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Introduction

As a cursory glance at any current film magazine, newspaper or TV guide will confirm, the popularity of adaptations shows no signs of abating. Although it is difficult to measure precisely, it is estimated that an average of thirty percent of all movies produced derive from novels, not to mention adaptations from other sources (Holt, 36).

At first sight, adaptation might then seem like an ideal field of investigation: always topical, at once easily fathomable and wide-ranging. The pervasiveness of adaptations combined with the deceptive "accessibility" of the term may give the illusion that research in this field has been exhaustive and/or straightforward. This illusion, however, does not take long to dispel once one begins to delve into the intricacies of adaptation theories.

Adaptation is not a clear-cut term nor is it a simple concept. At its very core lies an epistemological obstacle so arduous that it has often been circumvented: the problematic intrasemiotic transfer implied by the process (in text to film adaptation). If adaptation is considered as the transformation of meanings expressed through certain semiotic materials into other meanings and/or different semiotic materials in a new environment, on what grounds could an invariant core enabling comparison be posited and how should it then be articulated?

While this issue is central to an in-depth exploration into the process of adapting, it has attracted less criticism than one might expect and only recently has it come to feature prominently amongst the concerns of adaptation theorists. Previous investigations had often eluded the problem by centring on more abstract notions such as the much-inflated, but increasingly obsolete, term of fidelity. Another bias resulting from this complication was to devote almost exclusive attention to what was considered more straightforwardly transferable: content (and particularly narrative) over form.
When I initially decided to explore the meanders of adaptation, my interest was drawn
to the transformation(s) of language but it quickly became apparent that behind the word
“language”, in literature and in film, lay very different notions. This rapidly became the
cornerstone of this thesis’s investigation: if language is a system which works through double
articulation (as form and meaning), do not other semiotic systems, such as multi-track film,
transfer their meanings through multiple articulations?

It was at this stage that I first became acquainted with theories of multimodal
discourse and the systemic-functional grammatical models which underlay them. My
excitement grew as I realised that this theoretical approach offered a methodological
framework that would not only account for differences in the articulation of meanings through
diverse semiotic systems but also, through an underlying common core, enable these
differences to be re-cast and/or transcended.

The perspective which this thesis proposes is then resolutely new but has antecedents
and ramifications in a series of related (and a few more remote) disciplines. It was adopted
after fairly comprehensive exploration of foundational adaptation theories and the trends
governing them.

The first part of this work thus presents not only the methodology which has been
devised and implemented but also explores the background leading to its adoption. The need,
in terms of scope and reach, for a flexible and inclusive model required some backtracking
and sidestepping into adjoining fields. This investigation into the state of the art then weaves
together strands of adaptation theory with discourse analysis, film semiotics, multimodality
and even sociology. The intricacy of this endeavour will hopefully appear justified by the
intricacy of the issue itself and the many pitfalls it has previously presented. Robert Stam, one
of the leading adaptation theorists, has similarly advocated what he labels “theoretical
cubism (Theory, 1), arguing that a complex medium such as film (not to mention adaptation) virtually demands complexity in its exploration.

Even as the theoretical paradigm is presented and defended and before it is tested, cautions and potential limitations to its implementation are acknowledged. If the model can enable or facilitate insights into the processes of adaptation through investigation of its products, it must also take into account the nature of the products or texts¹ being examined, the centrality of context (or even contexts: situational and cultural) and the ultimate subjectivity that unavoidably shapes any analysis.

Two more factors deserve mention before the corpus is delineated, notably because they factored considerably in its selection. First, the notion that the grids proposed aim to assist comparison but by no means to support evaluation. Adaptation theory has often confused these notions, indulging in comparisons while often matter-of-factly conferring some kind of axiomatic primacy/superiority to the original. This prejudice is increasingly being challenged, most notably by the growing interest in intertextuality as an alternative to fidelity criticism. Second, the belief that the use of the methodology presented here may help redress another long-standing bias in adaptation: the pre-eminence of comparisons based on content rather than form.

The working hypothesis is then the following: a multimodal systemic functional model provides the analyst not only with wider insight into the process(es) of adaptation, but also with a complex yet manageable methodological apparatus which enables comparison and articulation of these comparisons over and above intrasemiotic boundaries.

¹ The choice of the term « text » to describe both traditional linguistic text and film-text is deliberate and further developed in section 1.7.2.
Once the methodological approach was chosen, it required a coherent corpus for its application. As stated above, adaptations have always been a prolific part of film history; in choosing their examples and/or corpora, adaptations theorists have generally resorted to selections which were arbitrary to a certain degree, but by no means haphazard. I followed the same path and chose two defining factors which, to my mind, would provide a unified textual body worthy of investigation.

First, my attention was drawn to the issue of the prevalence of transfers of content over form, as had been borne out by the methodological exploration. To restore the balance and allow closer scrutiny, I chose texts whose original form offered face-value resistance to transposition. Rather than a straightforward and/or heavily dialogued narrative, the idea was to use a text which was “fragmented” in some manner and then observe if and how features of this fragmentation had found their way to the screen.

Second, in an effort to avoid the evaluative pitfall, I opted for original texts which had seen various and varied adaptations. Rather than present a two-valued reading which would oppose the original author’s view to that of the adaptor, the aim was to engage in an intertextual plurilogue with a variety of texts. This would in turn allow common traits between the adaptations to surface and therefore facilitate comments on the nature of the adaptive process itself.

Although a wider corpus was initially considered, it rapidly emerged that the analytical grids which had been chosen demanded extremely close scrutiny of the texts. As the analyses began, it also became obvious that the more systematic and inclusive the approach was, the more the results it yielded would carry meaning and therefore ultimately demonstrate the model’s universal reach. Rather than piece together elements garnered from sources which were diverse but never all-embracing, the decision was then taken to focus on a
single original source with numerous adaptations and to explore their intertextual ramifications as far as they would reach.

_Dracula_ was instantly felt to be the best possible choice in all the respects mentioned above and also generated its own set of concerns, to be explored hereunder. The form of the novel and its narrative presentation were a major attraction. Although usually labelled epistolary, Bram Stoker’s book offers a structure that is much more complex than the term implies. It includes a variety of different voices, perspectives and forms. I have therefore preferred the term “fragmented”, used here to denote a wider range of more diverse documents.

The story’s unusual arrangement presented many features whose transposition (or lack of it) enriched textual exploration: multiple points of view; different styles; increased reader participation in piecing together the story or _fabula_ on the basis of a less linear discourse or _syuzhet_; the use of foreshadowing and dramatic irony; an unusual balance of tension between fiction and the appearance of veracity; etc…

The novel was also unique in the extremely high proportion of adaptations that it has spawned and the possibilities which it therefore offered for more precise restriction. Other criteria thus guided the selection of adaptations further.

Films were chosen on the basis of their format (feature-length films intended for theatrical release) and how closely they sought to emulate the original narrative. This is an essential point to make in the case of _Dracula_ which has churned out innumerable sequels and derivations. The temporal scope was deliberately kept as large as possible, spanning from the emblematic first representations of the mysterious Count on the screen to recent re-visitations of the myth.
Seven films were chosen, a number that was judged manageable yet sufficiently wide-ranging to give an accurate general outline of the novel’s representation on screen over the ninety years since its first adaptation. Each film represents a different perspective: that of the director’s individual vision but also of the context which saw its development, especially in terms of historical time and/or generic intent. Nevertheless all the films offer sufficient common ground with the novel in terms of plot elements and/or characters, a feature which determined their selection. These films are, in chronological order: Murnau’s Nosferatu (1922), Browning’s Dracula (1931), Fisher’s Horror of Dracula (1958) and Dracula, Prince of Darkness (1966), Badham’s Dracula (1979), Coppola’s Bram Stoker’s Dracula (1992) and Maddin’s Dracula, Pages from a Virgin’s Diary (2003).

With the corpus thus delineated and introduced, analysis could proceed in the next sections. To ensure the comprehensiveness of the approach, seven different scenes, representing key episodes in the novel’s narrative were selected and contrasted, when possible, with their filmic equivalents across the corpus. The selection of the scenes was based on their importance in the novel (especially in terms of plot) but also on how often they appeared on screen. Four scenes were selected from the novel’s first part (more on this division and the novel’s form below) and three from the second. In this manner, the corpus was felt to offer an inclusive view not only of the novel’s plot but also, equally relevantly, of its structure, themes and characters’ representations. An important facet of this analysis was that its scope should enable it to establish links not only to the films’ original source, Stoker’s novel, but also between the films themselves.

This leads to the final reason which corroborated the selection of Dracula as the core of the analytical exploration conducted here. As the methodological investigation conducted in the first section develops, most scholars who have recently been engaged in the field of
adaptation have pleaded, sometimes with different agendas, for an intertextual perspective. This is naturally the path which has been chosen in this thesis and one which has been considerably facilitated and enriched by the selected material: Dracula provided a seemingly endless wealth of intertextual (and metatextual) information within the selected corpus, but also beyond it.

On the one hand stand the cultural products themselves: novels, films, comic books, cartoons, video games, television series ... and their convoluted relations to the original: sequels, prequels, adaptations, parodies, derivations, re-visitations etc. As the prototypical vampire, Dracula also has a preponderant role to play in the fast and exponentially expanding field of vampire lore in popular culture; laying the groundwork for a new (sub-)genre while simultaneously being subjected to its influence.

On the other hand stands the bulk of critical studies which the novel has been subjected to. As a novice in the field, I imagined that dipping a toe into the pool of Dracula studies might suffice; I soon found myself plunging in headfirst ... and a very deep pool it was! Of the many insights I gained, the most revealing was the indelible mark which criticism had retroactively imprinted on some of the novel’s themes, regularly perceived as inherent in the text itself. Most telling amongst these was the over-sexualization of the novel, its characters and Dracula in particular; a reading which has come to bear quite heavily on subsequent adaptations.

As Bram Stoker’s novel made its way from Gothic masterpiece to canonical work, through the twists and turns of scholarly criticism, it also left an indelible print on popular culture, conjuring up endless images in its wake. The iconic (contemporary representation of) Dracula, while still closely connected to its original source, has fed on the multiple Draculas which have developed in the interim; it will also very likely go on to feed future
representations. Predictable though it may be, the metaphor of the eternal vampire regenerating himself through fresh blood is strangely apt.

“Fresh blood” and new life is precisely what the multimodal model proposed in this thesis aspires to breathe into the field of adaptation theory, as the use of this restricted but fairly exhaustive corpus aims to illustrate. Let us hope that it may convince its readers that, to quote Linda Hutcheon: “Adaptation is not vampiric: it does not draw the life-blood from its source and leave it dying or dead, nor is it paler than the adapted work.” (176)
1 Background and methodology

1.1 Introduction

The primary issue to be examined within this chapter is the link which exists between film adaptation and language (especially discourse), both in their wide and more restricted understandings. Is there valid ground supporting this linkage, how can it be posited and how far may it reach?

Before delving into the intricacies of adaptation theory, a few succinct definitions may help set the scene for understanding the issues at stake. At face value, adaptation appears as a relatively simple concept to fathom and probably one which any individual might feel familiar with. But adaptation is in fact a layered notion: it comprises different levels of convolution and each foray into these comes to bear on the inferior and superior levels. In the manner of a convoluted Escher staircase, the deeper one goes, the closer one comes to question the surface notions which had been taken for granted as a starting point, which is why some backtracking is in order.

According to Longman to adapt is “to make or become suitable for new needs or different conditions (12). Adaptation is then “the act or process of adapting or the state of being adapted” but also “something that is produced by adapting something else”. (Collins) The American Heritage Dictionary is even more specific for our purposes, labelling it: “a composition that has been recast into a new form”. Upon sketching a broad definition of adaptation, a series of correlations emerge:

- adaptation is both a process and a product,
- it implies a change of aspect,
- this transformation is deemed better suited to new circumstances.
Film adaptation, is thus “the transfer of a written work to a feature film. It is a type of derivative work” (Wikipedia). What is implicit, yet not overtly stated, in these observations is that, although there is a necessary change of status, adaptation also implies an invariant, something which endures beyond and despite the change and which makes alteration perceptible.

This can be put into perspective within the wider context of the stylistic conflict opposing monism and dualism/pluralism. Leech and Short have summarized this tension as follows: “The dualist holds that there can be different ways of conveying the same content. The monist holds that this is a mistake, and that any alteration of form entails a change of content” (19-20). A dualist in fact sees a message in terms of its total significance, which is the addition of sense and stylistic value. These can by and large be equated with content and form. The dualist then, acknowledges the possible existence of an invariant core, regardless of the different guises it may take and of how these may in turn affect its significance. A monist, on the contrary believes that the sense itself (or at least a good part of it) is irredeemably lost in any transition. As they examine the validity of this assumption, Leech and Short bring adaptation into the equation:

It is admittedly relatively easy for a monist to show (as Lodge does) that even the best translation of a prose work loses something of the original. But this is not sufficient: the monist must show how translation is possible at all. He must also show how it is possible to translate a novel into the visual medium, as a film. (27)

Any theory of adaptation is thus necessarily pluralist in scope and, when corpus-based, by essence comparative. For this comparison to carry relevance, common ground within which contrast may take place needs to be posited.

This is the point where adaptation theory generally hits its first, and major, obstacle. Text to film adaptation implies a change of medium, and therefore a change in the semiotic
material when the source product is shaped into its derivation. In other words, whereas certain types of adaptations, in the term's wider sense, can be intersemiotic, or function within a single semiotic system, text to film adaptation is intrasemiotic, it shifts from one semiotic system to another. How is it then possible to contrast the, essentially different, objects of this comparison, and how should this contrast be articulated?

Surprisingly, as will be developed below, few adaptation scholars have dwelt on this issue, generally circumventing it in one way or another. But the contention of this thesis is that there is a way of overriding this obstacle; to give the two elements in the equation a common status, i.e. consider them both as texts.

What significance this premise carries, what antecedents it requires and how it may be implemented will receive extensive development hereunder. Beyond the notion of text, the relevance of another term, that of discourse, will be presented and expanded with all its implications.

Before this path is embarked upon, it is necessary to point out that the links between adaptation and language will also receive other types of consideration within the wider context of this thesis. The exploration of their points of interaction will be threefold:

a) A reflection on the nature of text and how well it applies to film. (as developed in this chapter)

b) The subsequent textual analysis that can be conducted on the basis of this premise (as developed in the next chapter)

c) Within the filmic text(s), particular attention will also be paid to the single track of language, the features of spoken vs. written language, and whether meaningful

---

2 One may consider text to text adaptations, such as simplified versions of texts, translations, a novel being dramatized (once it is staged, however, other semiotic systems come into the picture).
inferences can be drawn on the basis of comparisons with written text(s) in the original novel(s).

1.2 What is text? What is discourse?

Although it may include a wide variety of approaches and perspectives, there seems to be a fairly general consensus on what Discourse Analysis comprises. In their introduction to *The Discourse Reader*, Jaworski and Coupland label this approach “the analysis of language in use, or even beyond it.” (2) The object of Discourse Analysis is likewise quasi straightforwardly considered to be texts. A definition of what precisely constitutes ‘texture’ has remained elusive, but one of its less problematic tenets is the idea of coherence and cohesion beyond and across smaller units or sequences, which may be clauses, sentences, utterances, turns, etc.

But if Discourse consists of texts, it is also much more than that. Mills has highlighted this dimension: “A discourse is something which produces something else (an utterance, a concept, an effect), rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analysed in isolation” (17) Hymes points out the fact that creating discourse is about choices: “Discourse may be viewed in terms of acts both syntagmatically and paradigmatically: i.e. both as a sequence of speech acts and in terms of classes of speech acts among which choice has been made at given points.” (57) Fairclough similarly views Discourse Analysis as a dynamic practice, but focuses more on the different stages of its processing: “There are three

---

3 See for instance Halliday and Hasan. There are, however, some detractors to this theory: Enkvist, for instance, raised objections and argued that coherence could be deceptive and was not a sufficiently discriminating criterion to establish texture, introducing the notions of pseudo-coherence and non-coherence.
analytically separable elements in processes of meaning-making: the production of the text, the text itself, and the reception of the text"(10)'. Another essential notion which is built into this statement is that of discourse as a meaning-making practice. The notion of assigning significance, thus of interpreting texts into their meanings is central to the analysis.

Once interpretation is brought into the picture, its frame is necessarily widened and the global context beyond the text becomes a sine qua non condition to its processing. Brown and Yule are quite specific in considering the many circumstantial dimensions surrounding the text:

We shall consider words, phrases and sentences which appear in the textual record of a discourse to be evidence of an attempt by a producer (speaker/ writer) to communicate his message to a recipient (hearer / reader). We shall be particularly interested in discussing how a recipient might come to comprehend the producer's intended message on a particular occasion and how the requirements of the particular recipient(s), in definable circumstances, influence the organisation of the producer's discourse. This is clearly an approach which takes the communicative function of language as its primary area of investigation and consequently seeks to describe linguistic form, not as a static object, but as a dynamic means of expressing intended meaning. (24).

Thus beyond the text, there is a context which will essentially impact on the text's analysis and interpretation. It would be naïve to believe that this context is restricted to the context of the utterance; another crucial aspect of discourse is its wider linguistic, social and cultural background, or as Schiffrin puts it: "Linguistic forms and meanings work together with social and cultural meanings, and interpretive frameworks, to create discourse." (416) Teun Van Dijk holds a similar position: "In order to be able to interpret a discourse, that is, to assign it meaning and reference, we also need a substantial amount of world knowledge, and
such knowledge can only be partly specified within linguistics or grammar, namely, in the lexicon." (105)

Whereas they tend to share this comprehension of the multi-layered nature of discourse, linguists are not as unanimous regarding the degree of pre-determination (generally social and ultimately conducive to imbalance in power relationships) which is intrinsic to the structure of discourse itself. Fairclough refers to this as the ‘order of discourse’ (3), i.e. the social structuring of language which is, by essence, an element of the structuring of social practices. Taking a Foucaultian perspective, Mills argues that:

In the process of apprehending, we categorize and interpret experience and events according to the structures available to us, and in the process of interpretation, we lend these structures a solidity and a normality which it is often difficult to think outside of. Foucault does not consider these structures to be simply the invention of institutions or powerful groups of people, as some Marxist thinkers have suggested in their formulating of the notion of ideology, nor does he propose that they are simply abstract and arbitrary. Rather, he considers that there is a combined force of institutional and cultural pressure, together with the intrinsic structure of discourse, which always exceeds the plans and desires of the institution or of those in power. (54)

As to Brown and Yule (206), they give more sway to the individual’s role and perspective in processing discourse. They consider that an individual will integrate his specific representation of a particular experience of the world into a more general representation of the world which is also specific to him.

Before highlighting the more specific distinction(s) that can be made (within discourse) between different types of texts and more particularly between written and spoken text, a marked bias in traditional discourse theories needs to be expounded. Even though, as
mentioned above, it is ominously aware of context. Discourse analysis has customarily tended to centre, in its examinations, exclusively on the meanings which are conveyed by language. However, if language can be interpreted on the basis of the wider context of its production, it also follows that meanings are expressed by other non-linguistic means, which would also be worthy of being analytically processed and interpreted, maybe even independently from language.

