dracula is a manifestation of data in many ways, but he is also a literalization of anxieties regarding contemporary technology. If any circulation of information beyond the immediate boundaries of the individual author's mind carries with it the potential for that information to be observed, then the vulnerability of the discrete authorial subject is directly connected to technologies of mass reproduction and data transmission. Newspapers, phonographs, telegraphs, telephones and typing are all technologies which translate information and then transmit it through data channels so that it might be heard, seen and recorded. The undead Lucy is rendered vulnerable and ultimately killed once she is consumed by the mass media, and technologies render the author similarly vulnerable to eavesdroppers. Dracula's ongoing efforts to spy on the

hunters to obtain data, as he once did to the coach driver, call attention in the novel to underlying anxieties concerning contemporary technologies of data circulation.

The apparent discrepancy between the cutting-edge technologies used to hunt Dracula and the seemingly primitive knives used to kill him can be understood as a parallel to the struggle between the process and the product of information gathering--between the existence of individual authors and the conflicting need for ubiquitous and standardized data. Just as Seward expresses doubts about letting the rest of the group read the private words spoken into his phonograph, so is there an unease concerning the very technologies which the hunters apparently embrace. Dracula is killed with knives instead of Winchesters for the same reason that Jonathan Harker once wrote, "unless my senses deceive me, the old centuries had, and have, powers of their own which mere 'modernity' cannot kill" (67). Jennifer Wicke argues that Dracula cannot be reproduced in the mass media because he is "an articulation of, a figuration for, that same mass culture" (Wicke 475). I would shift the focus slightly, and argue that Dracula cannot be killed by contemporary technology because he embodies the complete potential of that technology. It is not that his abilities are too primitive, but rather that they are too modern; they echo uncomfortably in the minds of the hunters, who are forced to contend with a monster who has a more advanced understanding of data circulation than they do initially. The ultimate textual anxiety in *Dracula* is the fear that the very technologies and media of data transmission that purport to be objective, scientific and reliable will prove otherwise. It is the fear that the bureaucratic move from pens to typewriters, which also signals a move from the male clerk with his pen and penmanship to a more inexpensive female workforce of typists (Kittler 155), will somehow undermine the

structure and stability of late Victorian society. Just as information cannot be dissevered from its media of inscription, so are vampires irrevocably bound to the technologies of their destruction.

And so, in the end, the anxieties are apparently resolved, both by the death of Dracula and, more significantly, through the return of narrative control to Jonathan, in whose journal the story originally began. Harker narrates the final Note, reasserting his authorial position by referring to Mina occasionally as a "mother" (419) instead of an editor, and taking the role of editor upon himself by publishing Mina's "secret belief" that some of Quincey's spirit has passed into their son. Jasmine Hall equates Mina the secretary with Mina the wife in that both reproduce copies that bear the male name (Hall 113), implying that little has changed by the end in this respect, but this ignores the now-absent editorial power that Mina had over the dissemination of information. Gone are the struggles with technology and the uncertainties about valid data; both have become non-issues. Their convoluted chase of Dracula and the damage to their boat is replaced by the mild and unassuming line, "in the summer of this year we made a journey to Transylvania" (419). Similarly, their earlier anxieties about the quality of their data (as exemplified in Harker's emotional breakdown before Van Helsing validates his narrative) have been replaced by Van Helsing's "we want no proofs; we ask none to believe us!" and by Harker's admission that "it was almost impossible to believe that the things which we had seen with our own eyes and heard with our own ears were living truths" (419). Concerns about the distribution of data are also conspicuously absent, and Quincey Harker has replaced the group of hunters as the only intended recipient of information.

Jonathan never once mentions the name "Dracula" nor the word "vampire," and references to the Count are curiously nonexistent.