Teun Van Dijk is one author who acknowledges the wider implication of semantic analysis, although he applies it foremost to discourse in its traditional conception as 'language-bound':

'In the most general sense, semantics is a component theory within a larger semiotic theory about meaningful, symbolic, behavior. Hence we have not only a semantics of natural language utterances or acts, but also of nonverbal or paraverbal behavior, such as gestures, pictures and films, logical systems or computer languages, sign languages of the deaf, and perhaps social interaction in general. (103)

This issue will be examined more thoroughly in the next section. Recent perspectives have widened the traditional scope of discourse analysis to include 'texts' which are not necessarily -or not exclusively- linguistic in nature; these theories will be presented, then tested and assessed.

But before that detour beyond the purely linguistic is taken, another –intra-linguistic– issue needs to be addressed, namely to what extent writing and speech have been considered as different expressions of language and how these differences have been accounted for within the field of discourse analysis.
Halliday is one of the scholars who has pondered this issue. He anchors his examination in a diachronic perspective and offers valuable insights into evolutionary aspects of language acquisition, features of ‘protolanguages’ and the added cultural value of writing. However, when it comes to investigating synchronic differences between the two ‘mediums’, Halliday is much less specific and warns against over-simplification: “Written’ and ‘spoken’ do not form a simple dichotomy; there are all sorts of writing and all sorts of speech, many of which display features characteristic of the other medium.” (Spoken, 32) He therefore remains consistently detached in his observations, occasionally focusing on certain measurable features but never proposing a global analytical system. Two such features which he develops are

- the absence of certain markers of the speaker’s state of mind (reservations, doubts, hesitations, hierarchy in argumentation) in most varieties of written language because, “in its core functions, writing is not anchored in the here-and-now.” (Spoken, 32)

- He also highlights the lexical density of written language (as opposed to spoken language which includes more grammatical words) and links the perception of density to a word’s frequency arguing that the higher frequency is, the less dense the text will appear.

Brown and Yule explore Goody’s anthropological literacy theories which suggest that writing has two core functions: “The ‘storage’ function which allows transmission over time and space and the ‘shift from oral to visual domain’ function which allows transmission in an ‘abstract’ context.” (13). Like Halliday, they make no absolute distinctions and categories but they do present a slightly longer list of contrastive attributes between sentences and utterances. The table below offers a quick summary of these features:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less structured syntax (incomplete sentences, little subordination,</td>
<td>More structured syntax (subordination, wh-clefts etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more active declaratives forms, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few and very simple metalingual markers: but, and, then, if...</td>
<td>Presence of many and more complex metalingual markers (complementers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporal markers logical connectors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few pre-modified noun phrases</td>
<td>more pre-modified noun phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information can follow a spoken topic/comment structure, f.i.: the</td>
<td>Information is generally structured in a subject/predicate form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cats + did you let them out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent passives</td>
<td>More passives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze direction can be used to supply a referent</td>
<td>The referent needs to be explicitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The speaker may refine speech while it is being uttered</td>
<td>Once the writing process is completed, it cannot be amended⁴.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized vocabulary</td>
<td>More specific or more precise vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of syntactic forms</td>
<td>Little syntactic repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prefabricated fillers</td>
<td>No need for fillers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But, to date, the most consistent examination of the differences between the two mediums in all their complexity, has been conducted by Douglas Biber. He bases his

---

⁴ This particular criterion is one of Brown and Yule’s weak spots and could easily be contradicted by stating that speech, once uttered, cannot be retrieved and that texts can be revised and amended at will before completion of the process.
conclusions on the statistical evidence provided by a large corpus of texts. Rather than use a binary speech/writing dichotomy, he divides his corpus into genres and sub-genres; genre is determined on the basis of external criteria and thus relates to use rather than form. Biber also uses the notion of text-types to denote texts which are similar in their linguistic form, irrespective of genre⁵. Like Halliday, he warns against over-simplification: "one of the central findings of the present study is that there is no linguistic or situational characterization of speech and writing that is true of all spoken and written genres." (Variation, 36) To contrast one genre with another he uses six parameters of variation or, as he prefers to call them, dimensions. This label carries three strict distinctive characteristics:

1. no single dimension will be adequate in itself to account for the range of linguistic variation in a language; rather a multi-dimensional analysis is required;
2. dimensions are continuous scales of variation rather than dichotomous poles; and
3. the co-occurrence patterns underlying dimensions are identified empirically rather than being proposed on an a priori functional basis.

The genres and sub-genres he refers to and uses in his corpus include: conversations (face-to-face, telephone), letters (personal, professional), Speeches (spontaneous, prepared), interviews, fiction (romantic, mystery, general, science, ...), broadcasts, religion, humour, popular lore, biographies, press reviews, academic prose, press reportage and official documents.

The functional dimensions which he observes are:

1. Involved versus Informational production
2. Narrative versus Non-narrative concerns

---

⁵ See Biber Variation. Biber subsequently refined his analytical work further, making it more precise, but also more complex in the process. Because this later model applies only to conversation types, thus exclusively to spoken language, the earlier version will be used here but the reader who wishes to pursue this investigation further may consult Biber "Conversation".
Comparing texts according to all these dimensions and the underlying communicative functions they are associated with is thus a very complex endeavour. Without embracing Biber's model in all its intricacy, this thesis will use more individual facets of his findings, such as the 'essential' features of certain genres compared to others, in its sections which are devoted to textual analysis.

1.3 What is film? (Is it text?)

As mentioned above, even a fairly consensual definition such as to identify the object of discourse as texts includes an internal bias: approach to these texts has, until recently, been overwhelmingly centred on language, disregarding other semiotic systems, meaning-making systems that function beyond language, parallel to it or in combination with it. Although the existence of such systems has been posited through the acknowledgment of multimodal texts (Jaworski and Coupland, for instance, use the term), i.e. texts which make use of more than one semiotic system, they have rarely been subjected to analysis due to the metalinguistic obstacles that such an analysis would entail. Thus discourse analysis was perceived as monomodal, the focus being primarily on the already rich perspectives offered by language-centred approaches. This model, with its overbearing emphasis on language, left little leeway to consider film as a textual object.
Within the field of film studies however, the notion of film as text has long been a concept eligible for consideration. This current stemmed with film semiotics, and particularly with its founder and inspirational figure, Christian Metz. Unlike authors who had come before him, Metz was less interested in taking an evaluative stand towards film criticism and sought instead to develop a methodological paradigm by introducing more technical vocabulary into the field. Metz had trained as a linguist and thus naturally resorted to Saussurean structuralism as a model.

Metz distinguishes between cinema, the cinematic institution as a multidimensional, socio-cultural fact, and film, a localizable discourse or text and favours the latter as the object of his analysis. Yet Metz’s enquiries into film as language are developed at the level of Saussure’s ‘langage’ rather than exemplified through instances of ‘parole’. In the work which may be considered as the cornerstone of his theory, *Langage et Cinéma*, Metz draws the outlines of a system which he hopes could lay the ground for a theoretical understanding of filmic processes both from the producer’s and the recipient’s point of view. Defining films as texts is paramount to his approach.

Le seul principe de pertinence susceptible de définir actuellement la sémiologie du film est [...] la volonté de traiter les films comme des *textes*, comme des unités de discours, en s’obligeant par là à rechercher les différents *systèmes* (qu’ils soient ou non des codes) qui viennent informer ces *textes* et s’impliciter en eux. Si on déclare que la sémiologie étudie la *forme* des films, ce doit être sans oublier que la *forme* n’est pas ce qui s’oppose au contenu, et qu’il existe une *forme* du contenu, tout aussi importante que la *forme* du signifiant. (14)\(^6\)

---

6 The only relevant principle which is likely to define film semiology today [...] is the will to treat films as *texts*, as unites of discourse, thereby forcing us to research the different *systems* (whether or not these are codes) which inform these texts and become implicit through them. If we declare that semiology studies the *form* of
Using Hjelmslev’s theory of the ‘matters of expression, Metz sees these texts as whole signifying objects while also acknowledging the possibility to subdivide them into separate components, labelled as ‘sensorial supports’. They are of five kinds: image, musical sound, phonetic sound (in speech), noise and writing. The fact that he chooses to consider these supports globally as one product does not preclude their separate analysis. It is however essential never to lose perspective of the whole underlying them.

Ce n’est pas parce qu’un message est visuel que tous ses codes le sont ; et ce n’est pas parce qu’un code se manifeste dans des messages visuels qu’il ne se manifeste pas aussi ailleurs. Les «langages» visuels entretiennent avec les autres des liens systématiques qui sont multiples et complexes, et on ne gagne rien à opposer le «verbal» et le «visuel» comme deux grands blocs dont chacun serait homogène, massif et sans faille, et qui entretiendraient l’un avec l’autre des rapports logiques de pure extériorité. (24)

Metz uses the label of ‘pluri-code’ to describe the combined nature of film which is not contrived but simply a condition for its existence. Film is therefore a text, albeit of an unusual, complex kind. As such, it realises discourse:

Lorsqu’on note que le film est un « discours », on entend par là (…) qu’il a pour propre de co-actualiser un certain nombre d’éléments signifiants qui, sur le plan sensoriel, (…) peuvent être selon les cas homogènes ou hétérogènes : homogènes si l’on a affaire à l’agencement significatif de deux ou plusieurs images, de deux ou

---

7 It is not because a message is visual that all its codes are; and it is not because a code appears in visual messages that it does not also appear elsewhere. Visual "languages" maintain multiple and complex systematic links to other languages, and nothing can be gained by opposing "verbal" and "visual" as two great blocks, homogeneous, solid, unfailing and which logically maintain with each other only purely exterior links.
plusieurs « bruits », etc ; hétérogènes si le « rapprochement » relevé dans le texte concerne une image et un bruit, une donnée visuelle et un segment du dialogue, etc.\(^8\) 

(121)

Although he is primarily a structuralist, Metz also displays a post-structuralist trend in his writings, notably through his emphasis on perpetual displacement. A film's text is not the addition of its codes but a process of re-structuration, through which the text is rewritten through modification and recombination of these codes.

It is a stance which François Jost would also hold; he insists that a film is never an addition (images + words and sound) but rather a product or result, a double narrative whose two modes of expression are ultimately bound to one another (61). Rather than "double", which still restricts its scope, "multiple" might appear as a better way of qualifying this process. Gardies hints at the multiplicity of (re)combinations and interactions which are implicit in such considerations:

Les messages médiatisés supposent le recours quasi général à plusieurs langages concomitants. Au-delà de son évidence théorique il faut en tirer toutes les implications. Envisagé maintenant sous l'angle sémiotique, l'objet d'acquisition se définit alors comme l'ensemble de discours sociaux qui bâtissent leur signifiance sur la conjugaison étroite de plusieurs langages, discours qui fonctionnent sur la double interdépendance de ces langages entre eux et avec la langue. (12)\(^9\)

\(^8\) What is meant by applying the label of "discourse" to film is that it characteristically co-actualizes a certain number of signifying objects which, from a sensorial point of view, can be either homogenous or heterogeneous: homogenous if several images, "sounds" are significantly put together, heterogeneous if the "connection" noticed in the text concerns an image and a sound, a visual element and a piece of dialogue, etc.

\(^9\) Media messages almost systematically resort to several concomitant languages. All necessary implications must be drawn from this theoretical blatancy. Seen from the semiotic angle, the object of acquisition may then be
Although it was frequently disputed, the influence of Metz’s model was wide-ranging and long-lasting. The main issue which film scholars raised was that the paradigm relied too heavily on “absolute” analysis and did not take into account contextual factors. David Bordwell, for instance, lamented its lack of what he labelled “historicization”. (“Textual”, 127) This perceived “flaw” was in fact ingrained in the foundations of the Metzian perspective itself, as Robert Stam explains: “The roots of the “decontextualisation” of some textual analysis lie in the ahistoricism of two of the source movements of semiotics: Saussurean Linguistics – particularly its tendency to cut off language from history – and Russian Formalism, with its preference for a purely intrinsic analysis.” (Theory, 193)

Amendments would be provided by a later generation of semioticians, more precisely the semio-pragmatists. Their area of investigation remained the means by which film conveys meaning, but they anchored their findings in a more precisely delineated social and historical framework.

The restrictions of a de-contextualized Metzian-inspired model of analysis and how it may be amended - in a semio-pragmatic fashion - to increase its tenability will be developed more extensively below. But before its application is focused on, this model needs to be introduced as well as recent trends in Discourse Analysis which led to its adoption and to the firm establishment, and relevance, of the notion of film-text.

---

defined as the group of social discourses which build significance by closely combining several languages, discourses which depend on the double interdependency of these languages to each other and to language itself.

10 See, for instance, Casetti or Odin.
1.4 Multimodal texts.

The late 1990s and early 2000s witnessed a shift of perspective within the field of Discourse Analysis. Whereas a tangible bias towards monomodal linguistic texts (in both writing and speech) had previously been held, the implications of considering the meaning-making potentialities of ‘texts’ in all their dimensions and through any form of semiotic material finally began to take hold.

This newfound perspective takes its inspiration from Halliday and expands it from there: “The text is the linguistic form of social interaction. It is a continuous progression of meanings . . . selections made by the speaker from the options that constitute the meaning potential; text is the actualization of this meaning potential, the process of semantic choice.” (Language, 122)

What multimodal linguists put forward is that the Hallidayan model, with its emphasis on meaning, would thus be equally applicable to other, non-linguistic or partially linguistic, semiotic systems. Many of the concepts which are in fact developed in the study of texts are by no means specific to language and can prove enlightening and productive when applied to other fields. This obviously implies an extension of the notion of text beyond the linguistic as “complexes of signs which cohere both internally and with the context in and for which they were produced” (Kress and van Leeuwen, Reading, 41) The notion of discourse is similarly expanded and refers to socially constructed knowledge(s) of (some aspect of) reality which may be realised in different ways. (Kress and van Leeuwen, Multimodal, 5-6)

Another essential tenet of multimodal theories is that discourse, even when considered from a more traditional linguistic perspective, is rarely completely detached from other semiotic resources even though there has been a theoretical deficiency in acknowledging this feature. Speech and writing often combine language with actions, images, sounds etc… to form an integrated whole and the number and degree of these combinations is infinite. As
Kress and Van Leeuwen point out, the emergence of multimedia has heightened recent perception of the different modes surrounding linguistic texts:

Language, whether in speech or writing, has always existed as just one mode in the totality of modes involved in the production of any text, spoken or written. A spoken text is not just verbal but also visual, combining with ‘non-verbal’ modes of communication such as facial expression, gesture, posture and other forms of self-presentation. A written text, similarly, involves more than language . . . The multimodality of written texts has, by and large, been ignored, whether in educational contexts, in linguistic theorizing or in popular common sense. Today, in the age of ‘multimedia’, it can suddenly be perceived again. (Multimodal, 39)

Thus the object of multimodal discourse analysis can be overtly linguistic, marginally linguistic or even not linguistic at all.\(^\text{11}\)

A multimodal approach generally takes Halliday’s systemic functional grammar as a starting point and seeks to apply his instruments to other systems of meaning. Thus, these linguists subscribe to Halliday’s organisation of meaning into three metafunctions (ideational, interpersonal and textual) which can be adapted to suit different modes. Even though these approaches reach beyond the lexico-grammatical scope, their ‘grammars’ still reveal a system-structure cycle of paradigmatic choices built into a congruent whole which can in turn be decomposed along a rank scale. O’ Toole, for instance, contends that Halliday’s functions are valid as general, not just linguistic, semiotic mechanisms and that they are realized systematically in a wide variety of fields:

“Functional” semiotics assumes that every piece of communication has three main functions: 1) to engage our attention and interest, 2) to convey some information about reality, and 3) to structure these into a coherent textual form. Linguists label these

\(^{11}\) Michael O’ Toole, for instance, focuses (although not exclusively) on Displayed Art.
respectively the “Interpersonal function”, the “Experiential function” and the “Textual function”, and these govern the way we choose our words and construct our sentences in spoken or written language. Different labels are appropriate for other semiotic codes such as painting, sculpture and music, but the labels still stand for similar functions, or types of meaning relation. (5)

O’Toole is particularly inspiring as he acknowledges and develops the possibility that this model then renders a comparative semiotics feasible, not just between texts in a single medium, but across semiotic codes; as long as each model is appropriate to the specific processes of each code. This is precisely what this thesis maintains and how it proposes to implement this model with respect to adaptation.

The openness of this approach, especially in contrast with traditional monomodal discourse analysis, is illustrated by Kress and Van Leeuwen’s definition of what constitutes multimodality:

The traditional linguistic account is one in which meaning is made once, so to speak. By contrast, we see the multimodal resources which are available in a culture used to make meanings in any and every sign, at any level, and in any mode. Where traditional linguistics had defined language as a system that worked through double articulation, where a message was an articulation as a form and as a meaning, we see multimodal texts as making meaning in multiple articulations. (Multimodal, 4)

Different structures thus realize meaning in different ways, sometimes conflating and at other times diverging in what they say, but always idiosyncratic in how they say.

In the case of composite multimodal texts, it is of course essential, even when analysing the different ‘codes’ separately, to reprocess their meanings as part of an integrated whole and therefore interacting with each other. In keeping with Gombrich’s ‘Gestalt’ theory of art, the total meaning of such texts is always more than the added meanings of their parts,
coming closer to a multiplication of meanings, which participates in their expansion. In other
words:

Multimodal text analysis does not accept the notion that the meaning of the text can be
divided into a number of separate semiotic ‘channels’ or ‘codes’: the meaning of a
multimodal text is instead the composite product/process of the ways in which
different resources are co-deployed and in which the phase is taken as an enactment of
‘locally foregrounded selections of options. (Baldry, 87)

This theme and its ensuing caveats, had already been breached by film semioticians,
for instance by Metz and Jost, as mentioned above.

Through its dynamicity, film has additionally warranted a special status within
multimodal texts, as opposed to multimodal print texts. Over and above the co-deployment of
selections within different semiotic meaning-making resources, meaning is made through the
temporal and spatial unfolding of these resources which are perceived as a flux. The means
which multimodal theorists have used to explore film have varied in scope and perspective.
Some authors have even provided complex technological solutions to deal with this issue.
Anthony Baldry, for instance, has lamented the restrictions – and even inner contradiction-
that analysing film using a multimodal in-vitro transcription presupposes. In this type of
transcription, film is divided into still frames which can be metafunctionally annotated, but
the dynamic aspect of film is lost in the process. Baldry proposes to resort instead to an in-
vivo transcription obtained on the basis of a complex software system where film can be
retrieved in its dynamic format and simultaneously contrasted within a relational database.
This system, known as MCA (Multimodal Corpus Authoring) allows to analyse and contrast
metafunctionally based choices both intrasemiotically and intersemiotically. Despite its
promises, at the present stage this software is still under development and has not yet proven
its efficiency or added value, compared to in-vitro transcriptions. There are also in-built
limitations to retaining film's dynamicity in an analysis; chiefly that the quantity of
information will necessarily be constrained by time and/or space and that eventually some
further degree of deconstruction will be necessary.

Using interactive digital media and incorporating computer science approaches to
multimodal analysis seems to be the next step in this vibrant field of study, as exemplified by
ongoing research at the Multimodal Analysis Lab in Singapore, headed by Kay O’Halloran\textsuperscript{12}. Even if it has not come full circle yet, the principles which it posits, i.e. the use of a systemic-
functional terminology and model, may be equally applied to in-vitro transcriptions and
therefore provide the analytical framework which had so far proved elusive. Using a
systemic-functional framework opens the path to a comparative examination where texts, both
in their traditional linguistic form and as film-texts, can be contrasted along the same
metafunctional guidelines, even when the systems or semiotic resources which enact them are
at variance.

Before this framework is put forward in more specific terms, its applicability to
adaptation must be gauged. In order to do so, a fairly inclusive overview of adaptation
theory(ies), its precepts, ideologies and evolution needs to be presented.

\subsection{1.5 What is adaptation?}

In 1992, screenwriting coach Linda Seger devoted a whole book to the process of adaptation.
In it, she explains to prospective screenwriters, especially those interested in commercially
successful, high-grossing films that:

\textsuperscript{12} For more information on these projects and their academic scope, see their website, which includes a list of
downloadable publications: http://multimodal-analysis-lab.org/
By its very nature, adaptation is a transition, a conversion, from one medium to another. All original material will put up a bit of a fight, almost as if it were saying, "Take me as I am". Yet adapting implies change. It implies a process that demands rethinking, reconceptualizing, and understanding how the nature of drama is intrinsically different from the nature of all other literature. (2)

Although the manual is never particularly insightful as to the difference in nature between the two media, the fact that a handbook to adaptation exists at all bears testimony to its pervasiveness. Estimates hold, on average, that at least 30 percent of all produced movies derive from novels (Holt, 36). There are many factors, sociological, practical, artistic, which go towards explaining the popularity of adaptations but the main criterion seems to be financial; what better guarantee to commercial success than using commercially successful source material?

Less obviously justifiable is the interest which adaptation has generated amongst the critical and academic fields. The ambiguity of the adaptive process in which an original work of art is reshaped into another, sometimes vividly different, form has indeed been the focus of a lot of insightful research. The fact that this research has tended to focus on certain issues at the expense of others and how its scope has evolved over time will be detailed below.

This thesis's aim is to demonstrate the particular relevance of a systemic-functional multimodal model of (textual) discourse analysis to adaptation, especially within a comparative, but non-evaluative, perspective. Special emphasis will therefore be given to how previous theories of adaptation have approached—or indeed circumvented— the issue of semiotic variance.

The objects under scrutiny in adaptation studies present a double challenge to their practitioners. Firstly they are composite, or built up of different 'matters of expression', to use
Metz's (appropriation of Hjelmslev's) term. Second, the objects additionally display variation between the initial adapted product and the eventual adaptation.

The range of this variation can be very large indeed. Linda Hutcheon, for instance, proposes to consider adaptation(s) both as formal entities or products but also as processes of creation and reception. Additionally she highlights three different modes of engagement (telling, showing, interacting) and examines the bi-directional movements between them. Within the scope of this thesis, the understanding of 'adaptation' will be narrower and designate only the adaptation of literary texts to film, probably the most prolific of all adaptive domains, at least from a critical perspective.

Variation in semiotic systems is a cumbersome obstacle. It hinders comparative analyses and has tended to foreground the issue of interface instead; boundaries have been drawn opposing the verbal to the visual, written to spoken language, sometimes even signifiers to signifieds. These boundaries have ultimately often proved dissatisfying and at times reductive to the point of fallacy.

To fathom the mechanisms of the procedure of adaptation and thus comprehend and possibly re-define the balance of power between the elements in presence, a methodological framework is needed. It should be flexible enough to allow correlations and therefore contrast between the examined objects. It is only in this fashion that conclusive findings on the nature of adaptation as a process can be gained from observation of adaptations as products. Even as the essential differences at the core of the two systems, novel and film, are acknowledged, a way to transcend them must be found. To return to Hutcheon's terms, telling does not function like showing does; but to relate what has been told to what has been shown is feasible if we find a way of articulating divergences and convergences. Ropars-Wuilleumier held a similar view: "Pour comparer deux modes d'expression sans méconnaitre leur originalité respective, il convient de mesurer l'étendue de leurs différences et de situer le niveau
méthodologique où commencent les possibilités de confrontation.» (Littérature, 10)\textsuperscript{13}

Although initially her approach could be linked to the (semiotic) Metzian tradition, Ropars-Wuilleumier would evolve towards a much more post-structuralist view, her focus would shift towards difference and displacement, and she saw writing, or rather her particular understanding of écriture as the only tangible link between literature and film:

Un film n’est pas un texte – est-il encore temps de l’avouer ? […] Entre la littérature et le cinéma, l’assimilation provisoire présuppose un constat de différence, sensible, technique, voire éthique. Mais pas plus que le cinéma ne s’accomplit en soi, loin des signes de sa genèse, pas d’avantage la littérature ne se rend à elle-même, hors le détour d’un reflet où déchiffrer son visage, fût-ce pour le voir se briser. L’écriture, ce facteur ambigu si souvent invoqué, fraye un passage latéral, ménageant du film au texte, du texte au film, les canaux d’une liaison qui, en chaque cas, œuvre à la disjonction du terme joint. (Ecraniques, 225)\textsuperscript{14}

Adaptation scholars seem to historically have had problems defining where and how this ‘space of confrontation’ could exist. The semiotic obstacle in fact led to two separate trends; neither of which tackled semiotic variation straightforwardly but sought ways to elude or displace the issue. Yet, they would dominate the field of adaptation theory for decades.

\textsuperscript{13} To compare two modes of expression and not be mistaken about their respective originality, one must measure the scope of their differences and situate the methodological level where confrontation begins to be possible.

\textsuperscript{14} A film is not a text – can we still admit it? […] Between literature and film, temporary assimilation presupposes acknowledging an appreciable, technical or even ethical difference. But, like cinema which cannot find fulfilment by itself far from the signs of its genesis; literature cannot return to itself without observing, in a roundabout way, the reflection of its face even if it is to find it shattered. Writing, that ambiguous yet frequently cited factor, clears a lateral path arranging, from film to text, and text to film, the channels of a connection which, in each case, works to disconnect the united terms.
Comparative criticism was subtly superseded by evaluation, introducing “fidelity” as the benchmark of adaptation.

Comparison, when it took place, was based almost exclusively on content rather than form, generally with a particular emphasis on the narrative.

1.5.1 The fidelity pitfall

It has become a fashionable tendency in recent adaptation studies to debunk the fidelity standard, but no one puts it as clearly as Thomas Leitch:

Fidelity to its source text whether it is conceived as success in re-creating specific textual details or the effect of the whole – is a hopelessly fallacious measure of a given adaptation’s value because it is unattainable, undesirable, and theoretically possible only in a trivial sense ... [The] source texts will always be better at being themselves. (“Twelve”, 161)

Upon closer examination however it emerges that this bias is by no means as persistent in adaptation theory as such systematic discrediting seems to imply. Whereas it continues to infuse press reviews and individual judgments, the origins of the fidelity argument in adaptation criticism are more subtle and find their roots in the image/words divide.

Critical essays on the nature of adaptation are often imbued with a foundational tenet which would have deserved (and eventually would receive) more ontological probing: texts (novels) are transformed into images (films). This primacy of the visual over the aural dimension of film has sometimes led to total disregard of the latter and more often than not put the accent on the differences between the two media rather than seek for a ‘space of

15 On the unlikelihood and undesirability of fidelity in adaptation, see (for instance) Brooker, Stam (“Beyond”) or Kranz.
confrontation’ within their similitude. Bazin, for instance, noted that: “However one approaches it, a play whether classic or modern is unassailably protected by its text. There is no way of adapting the text without disposing of it and substituting something else, which may be better but is not the play.” (“Theatre”, 168-9) The corollary which he then introduces is another of adaptation’s underlying dogmas: adaptation can only be successful if the film is based on an inferior piece of literature, since masterpieces demand that their texts be respected. This belief originated with Béla Balàzs and would be echoed by famous figures such as Truffaut.

But Bazin’s point of view was not necessarily evaluative and certainly not as detrimental to the cinema as might first appear. He encouraged filmmakers, even when adapting, to become ‘auteurs’ in their own right and to develop their visual imagination and create a cinematic equivalent to the original, which it would be the critic’s role to perceive and decode. He specifies that “faithfulness to a form, literary or otherwise, is illusory: what matters is the equivalence in meaning of the forms.” (“Adaptation”, 19) Bazin continues in this vein, hoping that over time adaptations will be considered as different facets of a single work— he uses the image of sides on an artistic pyramid— and that chronological precedence of one part over another will no longer be an aesthetic criterion.

At about the same time (1950s) but across the Atlantic, another figure was emblematic of the word/image divide and generally considered as one of the founding figures of adaptation criticism, George Bluestone. In his influential Novels into Film, Bluestone insists on the transformative aspect of adaptation. His perception is that changes are inevitable since the shift takes place from a linguistic to a visual medium, and although he does acknowledge certain similarities between the two media, he finds their differences more startling. This then leads to the development that film and novel are different aesthetic genera entirely and, like
the French auteurists, he advocates the filmmaker’s creativity in crafting a distinctive work of
his/her own:

What happens, therefore, when the filmist undertakes the adaptation of a novel, given
the inevitable mutation, is that he does not convert the novel at all. What he adapts is a
kind of paraphrase of the novel – the novel viewed as raw material. He looks not to the
organic novel, whose language is inseparable from its theme, but to characters and
incidents which have somehow detached themselves from language and . . . have
achieved a mythic life of their own. . . . the filmist becomes not a translator for an
established author, but a new author in his own right. (62)

Bluestone would pave the way for many critics who, like him, would consider the
word/image split as central to adaptation, but who would also increasingly focus on the
resemblances that these separate systems presented and on how this divide could be bridged.
Keith Cohen can be placed in this tradition as he examines the possible relations between the
separate sign systems (novel and film). He sees these in terms of codes (perceptual,
referential, symbolic) which can reappear in more than one system and thus enable
comparison. In this semiotically inspired reading, Cohen also borrows heavily from Metz and
thus renders the connection between adaptation and textual analysis implicit.

After Cohen, Andrew would dwell on the connotational aspects of linguistic and
visual signs and would even correlate adaptation with discourse: “Adaptation is a peculiar
form of discourse, but not an unthinkable one. . . . We need to study the films themselves as
acts of discourse. We need to be sensitive to that discourse and to the forces that motivate it.”
(37). He is the only author to engage explicitly in this association, although he stops short of
its implementation. Andrew considers narrativity as the most median link between the two
sets of signs, one which could transcend the perceptual obstacles which are present at other
levels:
Since signs name the inviolate relation of signifier to signified, how is translation of poetic texts conceivable from one language to another (where signifiers belong to different systems), and how is it possible to transform the signifiers of one material (verbal) to signifiers of another material (images and sounds)? It would appear that one must presume that the global signified of the original is separable from its text if one believes it can be approximated by other sign clusters... If one accepts this possibility, at the very least one is forced to discount the primary articulations of the relevant language systems. One would have to hold that although the material of literature (graphemes, words and sentences) may be of a different nature from the materials of cinema (projected light and shadows, identifiable sound and forms, and represented actions), both systems may construct in their own way, and at higher levels, scenes and narratives that are indeed commensurable. (32)

This thus brings us to the second historically dominant trend in adaptation criticism: the prevalence of content over form analysis, particularly through exploration of narrative constraints.

1.5.2 Content over form

This drift in theory holds that only certain elements are transferable from text to screen. Clerc and Carcaud-Macaire, for instance, describe the complex interactions that these transpositions engage in with the iconic model, both from a qualitative and quantitative view. But it is Brian McFarlane who has most exhaustively defended this position. McFarlane was inspired by Seymour Chatman's approach to narrative and especially by his segregation between what he considered essentially novelistic vs. filmic properties. He held that:
In its essential visual mode, film does not describe, but merely presents; or better, it *depicts* in the original etymological sense of that word: renders in pictorial form. [...] Film attracts that component of our perceptual apparatus which we tend to favour over the other senses. Seeing is, after all, believing. ("Novels", 128)

Before that, Chatman had already elaborated on his definition of discourse as it applied to film as "the expression, the means by which the content is communicated." (Story, 19) Mc Farlane expanded Chatman's view and focused especially on narrative, which he considered the main connection between novel and film. He defines *narrative* as "a series of events, sequentially and/or consequentially connected by virtue of their involving a continuing set of characters" ("Reading", 19). To this, he opposes *narration*, the "how", the means by which the narrative has been presented. This distinction between *narrative* and *narration*, is inspired by and parallels Chatman's opposition of *story* and *discourse*, but also the French structuralists' *histoire* and *discours* (story matter and its manner of delivery) or, to a lesser extent, the Russian formalists' *fabula* and *syuzhet*. On the one hand he considers elements which he deems directly transferable from one medium to another since they are not linked to one or the other semiotic system. On the other, he examines the elements which are closer to the etymological understanding of adaptation, those which involve intricate processes of transformation because their effects are closely tied to the semiotic systems in which they are manifested. Although Mc Farlane does not regard enunciation or narration as essentially untransferable (only demanding complex adjustment strategies) his analytical emphasis is almost exclusively on narrative.

Jakob Lothe follows a similar path to Mc Farlane's although he does not expand on the essential characteristics of text and film but immediately posits narrative as his angle of

---

16 Elsewhere McFarlane also uses, as equivalent, the terms enunciated and enunciation. See Mc Farlane *Novel..*
approach to adaptation. Lothe is also more interested in the different narrative strategies which novels and films employ than in their commonalities. He uses Genette’s *Narrative Discourse* as a structural model but also seeks inspiration from Chatman (essentially for literature) and David Bordwell (for film). Approaches such as these, relevant though they well may be, are however restrictive at best. They disregard a whole unexplored dimension, namely how visual elements can also convey meanings, parallel to or at odds with narrative. Images are often ignored (or judged subordinate) as expressive units which can interact with the story’s progression and themes.\(^{17}\)

### 1.5.3 Current trends

Recent approaches to adaptation have attempted to steer away from these rather constricted views and embrace more global perspectives.

Kamila Elliott retraces the historical paradoxes and oppositions which have plagued adaptation and particularly the irreconcilable word/image and content/form dichotomies. Although she offers no definite resolution to the issue, she defends interart analogies, offering her own model of analogy (the looking-glass analogy) and explores a series of “semiotic heresies” which are in fact often creative ways of avoiding the dogmatic vicious circle: “If words and images do not and cannot translate, and if form does not and cannot separate from content (whether because of their mandated insoluble bond or because content is simply an illusion), then what remains to pass between a novel and a film in adaptation?” (4)

As mentioned above, Linda Hutcheon has proposed a polymorphous study of adaptation which is ambitious on two counts. First, as it tries to embrace all the levels at

\(^{17}\) Sobchack has argued forcibly against this restricted view and presented a convincing example of thematically expressive visual style.
which adaptation can be perceived (formal entities, creative process and reception) along with the movements between different modes of engagement (telling, showing, interacting). Second - a corollary of the resolve to be inclusive - the study aims to do away with evaluation entirely and especially with the axiomatic primacy of original texts. Hutcheon argues that by re-coding a text (in its widest understanding) into a new set of signs, one also re-codes it into a new set of conventions, in other words: "Adaptation is repetition, but repetition without replication."(7) When referring to the composite nature of film, Hutcheon, like many others, speaks of a multitrack medium, which beyond the single track of language (spoken and/or written), integrates music, sound effects, and moving photographic images.

This term originated with one of the leading contemporary authorities on adaptation theory, Robert Stam. Stam also dwells on the undesirability and indeed impossibility of fidelity in adaptation; but before proposing alternatives, he exposes the possible reasons behind the self-evident superiority which the original texts have generally been granted. He lists eight different contributing factors: "rear view mirror" logic or a priori valorization of antiquity and seniority, a perceived dichotomy between source and adaptation, iconophobia, (and consequently) logophilia, a distaste for the "embodiedness" of film, the myth of filmic facility, class prejudice (cinema as a popular 'un-noble' art form) and parasitism. (4-8) Clearly distancing himself from ultimately subjective notions of quality, Stam proposes to focus instead on the theoretical status and analytical interest of adaptations. This is obviously the stance which has been chosen within this thesis; as has hopefully been exemplified by the theoretical considerations in this chapter and will be reinforced by the analyses presented in the next chapters. Stam also takes issue, be it indirectly, with the school of thought which holds that only certain elements in film are transferable. Stam's perspective is that in fact there is no such thing as a transferable core, since a single text can trigger a plethora of readings. The notion of the much-abused "spirit" and "essence" of a text are no more than a
consensus reached about the meaning within a critical community. Desmond and Hawkes had reached a similar conclusion:

How is it possible to identify the core meanings of a story when we know literary texts are capable of supporting an indefinite number of interpretations? If we leave aside the problem of identifying what is essential in a text, we are still left with the difficulty of judging the degree to which the essential has been transposed. How can reviewers make useful judgments about fidelity when there is no agreed-upon method to compare text and film? (40)

This is not to say that comparison is impossible; it is simply not as delineated or self-evident as was previously believed.

Many of Stam’s followers have emulated this approach and advocated a return to comparative—but not evaluative—criticism. The emphasis should be much broader and especially textually rather than text-oriented.

As Kranz points out, comparison is in the nature of the discipline itself: “There is no reason to replace the comparative analysis at the heart of fidelity criticism; ultimately, one can’t understand an adaptation without a comparison to the named or most likely literary source or sources; that’s what we mean by adaptation.” (98) Cardwell further highlights that comparison of texts in different media can promote a fuller and more complex understanding of medium specificity.

To transcend the obstacles which had previously plagued adaptation criticism, fidelity and content emphasis foremost, Stam proposes a comparative model which emphasizes the intertextual nature of adaptation:

Adaptations then, can take an activist stance toward their source novels, inserting them into a much broader intertextual dialogism. An adaptation, in this sense, is less an attempted resuscitation of an originary word than a turn in an ongoing dialogical
process. The concept of intertextual dialogism suggests that every text forms an intersection of textual surfaces. All texts are tissues of anonymous formulae, variations on those formulae, conscious or unconscious quotations, and conflations and inversions of other texts. In the broadest sense, intertextual dialogism refers to the infinite and open-ended possibilities generated by all the discursive practices of a culture, the entire matrix of communicative utterances within which the artistic text is situated, which reach the text not only through recognizable influences, but also through a subtle process of dissemination (Literature, 64)

1.5.4 Intertextuality

The application of intertextuality to adaptation did not originate with Stam and neither is it by any means restricted to him but, as Leitch has commented ("Where", 328), he is perceived as the leader of this new perspective.

Dialogism is at the centre of intertextual perceptions of language, literature and/or film: all utterances respond to previous utterances and to patterns of meaning and evaluation. At the same time, they open up new paths towards future responses. There is no singular meaning. Or as Barthes put it:

The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture... the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them. Did he wish to express himself, he ought at least to know that the inner 'thing' he thinks to 'translate' is only a ready-formed dictionary, its words only explainable though other words, and so on indefinitely. (146-7)
Even more directly relevant to adaptation is the term of transposition which Kristeva would come to prefer to intertextuality and which seems to accommodate semiotic variation particularly well:

We shall call transposition the signifying process' ability to pass from one sign system to another, to exchange and permutate them; and representability the specific articulation of the semiotic and the thetic for a sign system. Transposition plays an essential role here inasmuch as it implies the abandonment of a former sign system, the passage to a second via the instinctual intermediary common to the two systems, and the articulation of the new system with its new representability. (60)

The suitability of intertextual theories to adaptation is further borne out by their social dimensions. First, they give prominence to the reader within the production of meaning, just as Hutcheon had foregrounded the reception process. Second, they insist on the inseparability of the (individual) text and the larger social or cultural text out of which it is constructed. The case of adaptation stands out within intertextual theories because of the explicitness of the connection between the texts. The evaluative stance which tended to grant precedence to the chronologically anterior production is then abandoned and in its stead the pleasantness of the referential process is put forward. The tension between the familiar and the new, similarity and difference is part and parcel of adaptation and, beyond other considerations (such as the financial argument) may account for its appeal. As Sanders puts it “The pleasure exists, and persists, then, in the act of reading in, around, and on (and on). (14)

Ideologically, intertextuality then seems to constitute the ideal methodological background against which to examine adaptation. But from a more practical perspective, certain caveats and restrictions need to be drawn out.