The final Note, however, is not as uncomplicated as it may appear. While the Note may seem to avoid the issue of vampiric consumption altogether, it is still a part of the "mass of typewriting" that remains as the leftovers of vampirism. Jennifer Wicke sees *Dracula* as a modern(ist) text because "it knows that it will be consumed--it stages the very act of its own consumption, and problematizes it" (Wicke 491). The Note's "mass of typewriting" is, as Wicke points out, at odds with the opening declaration, which affirms not only the simplicity of the text but its authority when it says,

All needless matters have been eliminated, so that a history almost at variance with the possibilities of later-day belief may stand forth as simple fact. There is throughout no statement of past things wherein memory may err, for all the records chosen are exactly contemporary, given from the standpoints and within the range of knowledge of those who made them. (29)

This affirmation of the narrative's authority is at odds with the skeptical and dismissive attitude towards the text's authenticity in the final Note. The hunters are left with no more originals, with nothing to identify them as individual authors. The collective writing that Mina initiates lives on in the mass/mess of typewriting and in Quincey Harker, for his "bundle of names" (419) reproduces the hunters for another generation. Even more significant is the fact that Quincey has the blood of the vampire running through his veins, in addition to that of three of the four hunters who gave their blood to Lucy. The child embodies, in a very literal sense, every hunter except for the adult Quincey, who transfers his blood to Lucy after *Dracula's* final attack on her. Data in the

form of blood still circulates, and the fluid which moves from Arthur, Seward and Van Helsing into Lucy has made its way through Dracula into Mina, and through Mina into her son, who will one day, presumably, read the entire narrative and, by reading, consume the documents that consumed Dracula. As much as the solicitor attempts to prevent the circulation of information by locking up the notes ("I took the papers from the safe where they had been ever since our return so long ago"; 419), it lives on in the body of Quincey Harker. Data and blood are inseparable, and knowledge will still circulate beyond the control of its editors. Rebecca Pope argues that "epilogues are often places of maximum repression" (Pope 213), and the technological and textual anxieties which permeate *Dracula* are all the more visible in the final Note for their attempted repression. The hunters seek to co-opt mass media and communication for their own purposes, to use vampiric technologies of data reproduction and dissemination to put an end to the threat of uncontrolled vampiric reproduction. Inescapably, however, their legacies for the future--the existing body of text and Quincey Jr.--are both products of vampirism, free to circulate in society and marked by the vampiric data that Harker insists has been "blotted out" (419) permanently. Vampires can be killed, but their legacies circulate endlessly.

## Works Consulted

- Arata, Stephen. *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Auerbach, Nina. *Our Vampires, Ourselves*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Bentley, C. F. "Sexual Symbolism in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Literature and Psychology* 22.1 (1972): 27-34.
- Brennan, Matthew C. "The Novel as Nightmare: Decentering of the Self in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 7.4 (1996): 48-59.
- Byers, Thomas. "Good Men and Monsters: The Defenses of *Dracula*." *Literature and Psychology* 31.4 (1981): 24-31.
- Carter, Margaret. *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988.
- Coats, Daryl R. "Bram Stoker and the Ambiguity of Identity." *Publications of the Mississippi Philological Association* (1984): 88-105.
- Craft, Christopher. "'Kiss Me with Those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Representations* 8 (1984): 107-33.
- Cribb, Susan. "'If I had to write with a pen': Readership and Bram Stoker's Diary Narrative." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 10.2 (1999): 133-41.
- Croley, Laura Sagolla. "The Rhetoric of Reform in Stoker's *Dracula*: Depravity, Decline, and the Fin-de-Siècle 'Residuum'." *Criticism* 37.1 (1995): 85-108.
- Daly, Nicholas. "Incorporated Bodies: *Dracula* and the Rise of Professionalism." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. 39.2 (1997): 181-202.
- Day, Gary. "The State of *Dracula*: Bureaucracy and the Vampire." *Rereading Victorian Fiction*. Ed. Alice Jenkins and Juliet John. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000. 81-95.
- Fontana, Ernest. "Lombroso's Criminal Man and Stoker's *Dracula*." *The Victorian Newsletter* 66 (1984): 25-27.
- Fowler, Christopher. "Dracula's Library." *Critical Quarterly* 40.2 (1998): 48-58.