---

18 The importance of the wider context and how to accommodate it within textual analysis will be further developed below.
First of all, intertextuality must not be recast as some kind of "pretext" to redefine the fidelity model and draw strict boundaries between the original text, or hypotext, and the adaptation or hypertext\textsuperscript{19}. The emphasis should shift instead to textualizing, or how different (yet similar) texts express similar or different things in similar or different ways.

Second, beyond dialogism, intertextuality necessarily implies plurilogism since texts interact not only with their more obviously perceptible hypertexts but also with a wide range of other (past and future texts). This will prove central to the analyses conducted here since multiple adaptations of single novels will be considered and the interaction(s) between all these texts will inevitably impact their readings.

Third, consequentially to the previous point, whereas the scope must be large and encompass all relevant information, it need not be infinite and consider endless texts and continual connections. Kranz has labelled this excessive openness "from a practical standpoint, the height of academic silliness." (89)

These stipulations then help delineate the confines of the theoretical model best suited to adaptation: ontologically intertextual but functionally comparative. As will be seen, these characteristics are effortlessly built into the multimodal systemic functional paradigm presented below.

\subsection*{1.5.5 Linguistic models}

But before taking a closer look at this model, a detour through earlier approaches to adaptation (or film) which were already text-based or more broadly linguistic will rapidly be undertaken.

\textsuperscript{19} The terminology here is Genette's.
Certain authors have underlined, generally fleetingly, the parallelism of adaptation to translation; but the most in-depth exploration of these resemblances was carried out by Cattrysse. He proposes a polysystemic model which would encompass all forms of adaptation and which is based on cultural-semiotic theories of translation (such as Toury's) whose scope is wide enough to accommodate varied types of texts:

Translating is an act (or a process) which is performed (or occurs) over and across systemic borders. In the widest of its possible senses it is a series of operations, or procedures, whereby one semiotic entity, which is a (functional) constituent (element) of a certain cultural (sub)system, is transformed into another semiotic entity, which forms at least a potential element of another cultural (sub)system, providing that some informational core is retained 'invariant under transformation', and on its basis a relationship known as 'equivalence' is established between the resultant and initial entities. (1112-1113)

Though Toury acknowledges the existence of semiotic borders, he does not see them as obstacles to the transfer of meanings, provided the appropriate transformations are made. His definition of what constitutes a semiotic entity is similarly broad: discrete signs, entire messages, rules and norms which govern their combination, institutionalized models for cultural significance etc...

Cattrysse's view mirrors intertextual takes on adaptation on three counts: it focuses both on the adaptive process and its results; it refuses the original's primacy and it is aware of context within and beyond the text (through consideration of a wide variety of 'norms' and adherence or shifts to/from these).

Although film, not adaptation, was the object of their investigations, two other authors deserve mention here as their explorations relied heavily on linguistic concepts. The first of these is Francesco Casetti whose work centres on film as discourse. Casetti is a semio-
pragmatist, whose exploration of how film produces meaning is steeped in Metz, but which he grounds within a more social and historical ‘space’. He also addresses reception theory and considers the essential communication which takes place between text (film) and spectators, who are active and participate in the filmic process. His discourse-inspired enunciation theory looks for the equivalent of language’s deictics within film, and associates different participants or processes with different pronouns. This search for linguistic equivalence might seem like taking the discourse analogy one step too far, but Casetti’s reliance on the textual model and its application to film and his exploration of the spectator’s active role are otherwise inspiring and fit in well with the multimodal perspective presented below.

Finally, Michel Chion also warrants mention here, not because his theory relies on a linguistic model but because, through his interest in sound, he was one of the authors to consider the role of language in film (rather than image) most consistently. When Metz divided the cinema’s matter of expression into five tracks, three of these were aural rather than visual: sound (noises), music and dialogue (spoken). Despite this, critical consideration of sound came very late and has remained sporadic. Film is commonly considered as an essentially visual medium; the impact of this misconception on adaptation theory (the circularity of the word vs. image opposition) has been mentioned above. Yet film theory remains iconocentric and few authors have insisted on the importance of sound (and language). Linda Hutcheon pointed out that “when theorists talk of adaptation from print to performance media, the emphasis is usually on the visual, on the move from imagination to actual ocular perception. But the aural is just as important as the visual to this move.” (40) Chion has studied sound’s relationship to image and proposed a series of terms to adequately describe and label the particulars of this relationship, some of which will prove useful to the analysis below.
1.6 Methodological concerns

Now that the background against which it may be appraised has been sketched, time has come to introduce the analytical model which this thesis proposes to use. Before looking at the model itself and detailing its specificities, a necessary epistemological reflection on the nature of the analysis and the validity of the conclusions inferred on its basis needs to take place.

1.6.1 The issue of stylistic analysis

Discourse analysis, especially when applied to fictional texts (in the term’s widest conception), is a form of stylistic close reading of those texts on whose basis a series of more or less germane yet necessarily subjective inferences are drawn.

Stylistics has seen its fair share of detractors; their main objection tended to be a perceived clash between the branch’s “dream of scientificity” and the randomness and subjectivity of its findings. Stanley Fish, for instance, took issue -amongst others- with Michael Halliday’s stylistic grammar and the findings which he reached on its basis. Fish considers the stylisticians’ pursued goal (extracting meanings hidden in existing structures) as not only impossible but also unworthy. What he primarily opposes is that stylistics, in their idealized principle, fail to integrate the human agent and the context of the utterance:

While it is the program of stylistics to replace the subjectivity of literary studies with objective techniques of description and interpretation, its practitioners ignore what is objectively true – that meaning is not the property of a timeless formalism, but something acquired in the context of an activity- and therefore they are finally more subjective than the critics they would replace. (80)
Yet even Fish judges that stylistic readings of a text might prove valuable provided they are given the appropriate context and the ultimate subjectivity of the findings is acknowledged. The descriptive and interpretive acts should no longer be linked to one another but be truly unified, which would also bring down the boundary between style and meaning. Ultimately, Fish’s critique could apply to any analysis, be it openly subjective or coated in a semblance of objectivity. What needs to be addressed is the analyses’ limitations; they must not only be acknowledged but also transcended, by providing and taking into account a wider contextual view. In this fashion, the (still and always eventually subjective) findings of the analysis can be more comfortably accommodated.

This is what this thesis proposes to do: to balance out close textual readings and the wider context of textual production, all the while recognizing the inevitable, but by no means indefensible, slant in its conclusions. Using an intertextual perspective to approach adaptation, as has been defended above, is already a form of contextualisation since it gives some idea of a work’s situation, if only with respect to other works.

But to lend authority more thoroughly to the analytical endeavour conducted here, two crucial sources, which also argue for critical middle ground, will be invoked. The first of these addresses the issue of the legitimacy (and variation in manner) of analysing art forms more globally, from a social perspective. The second source is foundational to film criticism and deals more specifically with this art’s angle.

1.6.2: Pierre Bourdieu

Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu wrote abundantly on the field of cultural production whose societal aspects he considered at length, describing how “art and cultural consumption [were]
predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences” (*Distinction*, 7)

Within the cultural field, Bourdieu observes the central epistemological opposition between subjectivism and objectivism, seeing the benefits and restrictions which both views inherently carry. To him, subjectivism fails to grasp the social ground that shapes consciousness, while objectivism fails to recognize that social reality is also shaped by individual representations of the social world. Which is why Bourdieu argues in favour of “the objectivity of the subjective”, a middle ground where both positions can coexist and temper each other’s extremes while retaining their strong points. (*Logic*, 135). His disapproval of “internal” pseudo-objective analyses is particularly strong:

It can only be an unjustifiable abstraction (which could fairly be called reductive) to seek the source of the understanding of cultural productions in these productions themselves, taken in isolation and divorced from the conditions of their production and utilization, as would be the wish of discourse analysis, which, situated on the border between sociology and linguistics, has nowadays relapsed into indefensible forms of internal analysis. Scientific analysis must work to relate to each other two sets of relations, the space of works or discourses taken as differential stances, and the space of the positions held by those who produce them. (*Homo*, xvii)

Bourdieu’s perspective is in fact intertextual, but he broadens the process’ relational scope: texts are not just related to other texts but to the structure of the field itself and the specific agents in presence.

Bourdieu also examines the legitimacy, not of the analytical procedures, but of the cultural products themselves, delving into reception theory and paying particular attention to how, and what kind of, recognition is granted by whom. He sees three competing principles: peer judgment or the specific principle of legitimacy; the principle of bourgeois legitimacy or
the ethical, aesthetic (and therefore political) taste of the dominant class and the popular or mass audience principle. ("Field") Accordingly, he subdivides the field of cultural production into the sub-fields of restricted vs. large-scale production and would later refine this classification and include the new category of "art moyen" or middle-brow art, aimed at an average public.

These distinctions are interesting to a theorist dealing with adaptation since novels and films are generally considered as belonging to two different artistic categories, one of which (literature) is often given precedence over the other. The implication in terms of how the work is perceived, received and evaluated can then be considered not only with respect to the generic (material) shift but also as a shift from one sub-genre to another.

Two further reflections of Bourdieu’s are particularly relevant to adaptation. First, his examination of the status of the author and his/her involvement in producing the value of the work. He argues that the “cultural businessman” who publishes, exhibits, stages, distributes etc. also has a role to play by consecrating the product and that the degree of his/her own consecration will similarly impact on the product. ("Production") This is interesting for film by itself, which is not a single individual’s creation but the result of a large body of people working as a team, and whose individual input is not always straightforwardly identifiable, retrievable or divisible. Thus many individuals, to varying degrees, can bring value to a film. But Bourdieu’s reading is even more appealing in the case of adaptation where the author of the source novel can confer a certain degree of consecration onto the film; sometimes, but more rarely, the motion is reversed and a film brings attention, (economic and/or prestige) to the novel it is based on. These considerations will be returned to, developed and illustrated below.
Finally, Bourdieu hints at the element of “enjoyment” which may appear beyond the first-degree reading of a work, if and when intertextual relationships are recognized within a text:

A genre containing ever more references to the history of that genre calls for a second-degree reading, reserved for the initiate, who can only grasp the work’s nuances and subtleties by relating it back to previous works. By introducing subtle breaks and fine variations, with regard to assumed expectations, the play of internal allusions authorizes detached and distanced perception, quite as much as first-degree adherence, and calls for either erudite analysis or the aesthete’s wink. (“Market”, 128)

The lure of this more cerebral but pleasurable dimension had already been highlighted in the case of adaptation.

1.6.3 David Bordwell

When considering film analysis more particularly, it would be amiss not to take into account one of its major practitioners and pivotal influences on the genre, David Bordwell. Although he has not examined the issue of adaptation specifically, most of his theories regarding film analysis more globally can prove a valuable source of information and inspiration. Bordwell is probably best known for his work on classical Hollywood Cinema, which centres on narrative, but it is towards his most recent works and his expression of a Poetics of Cinema that this thesis will turn to seek validation of its model.

In his influential *Narration in the Fiction Film*, Bordwell establishes a distinction which would bear heavily on adaptation theorists who saw narrative as the main common ground between text and film (see, for instance, Mc Farlane above): “The utterance is a stretch of text, a string of words, phrases, or sentences linked by principles of coherence and
perceived as constituting a whole. The enunciation, on the other hand, is the general process that creates the utterance.” (Narration, 21) An important part of this general process is the viewer’s perception of the utterance, which Bordwell develops constructively. Aesthetic perception is then a dynamic process which manipulates not only perceptual capacities but also a variety of cues (built into the film’s material structure) which the viewer can process thanks to his/her prior knowledge and experience. The circumstances of production but also of reception are then essential to interpretation; no analysis can be conducted without “historicization”. Bordwell also uses the concept of norms, which create schemata, and proposes to view films as affirming or breaking these norms. He then centres more particularly on classical narrative and its main unifying principle: causality.

But, as pointed out above, a point of view which focuses exclusively on narrative is automatically restrictive. In his later Poetics of Cinema, Bordwell opens up the scope accordingly. His Poetics of Cinema, like that of any other artistic medium, studies the finished work as the result of a process of construction. Thus a theoretical basis is used to feed close examination (analysis) while considering contingencies of time and place (contextualizing). Movements between these dimensions are by no means fixed or unilateral as analysis could inform a theory and lead to its re-positioning or even abandonment. The model which he proposes is in fact not explanatory but rather heuristic and empirical: it is grounded in theoretical activity rather than in fixed theory. Although he still sees narrative as a “contingent universal of human experience” and narratology as the “paradigm case of interdisciplinary inquiry” (Poetics, 86), he now advocates the broader analysis of materials, which he defines quite widely:

The poetics I propose looks at artistic form as an organising principle that works not on “content” but rather on materials: not just physical stuff like film stock or the items set before the camera but also themes, subjects, received forms and styles. Out of these
materials, the relevant principles create a whole that aims to achieve effects. By studying form in the sense I mean here, we can understand how cinema turns materials circulating in the culture into significant experiences for viewers. (*Poetics*, 23)

Bordwell detaches himself from a semiotic perspective by insisting on the term *effect* rather than *meaning*, which he considers as a type of effect. Artists thus seek to elicit discriminable effects by using, or deviating from, a series of conventions. This terminology shifts the attention to human action, not only on the part of the artists but also on the part of the perceivers.

While retaining his previous model, Bordwell makes it less rigid by redefining and adapting a series of concepts. Communication becomes *convergent inference making*, where inferences, not only about the narrative but also about themes or topics are based on the elaboration of cues presented in the design of the work. These inferences are supported, but not constrained, by a series of schemas relating to a body of norms. Although it is not haphazard (effects are sought and achieved, albeit differently according to the recipients), the model seeks to be more open-ended, relational and constructive. As to contextualization, while considering it essential, Bordwell warns that it should move from the artwork to the proximate conditions of production (agents, institutions and communal norms and practices) and from there onto wider social causes and preconditions.

Finally, he brings consideration of style clearly into the focus by proposing to analyze its functions. His definition of style is similarly flexible: "a system of technical choices instantiated in the total form of the work, itself grasped in its relation to pertinent and proximate stylistic norms" (*Poetics*, 378). The notion of viewing style functionally is perfectly in keeping with the systemic functional model which this thesis proposes and the functions which Bordwell ascribes to style - denotative, thematic, expressive and ornamental or decorative - are strikingly reminiscent of that model’s metafunctions.
Thus both Bourdieu and Bordwell substantiate the adoption of an intertextual, multimodal, systemic-functional model for the analytical exploration of adaptation. Bourdieu, by arguing for the "objectivity of the subjective", questioning the work's - and its author's- artistic and social legitimacy, and highlighting the appeal of intertextuality's gratification. Bordwell, by foregrounding a heuristic dynamic model, supporting analysis with open-ended theory and a sense both of context and reception, and focusing on materials and effects to validate its findings.

The espousal of the model which will now be introduced thus originates in a series of epistemological steps: from discourse analysis to film semiotics, to multimodal discourse, to adaptation theory, with some elements of sociology and film criticism thrown in for good measure. Hopefully, the complexity of this endeavour will have been justified by the complexity of the issue and its many pitfalls as presented in the previous pages. Stam had reached similar conclusions based on the nature of film:

If I am a partisan of anything it is of "theoretical cubism": the deployment of multiple perspectives and grids. Each grid has its blind spots and insights; each needs the "excess seeing" of the other grids. As a synaesthetic, multi-track medium which has generated an enormous variegated body of texts, the cinema virtually requires multiple frameworks of understanding. (Theory, 1)

What remains to be stated, in Bordwellian fashion, is that this theoretical model, while it is believed to be particularly adequate at facilitating intersemiotic comparison and the articulation thereof, is but a theoretical model. It is only one of the facets, along with the text(s) under scrutiny and the context(s) surrounding them of this thesis's main aim: to gain
insight into the process(es) of adaptation through investigating its products. And while this investigation’s findings are presented as conclusive, there is no denying the ultimate subjectivity which shapes them. But as long as it is acknowledged, that need not lead to their dismissal.

1.7 **Analytical tools**

Written texts and film texts, as stated above, are shaped by intrinsically different "matters of expression" and their analysis thus requires different perspectives and therefore different analytical grids. However, as has just been argued, there is a certain degree of commonality between them which enables the use of a shared system of enquiry and terminology, namely a multimodal systemic functional methodology.

1.7.1: Written text

The grid chosen for use here goes directly to the roots of systemic functional grammar as it is based on Halliday (*Explorations* and *Introduction*), albeit a somewhat simplified and more accessible version of his model. As far as its application to textual analysis goes, the grid has been inspired by less absolute more "pragmatic" approaches such as Downing and Locke or, especially, Butt et al.

Inherent to this approach is the notion that a text is functional, that it represents language in use and gathers a collection of meanings which are appropriate to its context(s). These meanings, on the one hand, cohere with each other, providing texture, and, on the other,
increase the probability, given particular purposes and contexts, of certain structural elements appearing, providing structure.

The notion of context is taken in its widest sense including not only the situational context, and its variables of Field, Tenor and Mode but also the context of culture.

Central to a systemic functional model is the organisation of meanings into three (meta)functions:

- The ideational (often divided into experiential and logical^26): language realizes the encoding of experiences and also the relationships between them.
- The interpersonal: language encodes interactions between the participants in the discourse and their attitudes to it.
- The textual: language organizes the above meanings into a coherent whole.

According to meanings and structures, the texts can additionally be organized into text types, and further into registers (common meanings) and genres (common structural elements, perceived as obligatory).

Beyond this primarily functional organisation of language, lies its systemic dimension which Halliday decomposes into a rank scale which goes from clause complex (one or more clauses) to clause (one or more groups or phrases) to verbal or nominal group or phrase (one or more words) to word (one or more morphemes) to morpheme.

Each metafunction thus offers, at one and/or the other level within the rank scale, a different perspective on what is expressed by language but also how language is uniquely able to express it. Thus each dimension focuses more particularly on certain elements within the

---

^26 Halliday situates the experiential at the hypotactic level (complexes of clause, group and word) and the logical at the paratactic level (interactions between all ranks), (*Explorations*, 141)
text and proposes likely paths to guide the recipient's interpretation. Before examining the options in their variety in the table below, a rapid summary of what fits into each category is proposed.

_**Ideational (Experiential and Logical):**_

According to Halliday, "our most powerful impression of experience is that it consists of "goings-on" – happening, doing, sensing, meaning, and being and becoming." (Introduction, 106) These "goings-on" are termed the processes of experience, and how they are expressed will be the fundamental constituent of a clause. Alongside the process, the participants and circumstances are also considered.

_**Interpersonal:**_

The most central aspect under scrutiny within this metafunction is the structure of the mood block, which is composed of the finite (verbal element which is marked for time or mood and also carries additional information such as comments and polarity) and subject. The rest of the clause is labelled residue and consists of the predicator, complements and adjuncts.

Another notion which is built into the interpersonal function, although some authors deal with it separately, is that of appraisal or how the authors of a text influence their audience's reactions. By making certain lexico-grammatical choices, the perceived meanings of the text may be oriented towards specific interpretations.

_**Textual:**_

The textual function is mainly concerned with how meanings are organized within the clause, especially in terms of thematic and rhematic structure. The theme is considered as the point of departure of what the message conveys, i.e. what it is concerned with; whereas the theme is the additional (new) information provided. Theme can be textual, interpersonal and topical,
but also simple or multiple. Different patterns of thematic progression and/or drift can be observed and also the manner in which these choices are unmarked (expected) or marked.
Table 1: Metafunctional analytical grid for texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process (types)</th>
<th>Participants (patterns)</th>
<th>Circumstances (patterns)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>Actor, Goal, Range, Beneficiary</td>
<td>Extent: time, place</td>
<td>Type of NGs and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavioural</td>
<td>Behaver, Behaviour, Range</td>
<td>Location: time, place</td>
<td>Patterns of tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental</td>
<td>Senser, Phenomenon</td>
<td>Manner: means, quality, complement</td>
<td>Pre and post-modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>Sayer, Verbiage, Receiver, Target</td>
<td>Angle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential</td>
<td>Existent</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational attributive</td>
<td>Carrier, Attribute</td>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational identifying</td>
<td>Identified, Identifier, Token, Value</td>
<td>Cause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal</th>
<th>Mood block (choices and patterns)</th>
<th>Residue (choices and patterns including lexical register)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Mood adjunct</td>
<td>Finite: time (tense) and/or modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood adjunct</td>
<td>Comment adjunct</td>
<td>Predicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textual</th>
<th>Theme (drift and progression)</th>
<th>Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>textual</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>topical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(patterns above and below the clause or in the whole text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logical patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohesion and texture (lexico-grammatical links)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure (generic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7.2: Film text

Now that an analytical grid has been proposed to deal with texts and language, its equivalent for film texts will be presented. As has been developed in the previous sections, the term of film text, representative of a Metzian semiotic tradition, has been chosen deliberately. Certain authors have explicitly renounced it, particularly in the case of adaptation. Kamila Elliott for instance is particularly loath to use it, deeming that it confuses an interdisciplinary debate and reflects "the colonizing application of terminology derived from language and linguistics to film and pictorial arts." (8)

However, this thesis holds that the terminological issue does not centre on the application of the word "text" to film but rather on the definition of text itself and where its boundaries stand. If text is construed in its multimodal understanding as the expression of semiotic material, and not limited to language, objections become groundless. Given the variety of possible texts which this definition encompasses, it is however necessary to subcategorize, adapt and re-construct the analytical models used to approach each text generically. A different grid is thus proposed and developed here for filmic texts. As it is tested and applied, it is hoped that it will shed as much light on these texts as it will on their construction. This dual and reciprocal process should then inform us on the nature of adaptation and the differences – but also the similitudes - between diverse texts and semiotic systems and the meanings they express.

As stated above, the stance here is semio-pragmatic: the roles of context and reception (and the unavoidable subjectivity which the latter entails) are foregrounded as part of the communicative process inherent in texts, whatever their nature. In keeping with a post-structuralist view, this should not invalidate (admitted and avowed) interpretation on whose basis wider ontological conclusions might then be expanded.
The analytical grid proposed here to approach film texts is indebted to two multimodal theorists in particular but also to other film and visual experts.

Michael O’Toole was one of the foundational theorists of multimodal approaches; his interest lay particularly in “displayed art” and how, like language, its codes could be processed, through a metafunctional process, into meanings. For visual arts such as painting and sculpture, he redefines the metafunctional categories as Representational, Modal and Compositional and the grammatical rank scale as Work to Episode to Figure to Member. Within each of these categories, he presents a series of criteria for observation, which go from narrative themes to actions, characters, framing, cohesion, gaze, light, colour etc. (See figures 1.5, Functions and systems in painting, and 2.1, Functions and systems in sculpture). What is particularly interesting with O’Toole is his concern with comparative standpoints and his belief that these are facilitated by such a model:

Auden and Brueghel both exploit framing devices from several systems at several ranks of unit of their respective semiotic codes. It is meaningful and revealing to compare these, I believe, as long as the comparison is made, not just in terms of structures, but relating each device to its overall function in the whole work. A functional analytical model appropriate to the specific processes of each code makes possible this kind of comparative perspective. (165)

The relevance of this conviction to adaptation, and to this thesis’ premise, is self-explanatory. However, comparative criticism is surprisingly still marginal even in multimodal approaches to textual analysis and the field remains relatively unexplored to date.

One author who has successfully sought inspiration from O’Toole’s visual model and applied it to film, albeit from a non-comparative angle, is Kay O’Halloran. It is her model which will serve as the blueprint for the analytical grid presented hereafter. Since the framework is based on O’Toole but applied to film, it also considers the medium’s dynamic
resources which result in change, similarity and contrast. The soundtrack is obviously also taken into account, although it is absent from her analysis of two scenes from Polanski’s Chinatown, as her interest rests solely on visual dimensions.

For a firm terminological basis, O’Halloran uses Bordwell and Thompson’s Film Art: An Introduction to define and label the categorizing units (in rank constituents and metafunctional manifestations). Her stance will be seconded here but some concepts, or developments, will also be gleaned from Block, whose structural shaping of visual components in terms of contrast and affinity is engaging and revealing. Another concept which O’Halloran borrows from Bordwell and Thompson is the classification of the film text according to type, form and genre. What this classification in fact implements is a manner of contextualization. As developed above, within the semio-pragmatic stance adopted here, this is an essential requisite to any conclusive findings.

However, this thesis would argue for a more inclusive perspective. In keeping with Hallidayan theories, both the context of culture and situation are relevant but these are not necessarily to be examined separately from the ensuing analysis. Field, mode and tenor function parallel to but are also built-into the three linguistic metafunctions. In the same manner, notions of type, form and genre in film can be found reflected or embodied, wholly or partially, at other ranks within the general scale.

In her Chinatown analysis, O’Halloran chooses the mise-en-scène as basic unit for analysis because the major systems for each metafunction across the semiotic resources are operational at that rank. She discards the sequence as being too complex to be comprehensive and the frozen frame, which excludes sound. However, for the purposes of the examination conducted here, this approach has been expanded. Alongside the rank of mise-en-scène, that of mise-en-scène complex or scene, where the various shots unfold, will also be considered.
This will allow consideration of the different shots presented but also of their alternation and interaction through editing.

The boundaries of scenes are generally easily, and consensually, demarcated; although at times some degree of subjectivity governs this process. The musical soundtrack, as will be seen below, is often an important clue (but by no means the only one) to this delimitation. As to O’ Halloran’s objection that considering scenes rather than shots might not ensure the analysis’ exhaustiveness, it need not hold if one believes, in agreement with discourse analysis, that it is through the use of salient (marked) features that specific meanings are put forward and that, beyond these features, comprehensiveness is neither relevant nor particularly desirable. The segmental ranks which are considered below the mise-en scene may temporarily dissociate the visual imagery and soundtrack, with the proviso that their recombination is essential at a later stage. The visual imagery can be further decomposed (action, episode, figure, member) while the soundtrack can be split into speech, music and sound effects.

The grid itself provides all the necessary information but, roughly put, the equivalences to the Hallidayan metafunctions are the following:

*The Representational and logical*

In combination, they correspond to the experiential metafunction. The logical concerns itself with narrative, especially from the perspective of cause-effect relations while the representational relates to what is displayed at each level and how this directed content input impacts the narrative.

*The Modal:*

It corresponds to the Interpersonal metafunction and focuses on the manner in which visual and aural cues are presented to the viewers and engage them. It includes for consideration such elements as lighting, colour, positioning, volume etc...
The Compositional:

It corresponds to the Textual metafunction and considers various elements at different ranks mainly as they relate to the Gestalt, i.e. the text globally.

Now that both analytical grids have been presented, what remains to be gauged is how appropriate they are at exploring adaptation. The fact of using two separate grids caters to the specificities of each medium while the common systemic functional model which underlies them ensures that articulating perceived consistencies (or incoherencies) will not only be facilitated but also justified. By gathering both novels and film under the label of texts and submitting them to textual analysis, it is hoped that the -metafunctionally retrieved- meanings which they express can be contrasted along parameters which favour commonality and thus transcend semiotic boundaries.

The following chapter will then apply and test this model. One novel, Dracula, and a series of films adapted from it, which offer some degree of commonality, have been chosen for this purpose. After this model has been implemented and assessed, appraisal of its relevance to adaptation may resume.
Table 2: Metafunctional analytical grid for films

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Semiotic resources / rank</strong></th>
<th><strong>Modal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Representational</strong></th>
<th><strong>Logical</strong></th>
<th><strong>Compositional</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISE-EN-SCENE COMPLEX</strong></td>
<td>Contrast and affinity between shots</td>
<td>Narrative continuity and discontinuity</td>
<td>Cause-effect relations</td>
<td>Global Continuity and discontinuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(the edited scene)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISE-EN-SCENE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Temporal-Spatial Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Relation: The Shot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual imagery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Movement-action-event in a shot</em></td>
<td>Patterns (Kinesic; Proxemic; Rhythm; Gaze; Shape)</td>
<td>Movement-Action-Event Sequence</td>
<td>Narrative Cause-Effect Relations</td>
<td>Frame (Dimension; Shape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colours and Contrast</td>
<td>Figures / Objects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contrast and affinity in Gestalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting (Quality; Intensity; Direction; Source)</td>
<td>Nature of Scene Props</td>
<td></td>
<td>Framing (Horizontal; Vertical; Diagonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Lighting Colour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contrast and affinity in Colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point of View (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film Tonality</td>
<td>Visual Motifs</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-Screen / Off-Screen Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special effects</td>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera (Angle; Level; Distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed of Motion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point of View (Viewer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal episode</strong></td>
<td>Relation to Movement-Action-Event (Scale: Depth; Centrality; Relative Prominence)</td>
<td>Sequence of Sub-Actions</td>
<td>Contribution to Narrative Cause-Effect Relations</td>
<td>Relative Relation in Gestalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Side Sequences and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Interplay of Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parallelism and Opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative On-Screen / Off-Screen Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera (Angle; Level; Distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal figure</strong></td>
<td>Colour (contrast and affinity; intensity)</td>
<td>Character of Figure Costume</td>
<td>Contribution to Cause-Effect Relations</td>
<td>Relative Position in Gestalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costume Style</td>
<td>Body Behaviour / Gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View</td>
<td>Props</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parallelism and Opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes (Size; Prominence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative On-Screen / Off-Screen Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaze Pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera (Angle; Level; Distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal member</td>
<td>Colour (contrast and affinity; intensity)</td>
<td>Body Part</td>
<td>Make Up</td>
<td>Facial expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soundtrack</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>speech</strong></td>
<td>Negotiation (internal)</td>
<td>Ideation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical aspects (Modality; Polarity; ...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>music</strong></td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sound effects</strong></td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual imagery + soundtrack</strong></td>
<td>Interweaving visual imagery and sound</td>
<td>Direction of Engagement through Foregrounded Semiotic Choices Marking of Phases</td>
<td>Development of the Narrative Plot through Directed Content Input Development of Cause-Effect Relations Organization of the Unfolding of the Narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7.3: Other tools

The analysis presented in the next chapter thus stems from a systemic functional model and the grids for text and film-text which have been devised on its basis. Beyond the structuring and articulation of its findings, a need to quantify these to a certain extent was felt. This is why other tools have been chosen for use alongside the SF model.

As has been argued above, any stylistic analysis is by essence subjective, at the very least at the interpretive level. Yet, by acknowledging this subjectivity and grounding the investigations within a relevant context, objectively measurable criteria may be used to shore up the analysis. The proportions of the observed features with respect to one another will obviously weigh heavily on the interpretation which is made of them. To measure their 'markedness', or lack thereof, some software programs were brought in.

It is traditional with multimodal logicians to use sophisticated technological instruments to support their conclusions. As mentioned above, Anthony Baldry and his MCA and Kay O'Halloran and her Singapore Multimodal Lab are the leaders in this field, using existing software programs to new ends or developing their own. It is not the aim of this thesis to rival with these technologies; the approach here is forthrightly exploratory rather than absolute and demonstrative. However, two easily accessible programs were deemed useful to place some elements and/or findings within a clearer perspective. Suitably for a complex issue like adaptation, one of these is exclusively linguistic, although it is applied both to the novel and films, and the second is primarily visual. As these tools are rapidly introduced below, the level of abstraction will be kept deliberately high; more concrete examples will be provided in the next chapter's analyses and will, hopefully, demonstrate their worth and usefulness.
**Lexical analysis (WordSmith)**

This software program is used to find lexical patterns in the examined texts and, since an overtly comparative stance has been chosen, contrast them. Its three main functions are: Concord, Wordlist and Keyword.

The first function is that of a traditional lexical concordancer which can enable the observation of patterns of distribution and collocation. The Wordlist function generates different word lists and can carry out comparisons between them. It is particularly useful to measure the frequency of certain words (how often they occur but also what percentage of the running words this represents) and give some indication of their verbal importance within the whole text, or even corpus of texts. On the basis of these lists, the final function Key Words can be implemented. This allows the analyst to sidestep the bulk of less relevant information regarding 'grammatical' words whose frequencies are always necessarily high, and identify key or even key-key words in the text(s). Key words are those which occur unusually frequently in comparison with a reference corpus.

The reference corpus which has been chosen for this purpose is a sample of the BNC (British National Corpus). It comprises two percent of the BNC Corpus, selected from the full range of texts present in the original. It adds up to two million words, half of these spoken and half written. When relevant, this corpus may be split into two sub-corpora, written and spoken words, and possible variation of the results can be considered. However, these will be inspected with circumspection, especially in the case of comparisons with film. Its type of language, in terms of channel and medium, is by no means clear-cut: lines of dialogue are initially written to be spoken on film and, generally, to resemble spontaneous speech. Whether that is the case in the present analysis or not will be examined below.
Movie measurement (Cinemetrics)

Cinemetrics is a simple software program that allows an analyst to collect statistics regarding a film's dynamic features, such as the length of shots, scenes, sequences but also Average and Medium Shot Length.

Introduced by Barry Salt, the idea of measuring the average shot length of a film and using it as an analytical tool to quantify individual styles (a movie, a director) or more general historical trends, now has many followers. Amongst them, David Bordwell has recognized its usefulness and future possibilities as long as it is not used in an absolutist fashion: “Of course such quantitative tools need to be supplemented constantly by qualitative ones—the researcher's understanding of narrative context and of the convergence of other stylistic devices (staging, lighting, camerawork, sound design)” (Cinemetrics) Salt's use of cinemetrics is particularly ambitious as he observes the pace of editing in films in a wide corpus and over long periods of time. This allows him to reach thought-provoking conclusions that may serve as a backdrop to the investigations developed here. One such observation is the marked increase of the cutting rate in American movies, and therefore decrease both of the average shot length and also of the range of shot lengths, over a period of more than seventy years. (378)

The approach which has been chosen here is narrower, relating more closely to the context of situation than the context of culture. The overall paces of the films in the corpus will be measured and contrasted against one another. But scenes will also be appraised individually so that they might be considered in respect to other films but also to the general editorial rhythm of the movie they are extracted from.

These two additional tools should prove their worth and usefulness in supporting and completing the systemic functional reading of the texts presented below. The complexity of
the endeavour – to devise an instrument which could circumvent the intersemiotic obstacles which have plagued adaptation theory – may help justify the plurality of approaches. As Stam had stated (Theory, 1), “theoretical cubism” may well generate “excess seeing”, but whatever excesses it produces should neutralize and complete each other; and with as intricate a subject as this one epistemological flexibility is of the essence.
2 The example of *Dracula*

2.1 Introduction

Now that the proposed methodological model has been introduced, a clearly delineated corpus is needed to implement and eventually assess it and appraise its relevance to adaptation more generally.

As will have emerged from the previous chapter, analysis through application of a multimodal grid implies fairly close reading of the texts. Even when it focuses on marked (salient) features, the approach needs to be systematic and to inclusively consider the diverse matters of expression and their meaning-making potential. In order to present an all-embracing perspective, the corpus was then restricted to a single original novel, *Dracula*, and seven films based on it.

The reasons for the selection of this particular novel have been sketched out in the introduction. They are also expanded in the contextual sections hereunder and reprised when relevant in the analyses themselves:

- Its uniquely "fragmented" form: the connection to the Gothic genre, the multiplicity of its voices and modes of narration, its variation of perspectives, the literary devices which it generates (foreshadowing, dramatic irony), etc.
- The popularity of the novel from an adaptive point of view, offering a wide selection of films and therefore the possibility to select and construct a cohesive filmic corpus.
- The wealth of intertextual connections generated by the work; not only from a hypertextual perspective (cultural products linked to the original text) but also from a metatextual perspective (critical readings of the text). (Genette, 7)

As to the films, other criteria guided their selection, to be similarly developed below:
- The format: feature-length films intended for theatrical release, rather than, for instance, television series or films.

- Their (at least partial) adherence to the original narrative in terms of plot and/or characters.

- The contrasts offered by their individual features; not only in view of the directors’ perspectives but also of the context of their production (most notably their anchoring in different decades).

The corpus was restricted to seven films which met these criteria: Murnau’s *Nosferatu* (1922), Browning’s *Dracula* (1931), Fisher’s *Horror of Dracula* (1958) and *Dracula, Prince of Darkness* (1966), Badham’s *Dracula* (1979), Coppola’s *Bram Stoker’s Dracula* (1992) and Maddin’s *Dracula, Pages from a Virgin’s Diary* (2003). Even as they differed in terms of impact and popularity, all were deemed emblematic of a certain time and together offered an illustrative overview of the evolution of the Dracula myth through its visual incarnations. As will be developed below, certain films focused more on certain episodes in the novel (generally at the expense of others), and their selection was also guided by a sense of balance to offer a general reflection of the novel.

On this basis, the analysis will proceed. Seven different scenes were selected and contrasted, when possible, with their filmic equivalents across the corpus. These episodes represent key moments in the narrative but also offer a fairly inclusive outline of the novel’s themes. In that manner, attention can be given not only to the transposition of content but also to thematic drifts and the transposition of form.

For reasons developed below (along with counter-arguments), Coppola’s film was felt to most closely resemble the novel and its particulars. It will then be used as the analyses’ red thread: it is the only film to systematically present excerpts as “matching” counterparts to the

---

21 Maddin’s inclusion is a hybrid case: initially produced for television, the film ended up being released in the theatres (on a limited scale), especially in the festival circuit.
seven scenes chosen in the novel (the other films present four or five excerpts). Given its special status, Coppola’s film will systematically warrant a more inclusive development, not only in terms of analysis but also of contextualisation.

But before the films can be examined in their contrastive interactions with the original, the novel itself needs to be contextualised and structurally presented. In this manner, the intertextual dialogue - or rather plurilogue - which then takes place can be gauged in all its complexity.