- Glover, David. "'Our Enemy is Not Merely Spiritual': Degeneration and Modernity in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 22 (1994): 249-65.
- . *Vampires, Mummies, and Liberals: Bram Stoker and the Politics of Popular Fiction*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Greenway, John. "Seward's Folly: *Dracula* as a Critique of 'Normal Science'." *Stanford Literature Review* 3.2 (1986): 213-30.
- . "'Unconscious Cerebration' and the Happy Ending of *Dracula*." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 4 (2002): 1-9.
- Halberstam, Judith. "Technologies of Monstrosity: Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Studies* 36.3 (1993): 332-52.
- Hall, Jasmine. "Solicitors Soliciting: The Dangerous Circulations of Professionalism in *Dracula* (1897)." *The New Nineteenth Century: Feminist Readings of Underread Victorian Fiction*. Ed. Barbara Leah Harman and Susan Meyer. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1996. 97-116.
- Kittler, Friedrich. "Dracula's Legacy." *Stanford Humanities Review* 1.1 (1989): 143-73.
- Krumm, Pascale. "Metamorphosis as Metaphor in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *The Victorian Newsletter* 88 (1995): 5-11.
- Marigny, Jean. "Secrecy as Strategy in *Dracula*." *Journal of Dracula Studies* 2 (2000): 3-7.
- Martin, Philip. "The Vampire in the Looking-Glass: Reflection and Projection in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Nineteenth-Century Suspense: From Poe to Conan Doyle*. Ed. Clive Bloom et al. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1988.
- May, Leila. "'Foul Things of the Night': Dread in the Victorian Body." *Modern Language Review* 93 (1998): 16-22.
- Miller, Elizabeth. *Dracula: Sense and Nonsense*. Westcliff-on-Sea: Desert Island Books Limited, 2000.
- . *Reflections on Dracula: Ten Essays*. White Rock: Transylvania, 1997.
- Netto, Jeffrey. "Violence and the Scene of Writing: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis and Technologies of Inscription." *The Image of Violence in Literature, the Media, and Society*. Ed. Wright and Kaplan. Colorado Springs: U of Southern Colorado, 1995.

- Pick, Daniel. "Terrors of the night': *Dracula* and 'degeneration' in the late nineteenth century." *Critical Quarterly* 30.4 (1988): 71-87.
- Pope, Rebecca. "Writing and Biting in *Dracula*." *LIT* 1 (1990): 199-216.
- Roberts, Bette. "Victorian Values in the Narration of *Dracula*." *Studies in Weird Fiction* 6 (1989): 10-14.
- Sandner, David. "Up-to-date with a Vengeance: Modern Monsters in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Margaret Oliphant's 'The Secret Chamber'." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 8.3 (1997): 294-309.
- Scandura, Jani. "Deadly Professions: *Dracula*, Undertakers, and the Embalmed Corpse." *Victorian Studies* 40.1 (1996): 1-30.
- Seed, David. "The Narrative Method of *Dracula*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 40.1 (1985): 61-75.
- Seltzer, Mark. "Serial Killers." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 5.1 (1993): 92-128.
- Senf, Carol. "*Dracula*: The Unseen Face in the Mirror." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 9.3 (1979): 160-78.
- . *The Critical Response to Bram Stoker*. Westport: Greenwood, 1993.
- Smith, Malcolm. "Dracula and the Victorian Frame of Mind." *Trivium* 24 (1989): 76-97.
- Spencer, Kathleen L. "Purity and Danger: *Dracula*, the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis." *ELH* 59.1 (1992): 197-255.
- Stavick, J.e.d. "Love at First Beet: Vegetarian Critical Theory Meats *Dracula*." *The Victorian Newsletter* 89 (1996): 23-29.
- Stewart, Garrett. "'Count Me In': *Dracula*, Hypnotic Participation, and the Late-Victorian Gothic of Reading." *LIT* 5.1 (1994): 1-18.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. Ed. Glennis Byron. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1998.
- Thompson, David. "Supinely Anticipating Red-Eyed Shadows: A Jungian Analysis of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 15.3-4 (1994): 289-301.
- Wall, Geoffrey. "'Different from Writing': *Dracula* in 1897." *Literature and History* 10.1 (1984): 15-23.

Wicke, Jennifer. "Vampiric Typewriting: *Dracula* and its Media." *ELH* 59 (1992): 467-93.

Wood, Robin. "Burying the Undead: The Use and Obsolescence of Count Dracula." *Mosaic* 16.1-2 (1983): 175-87.