2.2 The novel

2.2.1 The context

2.2.1.1 The author

In 1912, when Bram Stoker’s death was recorded in the Irish Times, it was chiefly his role as manager of the Lyceum theatre which was highlighted. As extraordinary as it may seem to us almost a century onwards, the work with which Stoker’s name has since been- and for the foreseeable future always will be – associated, Dracula, was mentioned only in passing: “He was the master of a particularly lurid and creepy kind of fiction, represented by Dracula and other novels . . . but his chief literary memorial will be his Reminiscences of Irving” (Haining, 36). The difficulty to understand this oversight, not just for anyone remotely linked to Dracula scholarship but indeed for the general public, bears witness to the dramatic changes that perception and reception of Dracula have undergone over these last hundred years. This will be explained and illustrated below, but let us first take a closer look at elements of Bram
Stoker’s biography\textsuperscript{22}. Although true understanding is illusory, links towards the author and his work can be drawn by trying to illuminate certain aspects of the man’s life and some form of contextualisation, though not necessarily explanatory may be devised. This is particularly relevant in the present case. As will be developed below, Dracula has been a pivotal novel in psychoanalytical criticism, and reversely this brand of criticism has been dominant and still remains in force in readings of the novel. The author’s life or what is known of it, leaving ample room for extrapolation and interpretation has thus held particular relevance here. Or in Hughes and Smith’s words: “The nature of psychoanalytical discourse permits the transfer of the site of study from the novel to the biography (or psychobiography) of the author \textit{as text}, and back again.” (3)

Abraham “Bram” Stoker was born in Clontarf, a suburb of Dublin, on 8 November 1847. His parents were Abraham Stoker (1799-1876) a civil servant and Charlotte Mathilda Blake Thornly (1818-1901). He was the third of seven children and brought up a Protestant in the Church of Ireland. Although it was not until the Irish Church Act of 1869 that the Church of Ireland’s role as State Church was terminated, members of the Anglican faith were a small minority amongst the dominant Roman Catholics. This posits the young Stoker at a crossroads between the tenets of his own faith and exposure to the more symbolically charged practices of the Roman Catholic Church; a knowledge which he would put to good use in expanding the religious motifs in Dracula\textsuperscript{23}. His religious identity can also be construed as the first rung on a ladder of isolation from the norm, to be followed later by his political beliefs

\textsuperscript{22} Biographical information has been compiled chiefly from two books on the subject: Murray and Belford.

\textsuperscript{23} Bruno Starrs takes matters even further and argues that Stoker might have been a covert Catholic secretly promoting, in his writing, the proselytization of Protestants to Catholicism.
and his status as transplanted Irishman in London, not to mention more controversial hypotheses as to his sexuality.

As a child, Stoker was of a weak constitution and particularly illness-prone. Much of his childhood was consequently spent bed-ridden, which seems to have had a lasting influence on him as a writer. It sharpened his budding perception of the randomness of life and death and the in-between state of illness; these memories would come to life quite vividly in the depiction of Lucy Westenra’s slow agony in Dracula. Also, more pragmatically, it gave him the opportunity to read many books, some of them Gothic novels, which would consequently shape his literary background. For instance, the penny-dreadful Varney the Vampyre (whose authorship is generally attributed to John Malcom Rymer and/or Thomas Pecket Prest) was serialized between 1845 and 1847 and subsequently published. It stands to reason that Stoker read it as his novel presents some similarities with the earlier work, notably in the very graphic depiction of young female vampires being staked. Unexpectedly, Stoker was to fully recover from his frail disposition and turn out to be quite an athletic young man.

In 1863, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, to study mathematics and was to receive his M.A. with honours in 1870. He was an active student, dividing his time between his studies, athletics, and involvement in different student societies: the Historical society and the Philosophical society, of which he would be elected president. The choice of these societies also gives some indication of Stoker’s centres of interest beyond the purely academic perspective; historical accuracy, for instance, would stand in good stead in his publications to come.

Despite this flourish of activity, Stoker still found time to devote most of his leisure to what would become a lifelong passion but also his professional occupation: the theatre. While still a student, in 1865, he first saw the great Victorian actor Henry Irving perform, in Irish-born Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s The Rivals. At that time Irving’s career had not yet peaked
and he was still a virtually unknown, if prolific, young actor. But as his reputation would grow, so would Stoker’s interest, although they would not meet until 1876.

In 1868, following in his father’s footsteps, Stoker entered the Civil Service at Dublin Castle, then the seat of British Government. Socially, Stoker was part of the commercial and professional Ascendancy. As far as his political beliefs went, Stoker was a Liberal who believed in Home Rule for Ireland as long as it was brought about by peaceful means. Yet he was at the same time a fierce monarchist and defender of the British Empire, of which he wanted Ireland to be part. There is a certain element of tension between these views which might seem to some degree problematic to reconcile. Some critics have picked up on the issue of Stoker’s conflicting allegiances and applied it to Dracula. Milbank, for instance, sees some of the novel’s characters as representing different layers of Irish society and their interaction as exemplifying the Irish question and posits that “a particularly Irish struggle towards modernity from a Gothic past is what makes Dracula so odd and yet so hermeneutically fertile.” (20). Arata argues for an interpretation of the novel in the light of reverse colonization where “Dracula’s journey from Transylvania to England could be read as a reversal of Britain’s imperial exploitation of “weaker” races, including the Irish.” (470)

Stoker’s experience as a civil servant would also inspire him to work on what would be his first published book (in 1879): *The Duties of Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland*. This work of non-fiction which, as the Irish Times mentioned in its obituary of Stoker, long remained a standard reference on the subject, was not his first foray into writing. A few shorter pieces of his had already been published, “The Necessity of Political Honesty”, “The Crystal Cup” in 1872 and, already, a horror story “The Chain of Destiny” in 1875. But it was as a drama critic that Stoker was most drawing attention to himself. The quality of his reviews in the *Dublin Mail*, most of which were written disinterestedly, made him stand out.
In 1876, following a very favourable review of his performance as Hamlet at the Theatre Royal in Dublin, Henry Irving himself took notice and invited Bram for dinner. It would mark the beginning of a lifelong friendship and professional partnership. In 1878, after wedding Florence Balcombe, one of whose suitors was Oscar Wilde, the couple moved to London where Bram assumed the position of acting manager of Irving’s Lyceum Theatre, a post which he would hold for almost thirty years.

Stoker and Irving’s relationship has received wide speculation. Bram was certainly dedicated to Irving and under his thrall. Some conception of his idolatry can be gleaned from the work which Stoker wrote in 1906, after Irving’s passing: Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving. He also named his only child, Irving Noel Thomley, born 1879, after his mentor. But evidence lacks to support – or indeed invalidate- any of the many theories which have sought to qualify or classify the two men’s friendship: substitute father figure (Bram’s father died in 1876, the year he and Irving first met), homoerotic, repressed homosexual, domineering/ dominated etc. And even though it is commonly taken for granted (Auerbach, 269-70), neither is there any evidence that Irving was the inspiration for the character of Dracula. It does however stand to reason that Irving was the more assertive force in the pair; he was, after all, not only older but also Bram’s employer and, in his day, more famous and respected (as evidenced by his being knighted by Queen Victoria in 1895). There is another element which brings grist to the mill of the idea that Irving was overbearing and somewhat crippling and condescending to Stoker, especially in terms of his own career. Irving never agreed to have Dracula dramatized and staged in his theatre, and is even reported as having derogatorily dismissed the text upon its copyright reading at the Lyceum in 1897: “After the show, Stoker asked his employer Sir Henry Irving what he thought of it. He dismissed it in one memorable word: ‘Dreadful!’” (Haining, 53) The success of the Deane / Balderston dramatization a few years later bears witness to the lack of, notably commercial, inspiration in
that decision; unless it was motivated by more mundane emotions such as jealousy or possessiveness.

But even if it may have stifled him in some respects, Stoker’s collaboration with Irving was fruitful in many others. Through his employment at the Lyceum, Stoker met many notable figures of his day, actors and writers especially, some of whom would become close friends and none more so than Hall Caine, to whom he would dedicate *Dracula* under the Manx nickname of Hommy-Beg (Little Tommy). It also gave him the opportunity to travel, especially to the United States, where Irving’s company toured in 1883; then again in 1887, 1901 and 1904. Irving was a popular figure in America and Stoker’s experiences there were enriching; he was received at the White House and finally got to meet one of the poets he most admired and had been corresponding with for years, Walt Whitman. Some authors have also questioned the nature of Stoker and Whitman’s friendship and used it to feed homoerotic readings of Stoker’s work. Mulvey-Roberts, for instance, argues that Stoker was a repressed homosexual (using both Irving and Whitman to make her point) and that *Dracula* is a “backlash text” through which Stoker sets out to restore the status quo with a vengeance” (79-80). Again, the evidence is flimsy at best, basing itself on the American’s ambiguous sexuality and some much abused quotes such as this one, from a letter the impassioned twenty four year old Stoker wrote to Whitman upon reading *Leaves of Grass*:

> But be assured of this, Walt Whitman – that a man of less than half your own age, reared a conservative in a conservative country ... here felt his heart leap across the Atlantic and his soul swelling at the words or rather the thoughts ... I have been more candid with you – have said more about myself to you than I have ever said to any one before ... If you would ever care to have more you can imagine, for you have a great heart, how much pleasure it would be to me to write more to you. How sweet a thing it is for a strong healthy man with a woman’s eyes and a child’s wishes to feel that he
can speak so to a man who can be if he wishes father, and brother and wife to his soul. (Traubel, 184-5)

Bram became a firm admirer of the United States, which would provide settings and characters for his works to come and inspire the lecture *A Glimpse of America* (1886).


And of course *Dracula*, which he began researching in 1890 under the working title *The Undead*, and which was published in 1897 in Great Britain and in 1899 in America. Stoker's holiday at Whitby on the North East coast of Yorkshire in the summer of 1890 provided him not only with inspiration for settings but also with some new themes, plot elements (the wreck of the *Demeter*) and opportunity for research at the local library. Amongst the books he used was *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia* by William Wilkinson (1820), which mentioned the Voivod Vlad Tepes, the name Dracula and customs of Transylvania. This was undoubtedly a pivotal moment in the genesis of the novel. This evolution can be traced quite accurately thanks to the author's notes and his original manuscript which were re-discovered after being lost for nearly a hundred years and which the general public gained access to through their publication in 2008. Joseph S. Bierman has discussed the centrality of the Whitby stay in the writing of the novel.
Towards the end of his life, Stoker’s health declined rapidly. He suffered a series of strokes, the first of which, shortly after Irving’s death, left him debilitated. He died on 20 April 1912. The cause of his death, commonly attributed to general exhaustion, has been, like most areas of uncertainty in Stoker’s life, open to speculation. Daniel Farson, who as Stoker’s grandnephew and biographer had privileged access to certain family documents, argues that Bram was unfaithful to the frigid Florence, probably with prostitutes, and as a result contracted syphilis. He substantiates this claim by referring to the death certificate, listing as cause of death *Locomotor Ataxy*, a clinical term used to describe general paralysis of the insane and consistent with the onset of the disease (234). This link, however tenuous and speculative, has again fed the interpretations of some critics (e.g. Senf) who were only too happy to be able to link the sexual perversions which they saw lurking between the lines of *Dracula* to its morally corrupt author.

The last work to bear Stoker’s name, the short story collection *Dracula’s Guest and Other Weird Stories*, was published posthumously by his widow in 1914. The eponymous story is generally supposed to have been an introductory chapter of *Dracula* which was cut out of the final manuscript. As interest in Dracula grew, Florence Stoker also became a forceful defender of the novel’s copyright, as Murnau would learn at his expense.

Although they have been used extensively by criticism, with varying degrees of success and intellectual honesty, many aspects of Stoker’s life are still obscure and conjectural. It is probably safest to use them parsimoniously and, instead, return to his texts, most particularly to *Dracula* which can accommodate - and indeed over the years has accommodated – a plethora of readings.
2.2.1.2 Critical evolution

As was made apparent in the previous segment, when Dracula was first published in 1897, it by no means became an overnight classic, and brought its author no immediate recognition. Upon its release, the novel was reasonably popular but gave no indication of the sales phenomenon it would become (it has never been out of print since its publication) or of its durability. But even more surprising than its commercial success is the status it has acquired as “one of the rare popular cultural novels to be canonised.” (Davison, 1) The critical evolution may have been slower to take off than its mercantile counterpart but its scope is comparable and, furthermore, unusual (or even unheard of) for a novel of its genre.

Upon its publication, reviews of Dracula were generally somewhat condescendingly positive. The Bookman deemed that its readers “unless (they) be of unserviceably delicate stuff, (would) both shudder and enjoy” the experience. The Daily Mail stated that “the eerie chapters are written and strung together with very considerable art and cunning, and also with unmistakable literary power”, and also praised the author’s rich imagination. Other publications were more sceptical and far less generous in their praise. The Athenaeum judged the book “highly sensational, but (...) wanting in the constructive art as well as in the higher literary sense”. The Spectator’s review was similarly understated, lamenting the novel’s modernity which it found out of key with its more medieval subject. (Auerbach and Skal 363-7)

It would take Dracula close to 70 years to take its first steps on the path towards critical recognition. In 1959 Maurice Richardson was the first to study the novel critically in his “Psychoanalysis of Ghost Stories”, giving it an oedipal reading. It would pave the way for many psychoanalytical interpretations of Stoker’s text to come. As Hughes and Smith have
pointed out, *Dracula* has in fact become: "the Freudian text *par excellence*, and
psychoanalytical criticism has (...) become for many observers the primary signifier of the
critical response to Stoker's novel." (3)²⁴ But Richardson's article concomitantly posited
Stoker's text as worthy of analysis alongside more classical texts. By this consideration, he set
in motion a kind of double vortex: on the one hand breaking down the exclusive and
restrictive borders of the canon, and on the other creating for the novel a legitimacy which
would later warrant its inclusion in that same canon (or rather an updated version of it). It is
the development of ground-breaking critical theories and their mechanisms in the 1960s
which would ensure the longevity of this precursor approach.

Alongside Freudian readings, *Dracula* also rapidly began attracting more materialist
approaches. Their range has been extensive and varied in content, but historical and
geographical approaches have predominated - especially in terms of their symbolic
representation of power, articulated in terms of dichotomies: East vs. West, North vs. South,
past vs. present, tradition vs modernity, etc...

The increased interest in and use of *Dracula* could be interpreted as representative of
post-structural criticism, especially in its challenges to critical orthodoxy and its value-
judgments: just another consequence and illustration of the shift from the canon to other types
of 'literature'. That is undeniably the case, but what makes *Dracula* stand out is the cyclical
way in which critical interest then rehabilitated the novel as a modern 'classic', a rather
exceptional occurrence. When Leonard Wolf published his Annotated version of the text in
1975 that was not yet the case, as we can learn from his introduction. By the centennial of the
novel's publication, as Davison mentioned, the situation had changed: *Dracula* was now a

²⁴ To list but some of the Freudian readings which the text has undergone, *Dracula* has been interpreted as
homoerotic (Schaffer), as a text of gender and sexual inversion (Craft), as woman-hating or woman-fearing
(Roth, Dijkstra), as menstrual (Mulvey-Roberts) etc...
Penguin classic, and frequently to be found on reading lists in schools and universities both in English-speaking countries and abroad\textsuperscript{25}.

The bulk, breadth and span of Dracula criticism since the 1970s has been uninterrupted and exponential, especially (but not only) if one considers the field of Dracula lore beyond the novel. It is therefore not within the scope of this thesis to attempt to give even a summarized idea of its governing trends. Where it proves relevant to the point at hand, certain authors will be cited but that should by no means be construed as indicative of their relevance (or lack thereof, when omitted) within the field of Dracula studies. It would, however, be iniquitous to write about Dracula and not mention, even if it is in passing, such influential figures and studies as Nina Auerbach, Clive Leatherdale, David J; Skal, Leonard Wolf, Radu Florescu and Raymond McNally or Elizabeth Miller.

The status of Dracula, and especially its evolution from popular fiction to canonical work and the attendant expansion of critical exploration, is also interesting beyond itself as it mirrors another concern which is central to this thesis. The previous chapter presented an overview of adaptation theory and critical responses to adaptations. I believe there is a palpable parallel to be drawn between the standing of film adaptations in relation to the original novels under the evaluative strain of ‘fidelity criticism’ and that of popular fiction in relation to the canon. Adaptation criticism traditionally displayed a distrust of films as inferior to the works of literature they were adapted from. As far as popular reception was concerned, reactions were sometimes similar, although even more arbitrary. Indeed the films were not compared to the books in terms of artistic merit but on the basis of whether they were able to reflect the readers’ subjective impressions. As has been argued above, this was a barren debate, out of which no worthwhile considerations could emerge; a ‘fixed fight’ where

\textsuperscript{25} For instance, it appeared on the usually fairly conventional list of the Agrégation d’Anglais in France, in 2006 and thus became a requisite for all aspiring teachers of English.
defenders of the pre-ordained winner, the novel, were left to revel in an unsavoury, unsubstantial and unsubstantiated victory. This situation, with its associated two-valued judgments, has mercifully evolved thanks to the increase of intertextual approaches to adaptation, a process which is still ongoing. There thus appears to be a kind of poetic justice in using *Dracula*, a text which had to fight its way past popularity towards notoriety, to explore adaptation, a process which had to overcome similar preconceptions before it was granted critical and/or artistic recognition.

### 2.2.1.3 The Gothic tradition

“Classic” may have been a label which it took a certain amount of perspective for *Dracula* to acquire; but there is another which has been unproblematic, namely that of “Gothic”. In order to understand in what way the novel at once tallies with, renews and perpetuates the Gothic tradition, it will prove useful to provide some background for that tradition. Although the Gothic also has an important place in other European literatures (more particularly French and German), the emphasis here, for reasons of scope and purpose, will be exclusively English. Neither does this overview purport to be exhaustive: the works mentioned herein are those most likely to situate *Dracula* within this tradition from the perspective not only of its themes but also its style.

Gothic novels, although they can be traced back to romances, are generally considered to have truly taken flight at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1764, Horace Walpole’s *The Castle of Otranto* would pave the way, and to a large extent set the scene, for this instantly popular genre. It introduced a series of staples of gothic fiction: a dark and mysterious setting
full of castles, abbeys and secret passages, pure virtuous heroines (and a few heroes) confronted to morally corrupt and degenerate aristocratic villains, an episodic plot studded with elements of mystery, terror and horror, supernatural occurrences etc.

One of the main features of Gothic fiction, and one inherently apparent in Otranto, is its use of extreme polarities: good vs. evil, dark vs. light, male vs. female, old vs. young, etc. What makes these dualities more complex, and thus better story material is their implicit reliance on each other: without darkness, there can be no light. It is this echo effect, the tinging of repulsion with attraction which accounts for the genre’s popularity. As Lisa Hopkins has pointed out: “It is the dualities typically created by the Gothic that invest it with its uncanny ability to hold its darkly shadowed mirror up to its own age” (xi) This polarization also accounts for the Gothic’s propensity to psychoanalytical readings, as it stands on the verge of transgression, particularly socially:

Transgression, provoking fears of social disintegration, thus enabled the reconstitution of limits and boundaries. Good was affirmed in the contrast with evil; light and reason won out over darkness and superstition . . . Images of light and dark focus, in their duality, the acceptable and unacceptable sides of the limits that regulate social distinctions. (Botting, 8)

The last decade of the eighteenth century would prove one of the most qualitatively prolific for Gothic fiction. In 1794, Ann Radcliffe’s Mysteries of Udolpho carried on the genre’s features but also introduced an element of typically eighteenth-century rationality. Extremes of imagination and feeling were still described, but subsequently moderated and explained away. Radcliffe was also emblematic of the role women played in Gothic fiction, not only as characters within the novels but also as an important part of their readership and authorship. Despite this, some critics were notably vehement towards female Gothic authors whose writing they considered particularly undignified given their gender. When Mary
Shelley’s authorship of Frankenstein became known (its first publication had been anonymous), the British Critic had this reaction: “The writer of it is, we understand, a female; this is an aggravation of that which is the prevailing fault of the novel; but if our authoress can forget the gentleness of her sex, it is no reason why we should; and we shall therefore dismiss the novel without further comment.” In 1796, Matthew Lewis’ The Monk added another layer to the Gothic by providing horrific elements alongside other episodes which overtly satirized the mechanisms of horror.

Under the influence of Romanticism, the Gothic took a more internalized and more ambivalent turn, exemplified by Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein (1818). The Gothic’s intrinsic dualities were still present but increasingly blurred. The story of Frankenstein’s genesis is well known; on the shores of Lake Léman in the summer of 1816, a young inexperienced woman engaged in a writing contest with two of the greatest poets of her time and emerged as the unexpected winner. What is even more surprising is that, had there been a podium, Percy Bysshe Shelley and Lord Byron would not even have stood on the second step. In terms of impact and popularity, if not of literary or artistic merit, that spot would have been occupied by John Polidori, whose short story The Vampyre (1819) is commonly considered as the precursor of vampire literature. The story’s protagonist, Lord Ruthven, a lapsed aristocrat whose cruelty was matched only by his deceit would similarly embody the prototypical vampire and serve as ultimate reference until a certain Count came along.

But another vampire, female this one, would prove an even stronger influence on Stoker: his countryman Sheridan le Fanu’s Carmilla (1872). The links between the two works stretch beyond the vampire theme to similarities in characters (Van Helsing is reminiscent of Baron Vordenburg); settings: both stories were set in Styria before Stoker’s research led him to choose Transylvania as his creature’s home; historical sources of inspiration (Erzsebet Bathory for Carmilla and Vlad Tepes for Dracula) and narrative framing. But Le Fanu’s most
blatant influence on Stoker seems to have been his association of vampirism and eroticism. The earlier lesbian tale is by far the more erotically charged of the two texts but despite that, or maybe because of it, *Dracula* has attracted more -and more diverse- sexual readings than *Carmilla.*

The last decades of the nineteenth century, like in the previous one, would give Gothic fiction its crowning glory, typified by two novels: Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) and of course *Dracula* in 1897.

Although it was profoundly steeped in the Gothic tradition, using all of its trademarks (settings, polar opposites, horror and the supernatural,...) *Dracula* was also very modern in many respects and thus contributed to reshape this same tradition for the century to come. First, Stoker’s use of the supernatural had deeper ramifications, which had not previously been usual. As Botting noted about the novel:

> Supernatural occurrences are more than manifestations of a metaphysical power: they are associated in scientific and quasi-religious terms, with the forces and energies of a mysterious natural dimension beyond the crude limits of rationality and empiricism, exceeding the reductive and deterministic gaze of materialistic science. These forces, seen as both unhuman and inhuman, are also in-human, embedded in the natural world and the human mind. (136)

*Dracula* also displayed an unabashed modernity, both thematically and in its characterizations. Thematically, through its contemporary setting and systematic references to the latest sciences and technologies: shorthand, typewriting, phonographs and blood transfusions, to name but a few.

---

26 For other links between the two texts, and the two authors more generally, notably their belonging to a common Irish Gothic tradition, see Milbank.
But it is Stoker’s characters who best exemplify this newness, at two different levels. First, from the point of view of their social extraction and professions. The trappings of aristocracy, although they have not disappeared, have receded into the background. Dracula, of course, is still a count, but his nobility is so alien that it never constitutes his main feature. Apart from him, only one of the characters - and a secondary one at that - Arthur Holmwood / Lord Godalming is noble. The others, like most of Stoker’s readership, are professional middle-class men and women with a variety of occupations: clerk, solicitor, doctors, schoolmistress, … By facilitating identification with its protagonists, thus bringing horror closer to home, Stoker’s novel would be prototypical of the future development of the Gothic and, more generally, of the Horror genre; not only in written fiction but also in film. But Stoker also provided an interesting twist on the traditional distribution of gender roles within the Gothic novel; although the vampire’s victims of choice are still women, it is men who become the primary objects of terror and horror (especially Jonathan in the first section of the novel), an almost unprecedented state of affairs.

Dracula then deservedly occupies a place of choice within Gothic literature. Its balance between tradition and modernity makes it one of the genre’s pinnacles; taking substantial nourishment from its predecessors while innovating in ways which would make it ideal sustenance for many future works.

\[\text{Among the rare precedents, one could mention an episode of Lewis’ The Monk, in which one of the male characters is left powerless to fend off the attacks of the “bleeding nun”.}\]
2.2.2 The Content

2.2.2.1 Plot summary

Now that the novel and its author have been introduced and placed within the relevant literary context, it is necessary before proceeding to further analysis to give an idea of the plot and its progression within the novel. A fairly detailed summary of the story will be presented but its structural elements will be dealt with separately in the next point. The narrative cannot be abridged too much since the reader needs to be made familiar with the general drift of the novel as well as with some of its particulars if these are later to be contrasted with variations within the film adaptations.

The story takes place over a period of six months from May to November. The precise year is not mentioned and opinions have varied on the subject, but cultural elements place it somewhere between 1888 and 1893, almost exactly contemporary to Stoker.

Jonathan Harker, a freshly made solicitor, travels to Transylvania to visit an important client, count Dracula, who is buying property in England and wishes to conclude the necessary transactions. As he proceeds to castle Dracula, he is repeatedly exposed to the locals’ superstitious wariness as to his destination, first at an inn where he is staying, then on a coach. At the Borgo pass, he boards a carriage sent for him by his host and which is driven by a mysterious man, who on his way to the castle dismisse a pack of wolves. He is then welcomed into the castle by Dracula, a tall and extremely pale old man with a long white moustache, a strong face, cruel expression, hairy palms and dressed entirely in black. The novel offers few physical descriptions of its characters. This is one striking exception. It is particularly relevant to include it here, given the way in which Dracula, mostly through films, has truly become a cultural ‘icon’. The choice of this term is not innocent since even —or
maybe especially—people who have not read the novel have an image, an instant visual representation, of Dracula. It is noteworthy that features which would probably be considered as quintessentially Dracula (the fangs, cape, evening wear, slicked-back hair) are nowhere in Stoker’s text. They are compounded from later adaptations and derivations, particularly Bela Lugosi and Christopher Lee’s portrayals of the count.

Over the course of his stay, Harker sees little of Dracula (or of anyone else for that matter, as the castle is deserted) by daytime, but during the night they have long-wrought conversations. By the third day, Jonathan begins to suspect there is something eerie going on: he cuts himself shaving as he notices that the count casts no reflection in the mirror he is using. The count’s reaction is strange on two counts, first he lunges for Jonathan’s neck, only to recoil as he comes in contact with a crucifix, then he destroys the mirror tossing it out the window. Jonathan surmises that he might be a prisoner in the castle, especially as the count has him write letters to his employer and fiancée stating that he wishes to prolong his stay. He is horrified when he sees the count climb down the castle walls headfirst one day, but the culmination of his fears comes on the tenth day of his stay. Contrary to Dracula’s recommendations he falls asleep in another room of the castle and is “attacked” somewhat voluptuously by three young women with sharp white teeth. He is saved in the nick of time by the count walking in on them, tossing the “brides” a child to pacify them.

This determines Jonathan to attempt an escape, which will take almost two months to see through. He tries to secure the help of Szgany gypsies but these prove faithful to the count. The day before his escape, he sees the count sleeping in a box of earth. Again on the next day, he creeps up on Dracula in his resting place and finds him younger looking and “gorged with blood”. He resolves to get rid of him with the help of a shovel but only manages to gash his forehead. The Szgany help the count on his way to London, along with boxes of
his native soil. Jonathan, who has been left behind to satisfy the brides’ appetites, has no other choice than to attempt an escape by scaling down the castle walls.

The action then shifts back to the beginning of May but now centres on Jonathan’s fiancée Mina and her friend Lucy. Through their correspondence, we are introduced to Lucy’s three suitors: Dr John Seward, head of a lunatic asylum, Quincey Morris, a Texan adventurer and Arthur Holmwood, soon to be Lord Godalming, whom Lucy becomes engaged to. Through Seward, we are also introduced to his “pet lunatic” R.M. Renfield, one of the asylum’s inmates who intersperses his ranting and insect-eating with bouts of lucidity. The girls then go to stay in Whitby, where Mina grows increasingly anxious at not hearing from Jonathan.

On August the eighth, a Russian ship, the Demeter, wrecks spectacularly into Whitby during a violent storm. Except for the dead captain who is tied to the ship’s helm with a crucifix and beads, there is no crew on board, just the ship’s cargo, great wooden boxes filled with earth, and a large black dog which jumps off the wreck and escapes. The Demeter’s log tells the strange tale of an invisible castaway decimating the crew in continuous fog until only the captain is left.

Lucy starts sleepwalking and wanders out one night after the storm. Mina goes after her and makes out a figure bending over her in the distance. She brings her back and notices two pricks on her throat, which she ascribes to the safety pin used to fasten her shawl. Mina locks the door on subsequent nights as Lucy tries to go out and notices a large bat outside on several occasions. Lucy’s health starts to decline as does her mother’s, who is suffering from a weak heart.

Mina finally hears from Jonathan, who has been convalescing at a hospital in Budapest and goes to join him. They are married there and Jonathan, fearing for his sanity, entrusts his wife with his diary, which she chooses not to read.
Back in England, Renfield grows increasingly restless, fleeing the asylum on two occasions and invoking the coming of his master. Lucy's health mysteriously continues to deteriorate and Seward, at a loss, calls in a former professor of his: Abraham Van Helsing, a Dutchman who specializes in rare diseases and the metaphysical. The latter proceeds to repeated blood transfusions to save her and demands that a nightly vigil be carefully kept, and that garlic flowers be strewn around her. But one night when there is no one there, an escaped wolf breaks down her window, causing her mother to suffer a fatal heart attack; Lucy is left defenceless and dies two days later. Not long thereafter tales are reported of a “bloofer” lady (beautiful) attacking children at night.

Meanwhile Jonathan and Mina have returned to England and spotted a much younger looking count in London. The effect on Jonathan is such that Mina decides to read his diary and becomes acquainted with its horrors. Van Helsing then gets in touch with her to learn more about Lucy and she confides in him concerning Jonathan’s trials.

Van Helsing –finally– takes the doubting rational Seward into his confidence and after showing him Lucy’s tomb, first empty then occupied again by an immaculate Lucy, explains that she has been bitten by a vampire and become Un-Dead. He then describes the situation to the rest of Lucy’s suitors and proposes to “exorcise” her by cutting off her head and staking her heart. Incredulous at first they are made to believe when they witness the Un-Dead Lucy kidnap a child, and re-integrate her coffin through a minuscule crack. On the next day they proceed to the exorcism and Arthur inflicts the final blow. The four of them then vow to find the monster responsible for this misery and “stamp him out”.

Mina and Jonathan join them in this endeavour and all together they manage to find out one of the count’s hiding places - Carfax, right next door to Seward’s asylum- and make his connection to Renfield explicit. Van Helsing lectures to the group on vampires, their features and properties, and the men proceed to Carfax to “neutralise” the earth in its boxes.
while Renfield begs for his release. They find only twenty nine of the original fifty boxes and render them useless, then set off in search of the remainder, which they track to Piccadilly, and also resolve to keep Mina and her delicate female nature in the dark: a tragic decision, as they learn when Renfield suffers a fatal “accident” in his cell and in his dying breath confides that the count has punished him for trying to protect Mina. They rush to her room only to find her there in a trance drinking Dracula’s blood from his chest with Jonathan lying helplessly in a stupor by her side. Before he can be stopped, the vampire dissolves into vapour. Both the Harkers are left scarred by their nocturnal experience: Mina’s forehead has been burned by a sacred host placed there for her protection and Jonathan’s hair has turned white overnight.

To render the count vulnerable, the companions proceed to destroy the boxes at Piccadilly and two more hiding places, but one still remains missing. They come face to face with the count one last time but he escapes again. Through the exchanges of blood, Mina is now linked to Dracula. Van Helsing manages to hypnotize her to follow his flight, learning that he is heading back home to Transylvania. Aided by Lord Godalming’s considerable finances and Mina’s mental connection, they embark on a wild chase throughout Central Europe. Throughout their trip, the ghost of Mina’s contagion and the eventual necessity to “euthanize” her is ever present. Although Dracula manages to throw them off his scent on more than one occasion, they catch up with him just as he reaches his castle, carried by the Szgany. The group had split up, which allowed Van Helsing to get there first with Mina and destroy the three brides in their coffins. The remaining men arrive and engage in a fight against the gypsies, who are racing to get Dracula into his native soil and restore his powers by sunset. Just as he emerges, Jonathan slashes Dracula’s throat and Quincey stabs him in the heart, and the vampire crumbles into dust. The Szgany flee the scene, Mina is saved and her scar disappears but Quincey, wounded in the attack, passes away. A note, written seven years
onwards, tells of the group’s return to England and of a son, Quincey, being born to the Harkers on the anniversary of Quincey’s death.

2.2.2.2 The fragmented structure

Even though the previous summary has attempted to put the emphasis on events and cause-effect progression, it has been difficult to entirely omit the structure of narration; hence its references to diaries and correspondence. Dracula is so heavily structured that it could be argued that the plot is also its structure. David J Skal commented on Stoker’s craftiness and its efficiency: “Though none of Stoker’s prose could be called undying, the care with which he prepared and polished his chronicle of the un-dead no doubt contributed to its effectiveness and wide popular appeal.” (Hollywood, 23) Before exploring the veracity and scope of this statement, let us return to the Gothic tradition and pinpoint some of Stoker’s forebears and influences.

As mentioned above, it is with Walpole that the Gothic romance truly takes flight; it is also Walpole who first introduces into his writing a device which will become a staple of Gothic fiction: the framing of the story against a pseudo-realistic background. This may be realised by a variety of devices: the inclusion of a preface and/or afterword, testimonial presentation (witness accounts which can converge, conflict or complement each other, personal letters, diaries, ...) or objectified presentation (newspaper cuttings, official documents), and other variegated means. It does not take much effort to surmise why this “presentational strategy” was to become a basic, but by no means exclusive, feature of Gothic fiction. These stories’ aim is to evoke in their readership a kind of “Schadenfreude” or even vicarious, but harmless, experience of terror and horror. If the reader is to truly partake of
these experiences and not remain on their margins, they need to be believable or at the very least display the illusion of believability. Hence the popularity of these devices within the genre.

When Walpole’s *Otranto* was first published in 1764, the title read as follows *The Castle of Otranto, A Story. Translated by William Marshal, Gent. From the Original Italian of Onuphrio Muralto, Canon of the Church of St. Nicholas at Otranto* and the tale indeed purported to be the translation of a recently re-discovered mediaeval manuscript. In subsequent editions, Walpole would acknowledge his exclusive authorship of the work, explaining that he had attempted “to blend the two kinds of romance, the ancient and the modern. In the former all was imagination and improbability: in the latter, nature is always intended to be, and sometimes has been, copied with success...”.

Another gothic landmark which probably had a strong influence on Stoker’s crafting of his tale was Lewis’ *The Monk* (1796). Although it offers no “framing” preface, the story of Ambrosio’s debauchery does not progress in a linear way; it is systematically interrupted by tales and/or even “interludes” which afford the other characters an opportunity to present their point of view and contribute to the general drift of the narrative. At times this device can appear artificial and distracting, at others it makes the reading experience a more interactive one, as it involves its audience in the piecing together of the story and may develop their empathy towards the temporary narrators and their predicaments.

Another obvious structural influence on *Dracula* is that other initially decried Gothic standard which managed to achieve classical status: *Frankenstein; or the Modern Prometheus*; the story of Victor Frankenstein’s ungodly creation and its revenge upon his family is framed at both ends of the narrative by an epistolary exchange between Captain Robert Walton and his sister.
Dracula’s thematic links to Carmilla have been mentioned above but its compositional links are also noteworthy. Le Fanu uses two framing devices to relate his story. First, Carmilla’s tale is presented as a casebook study of a specialist of the occult, Dr Hesselius. Second, it is then recounted in the first person by Laura, one of its two main protagonists. The narrator’s emotional involvement in the tale, her first-hand depictions of terror and horror but also the ambiguous feelings of attraction/repulsion which she experiences even in retrospect, are strongly reminiscent of the Dracula diaries and their expressive representation of sentiments.

But the novelist whose structural devices most resemble Stoker’s, his closest contemporary and most definite influence does not pertain to the Gothic genre; it is the sensationalist author Wilkie Collins. Collins, who had trained as a lawyer, saw the narrative power of testimonial accounts and applied it to his writing, particularly in his two major works The Woman in White (1860) and The Moonstone (1868). These novels have often been labeled epistolary, probably for want of a better term although they do not consist solely of letters. Even though the term is also used to describe novels composed of any series of documents, it is often deemed unsatisfactory or at best restrictive. Its etymology, and the origins of the genre which relied heavily if not exclusively on letters, underscore this position. Like for Dracula, I would rather propose the term “fragmented” due to their reliance on different narrative voices and modes of narration. Collins pieces his stories together by using contrasted testimonials, generally a posteriori retellings of events from the restricted points of view of a variety of characters, sometimes the story’s protagonists but at other times characters who gravitate on its periphery (mainly servants). In The Woman in White he also introduces non-narrative elements such as a death certificate and the engraving on a tombstone. As the precursor of the modern detective genre, who would soon see its master Arthur Conan Doyle follow in his footsteps, Collins used this fragmentation to distil the truth
and instill mystery in his writing by giving only partial glimpses of the global picture. It is precisely this reader-involving presentation of events, rather than the stories themselves, which ensured his reputation within -and even beyond- the mystery genre.

Although his influence on Stoker is obvious to whoever has read both authors, the latter would take things to the next level by using an even more extreme type of fragmentation. Whereas Collins' writing is, to a large extent, chronological and concatenated (a first narrator tells the beginning of the story which is then continued by the next narrator, and so on), Stoker will be more ambitious, moving back and forward within story time (the diegesis) using more variegated forms which are not as straightforwardly narrative as Collins' (diaries and letters rather than accounts).

*Dracula's* structure now warrants closer inspection. In an attempt to comment more objectively on the novel's arrangement, some word counts have been conducted and a few simple statistics deduced on this basis.

The novel consists of twenty seven chapters which are more or less equivalent in terms of length but not in terms of structure. Some chapters are uninterrupted stretches of writing by a single hand, others are compounded of different pieces (exchanges of correspondence, passages from different diaries, combinations, etc.). The term "points of view" is preferred to that of "voice" since a variety of voices are in fact heard within these perspectives, as each narrator gives (sometimes verbatim) accounts of conversations or exchanges that they have witnessed or participated in. These quoted indirect instances of conversation have deliberately not been considered in my tallies, although they will of course be used further on, notably for characterization.

The clearest example of a notable variation takes place between chapters 4 and 5, approximately after one eighth of the novel. The first four chapters, which relate Jonathan's
travels to Transylvania and his subsequent imprisonment, are recounted exclusively through his diary. *Dracula* up to that point might then appear as a first-person narration of a fairly classical type furthermore displaying consistent unities of place, time and action. This illusion is brutally shattered in the next chapter. All of a sudden, the reader is confronted with a series of drastic changes: in time, as he/she is made to backtrack almost two months back; in setting (Transylvania becomes different places in England: London and its periphery, Exeter, Whitby, ...); and in characters. But the most structurally interesting change to take place is in terms of narrative voice: Jonathan’s univocal tale gives way to a polyphonic narration.

Despite a few exceptions (more on which below) chapter five is representative of the shape of things to come, even to a certain extreme. The average number of narrative points of view used within a chapter is 2.66 or even 2.95 if disregarding chapters one to four. In chapter five there are five different perspectives, the most a single chapter ever has. This chapter also uses 3 different modes of telling, markedly above the 1.81 average (or again 1.95, if excluding the Transylvania chapters).

Chapter five then patently signals a rupture with the previous chapters and their narrative structure. This break is so blatant that it almost results in a discrepancy between *Dracula’s* opening and the rest of the novel. The proportional unimportance of this section would seem to refute this. Chapters one to four account for only fourteen percent of the whole novel and would therefore not even be equivalent to the first act in a five-act play. Yet a series of factors enhance this segment’s impact: it opens the book; its setting and storyline are the most exotic and Gothic in the novel; it introduces the title villain and provides the most vivid descriptions of him, even though his nature will remain unfathomable for many chapters yet.
As will be seen below, this structural and thematic rupture has in fact proven a considerable challenge to adaptors, who will take different approaches, privileging one part or the other, sometimes by excluding their counterparts completely\textsuperscript{28}.

Dracula makes use of fifteen distinct narrative perspectives: seven main characters who are also involved in the action of the novel, five characters whose correspondence's only purpose is to ensure story progression and four other documents (three newspaper cuttings and a ship's log) whose aim is also to supplement information from a new perspective or fill in gaps in the story-telling. The novel also uses distinct modes of telling: which can be roughly summarized into three categories: personal writing and/or speaking (diaries and journals, kept in different formats including shorthand and phonograph recordings which have subsequently been transcribed), correspondence (letters and telegrams, mostly private although there are some instances of professional exchanges) and general public documents (newspaper excerpts, the ship log but also a meeting report and "memoranda" written by certain characters and which fall somewhere between all three categories).

Even a cursory glance at figure 1 will show to what extent personal writing outweighs the other modes, also beyond the initial Transylvania chapters. Dracula can thus certainly not be labeled epistolary in its restricted etymological interpretation. If anything, it is a "diary novel".

\textsuperscript{28} This will be further exemplified below, but for the sake of illustration, one could mention the Hamilton Deane play, in which there is no Transylvanian section.
An indication of the pace of alternation, general construction and rhythm of the novel can be found by examining appendix one in which each chapter has been decomposed into its different modes and voices. Obviously, this is only indicative of the narratorial rhythm, not of the rhythmic succession of action/effects conveyed by the story's progression.

At times, however, it seems that the narrative intricacies have been deliberately (and always temporarily) toned down to allow the reader to devote his/her full attention or empathy to the story, characters and their predicament. The first most notable example is chapter 16 which displays only one mode of telling and uses only one character's voice. It graphically depicts Lucy's staking, the most violent and arguably most emotionally charged scene in the novel. Another chapter displaying the same structure for similar reasons is chapter 21, in which Mina is attacked by Dracula and made to drink his blood as the rest of the "band of heroes" witness the scene. Both episodes are pivotal in the novel's story and are also amongst its most evocative moments as can be gauged by the amount of criticism focusing on those particular incidents. These scenes have chiefly aroused the interest of critics seeking to explore the sexual associations of vampirism (e.g. Roth) and have commonly been re-
processed as instances of penetration and/or gang-banging (ch. 16) and oral sex or breast-feeding (ch 21).

But the most striking fact which emerges when one starts paying particular attention to the structure is the proportion of “telling” which the characters do. Readers would no doubt find it impossible to dissociate the characters who are narrating from the characters who are being narrated about. Many critics have pointed out that Dracula, the title character, is voiceless in the novel, i.e. we never hear his version of the facts directly. It is also notable that throughout the novel, and especially after the initial chapters, he is seldom heard even indirectly. This is by no means a flaw in the novel; on the contrary, Dracula’s silence and the mystery in which he is shrouded or indeed surrounds himself is what makes the read chilling. The vampire’s threat is ever-present and permeates every moment of the characters’ lives even is it is often an incorporeal threat. The fact that Dracula remains « silent » in a novel in which virtually everyone else has their say, has inspired different authors to give him an opportunity to finally give his version of the facts.

As will be shown below, that is the case for some of the film adaptations, in which an almost silent title character might have appeared uncinegenic. It is undeniable that Bela Lugosi’s accent and particular diction, for instance, contributed much to his portrayal of the count. Other than the silent versions, there is one notable exception. In the Hammer series, which rehabilitated the Dracula legend at the end of the 1950s and into the seventies, Christopher Lee starts out saying little, then grows increasingly and eventually completely silent. But more to the point would be the revisionist versions of Dracula, which not only give him a voice but also something to say. This point will be developed separately for the adaptations which will be examined.

One novel deserves a quick mention here as it proved to exact a marked influence on films and novels which were to follow and on Dracula and vampire lore in general: Fred
Saberhagen’s *The Dracula Tape*. The book is presented as the transcript of a tape found in the back of a car belonging to Arthur Harker, one of Jonathan’s descendants. On it, Dracula sets the record straight about what exactly happened almost a century ago and explains how his intentions were misconstrued by the band of heroes. Saberhagen’s intention was not to emulate his model in terms of literary value (nor would he have succeeded), but he uses Stoker’s text quite cleverly, abundantly quoting it but systematically re-contextualizing the quotes. The book’s format is also a nod to Stoker with its first-person narration and its use of the most up-to-date technology, a tape recorder, to record the confession.

But if the count is Dracula’s most prominent semi-silent character, he is by no means the only one. Second would probably be Renfield, to whom we are given ample access through Seward’s recordings of their conversations but only through these. The peripheral nature of Renfield’s character, as exemplified by his lack of interaction with other characters and the general action of the novel has also led his portrayal in different adaptations to vary widely; some exclude him completely, while others conflate him with Jonathan. For instance, in Browning’s 1931 version, it is Renfield, not Harker, who goes to Transylvania and subsequently goes mad.

Then, as shown in figure 2 (in which characters are identified by their initials), there are some characters who participate in the novel’s plot but speak little—Lucy Westenra and Abraham Van Helsing— or hardly at all—Quincey Morris and Arthur Holmwood.
In the case of the latter category, this is fairly consistent with general characterization; Lucy’s suitors are most definitely secondary characters, eminently disposable as most adaptations have shown. Quite often the three suitors are blended into one, or even dismissed completely or given new functions.

Lucy’s voice is similarly consistent with her function in the novel. Her character could be defined as a red thread and catalyst. It is through her (and Mina) that the Transylvanian episode is linked to the events in England, and through Seward’s courtship of her, to Renfield. Her death and exorcism are what bring the band of heroes together and cement their decision to take on Dracula. Thus, Lucy’s writing serves an analogous connective purpose. Her voice is only heard at those moments when no other character can supplement information, such as when she is attacked behind closed doors by Dracula. Her sudden attraction to diary writing, an activity which she had shown no interest in previously, is introduced somewhat unnaturally.
in chapter 9: «I must imitate Mina, and keep writing things down». When concerns about her health are at the core of the novel, her voice is heard most and then dies with her.

Van Helsing is a more interesting case. Although he first appears in chapter nine (about one third into the novel), through his vivid depiction and pivotal function in the plot, he rapidly emerges as one of its main characters if not — as Dracula’s nemesis and the bringer of his downfall — the main character. Yet, he is not one of the story’s tellers, at least seldom directly. As with Lucy, he only seems to step in when there is no one else to take over for him; most notably in chapter 27 as he goes, un-witnessed, to dispatch the brides and therefore has to recount their demise himself. Despite the paucity of his direct talking/writing, Van Helsing’s voice is the most memorable in the novel. This can be accounted for by its distinctiveness; Van Helsing speaks an extremely flourished, and at times fairly bizarre, variety of English. The fact that he is a Dutchman and thus not acquainted with some of the finer points of English grammar and/or lexicon may partly account for this. But the professor is also something of an original and this is reflected in his mannerisms of speech as well as of behaviour. It is surprising how little has been made of these idiosyncrasies of Van Helsing’s, beyond ascribing them to dialect; Leonard Wolf is one of the rare critics who picked up on his more bizarre behaviour, even qualifying him as cruel at times.

As will be developed below, Van Helsing has often been portrayed slightly stiffly in film adaptations and his more unusual traits dismissed, sometimes along with his foreignness. It is then all the more surprising that the actor who would reinstate that touch of fantasy into the character’s nature, Anthony Hopkins in Coppola’s 1992 film, would often be criticised for doing so: Howe described his performance as “bizarre” and “campy”, while Hicks termed him “a wild-eyed goof”. Although he rarely speaks (for) himself, the particularities of Van Helsing’s speech pervade the text as they are faithfully recorded by Jack Seward. This is probably the point at which the novel’s framing strategies and their pretence at veracity are
weakest. Seward is not keeping a written journal but recording his diary on a phonograph, and
the extent and detail of the conversations he relates are, to say the least, surprising. Take for
instance this passage:

   God! God! God! [Van Helsing] said. 'What have we done, what has this poor thing
done, that we are so sore beset. Is there fate amongst us still, sent down from the pagan
world of old, that such things must be, and in such way? This poor mother, all
unknowing, and all for the best as she think, does such thing as lose her daughter body
and soul; and we must not tell her, we must not even warn her, or she die, and then
both die. Oh, how we are beset! How are all the powers of the devils against us! (144-5)

Believable or not, these accounts give flesh to Van Helsing and are what makes his
existence palpable. Seward, as to him, recedes into the background and is often the vector of
Van Helsing's musings rather than his own person. That is even truer when one considers
the other main drift in Seward's talking/writing, the one which prompts him into recording in
the first place: his examination of Renfield. Before Seward becomes the voice of Van
Helsing, he is already a substitute for Renfield. As for the professor, the impact of the
recorded is stronger than that of the recorder and Renfield the madman instantly proves a
more memorable figure than Seward the subdued doctor.

Seward has in fact always been considered as one of the secondary, background
characters in Dracula, just another of Lucy's suitors and probably the most ineffectual and
least remarkable of these. Leatherdale's view of the character, for instance, is very negative;
considering him not only incompetent but pretentious. Granted, he is one of the novel's main

29 The use of a 'bland' narrator to tell the story of another more remarkable character is of course a literary
device with illustrious predecessors (Melville's Ishmael) and successors (Fitzgerald's Nick Carraway). What is
unusual in this case is to find this strategy used within a fragmented novel alongside other pieces of writing
which do not rely on this line of attack.
narrators, along with Jonathan and Mina, but his lack of sway and peripheral involvement in its events make him appear as a rather feeble figure. Jonathan's account, which is firsthand, and Mina's, which is a lot more introspective, are the pieces of writing which stand out more. It therefore comes as something of a shock to notice that upon close statistical observation he is not just another narrator but in fact, by far, the novel's main voice (see figure 2). Jonathan, who comes second and despite having the novel's initial section all to himself, lags one third behind him.

Seward's dreariness, as seen above, can be explained by the fact that he acts more as a foil for Van Helsing or even Renfield than as a character in his own right. By observing the narrative progression, as shown in figure 3, another explanation could be put forward. Seward's contribution to the story line is constant and relatively even almost throughout, whereas Mina and Jonathan's are more irregular and therefore probably draw attention to themselves more.

As the graph shows, Mina alternates between periods of vocal activity and silence. Jonathan, as to him, is initially vocal then silent, then very gradually resumes his talking/writing which peaks towards the end of the story. Seward is more of an ever-present figure (as of his appearance in chapter 5, Seward contributes to every chapter in the novel with the exception of 7 and 22) whose involvement is continuous and therefore less conspicuous.
Before closing this discussion about the novel's structure, the issue of style needs to be briefly addressed. Does this novel, which uses fifteen different narrative telling voices, not to mention the voices which are built into these narrations (such as Dracula or Renfield but also more punctual contributions) show a corresponding variety of styles? The answer is clearly no. The polyphony of voices which one would expect to hear in a novel such as this is only incarnated by certain characters at specific moments. At others, pieces of writing blend into each other with no strong stylistic clues as to who is doing the telling. This is especially true when the focus is on plot progression. Only when dialogue is reproduced or emulated, does the author, as we have seen in the case of Van Helsing, tend to use language more creatively.

Stoker, perhaps due to his background as an expatriate, had an ear for dialects and enjoyed attempting to transcribe them into his novels not only rendering lexical particularities but focusing abundantly on deviant pronunciations. Two such clear examples are Mr Swales and Thomas Bilder the zoo keeper, who is being interviewed after the wolf's escape. The latter, clearly a Cockney, has a distinctive accent which is rendered just as distinctively by the journalist conducting the interview:

An' when you said you'd report me for usin' of obscene language that was 'ittin' me over the 'ead; but the 'arf-quin'd made that all right. I weren't a-going to fight, so I waited for the food, and did with my 'owl as the wolves, and lions, and tigers does.
But, Lor’ love yer ‘art, now that the old ‘ooman has stuck a chunk of her tea-cake in me, an’ rinsed me out with her bloomin’ old teapot, and I’ve lit hup, you may scratch my ears for all you’re worth, and won’t git even a growl out of me. (147)

Readers who find Mr Bilder’s accent challenging would probably be bemused by North Yorkshireman Mr Swales, whom annotated versions of the text have often provided translations for: “Yabblins! There may be a poorish few not wrong, savin’ where they make out the people too good; for there be folk that do think a balm-bowl be like the sea, if only it be their own. The whole thing be only lies.” (74)

Stoker’s curiosity about dialects and accents gives these secondary characters a strong identity but his flair for linguistic characterization seems to run out when qualifying characters from similar backgrounds, geographical but especially social. One would be hard-pressed to see much of a difference between Seward and Harker’s respective pieces of writing if it were not for the perspectives they use and the content they address. Linguistically there is not much to tell them apart.

The case is slightly different with Mina and Lucy. As seen above, Lucy is not a “natural” correspondent, when she writes she does so out of necessity not personal inclination. Mina’s writing is more deliberate:

When I am with you I shall keep a diary in the same way... a journal I can write in whenever I feel inclined... I shall try to do what I see lady journalists do: interviewing and writing descriptions and trying to remember conversations. I am told that, with a little practice, one can remember all that goes on or that one hears said during a day. (62)
And write accordingly she does. Her style is relatively straightforward: uncomplicated, observant and meticulous. On occasion, her feminine nature takes over and her writing becomes more emotional and/or gushing than the language the male narrators use.\textsuperscript{30}

Lucy’s style, both in letters and without clear addressees, is quite different and illustrates her spontaneous, almost fickle, character quite well. Her style displays a series of features that would be more usual in the spoken medium than the written, paradoxically unlike Seward who is supposed to be speaking his journal. Her sentences are short, use more coordination than subordination, she also uses spoken “hedges” and markers of intonation in writing (italics).

I think I have not stirred out of my bed for a week, that is when I once got into it at night. Arthur says I am getting fat. By the way, I forgot to tell you that Arthur is here. We have such walks and drives, and rides, and rowing, and tennis, and fishing together; and I love him more than ever. He tells me that he loves me more, but I doubt that (...) (117)

She is also more quintessentially feminine than Mina in her extreme uses of affective language: “Oceans of love and millions of kisses.” (117).

However, despite the few exceptions which have been noted, it is an absence of stylistic variation which predominates in the novel. To a certain extent, this could be seen as a reflection of the way in which the characters are personified and their function in the book. This subject has been touched upon in this section, in terms of the proportion their “voices” have been given, but it will be expanded in the next section. It will then become apparent that

\textsuperscript{30} E.g.: “Joy, joy, joy!” (ch. 8); “Lucy dear, do you know why I tell you all this? It is not only because it is all sweet to me, but because you have been, and are, very dear to me.” (ch 9); “I am so glad that I hardly know how to contain myself” (ch 17) etc.
the "mirror effect" which seems to afflict certain characters goes beyond the stylistic, and that what these characters lack is in fact individuality.

2.2.2.3 The characters

Since the plot summary above has been very much action-driven rather than character-driven, it now falls within the scope of this section to qualify the main characters involved in the novel. It is essential to attempt to give some kind of general profile, particularly morally, since physical descriptions —as mentioned above— are scarce. This profile may then serve as a template against which the subsequent adaptations can be gauged, especially as to characterization: exclusion, inclusion and/or compilation; importance given quantitatively and qualitatively, (re)presentation; portrayal, ... As has been hinted at above, the purpose and role of some of the novel's characters is unclear, or even worse undefined; and it is no coincidence that this aspect has seen considerable reshaping in adaptations.

Before looking at them individually, there is a global point to be made about characterization in the story. Dracula is, in this sense, a profoundly Gothic novel: it is unambiguously dichotomous and presents a fundamentally "good" band of heroes versus a fundamentally "evil" villain.

However, some of the protagonists display features that could be construed as more ambiguous and which critics and revisionists have latched upon: Seward self-medicates, Van Helsing is sometimes boorish, Lucy is fickle and somewhat superficial, Dracula is brave and cunning... These features have sometimes obscured the core opposition between good and evil which the novel depicts and have given rise to complete re-interpretations of the
characters and their roles in derivative novels, adaptations and what could be labelled Dracula lore in general. This point will be expanded and abundantly illustrated below.

Some critical readings have used these ambiguities to deliver very individual interpretations: Senf, for one, argues that the whole novel should be re-processed because of the narrators' fundamental unreliability:

On the surface, the novel appears to be a mythic re-enactment of the opposition between Good and Evil because the narrators attribute their pursuit and ultimate defeat of Dracula to a high moral purpose. However, although his method of narration doesn't enable him to comment directly on his characters' failures in judgment or lack of self-knowledge, Stoker provides several clues to their unreliability and encourages the reader to see the frequent discrepancies between their professed beliefs and their actions. (161)

Despite these interpretations, Stoker's aim was almost certainly more straightforward: to present a newly incarnated version of the mythical struggle between Good and Evil. There is in fact very little haziness surrounding his characters, and their depiction tends to be monolithic: Dracula is the quintessence of Evil with no redeeming features, the heroes and heroines are virtually flawless Victorian gentlemen and women. Their individuality is to some extent sacrificed to this representation as they seem to blend into a single perfect being. It will be interesting to notice how "giving flesh" to these characters in film necessarily dismantles this premise.

**Dracula**

The novel's title character is without doubt the one which demands re-contextualising the most. Since its publication, over a century ago, the count's status has evolved from that of character in a fairly popular book to that of cultural icon of almost mythical proportions. And
although the character’s name and vampiric essence have remained, so many of his physical, moral, intellectual or existential features have been revised, reshaped or re-interpreted, that returning to the original character requires considerable detachment. What one finds upon doing so would probably surprise an audience more familiar with the “traditional” representation that Dracula has carried since integrating popular culture.

As seen above, count Dracula is one of the novel’s “silent”, or at least non-narrating, characters. Though we hear about him through the other characters and although some instances of dialogue (and even one of his letters) are re-transcribed (mainly during the Transylvania episode with Jonathan), we have no direct, un-mediated access to his voice or story.

Physically, he is initially depicted as:

A tall old man, clean-shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him anywhere... His face was strong – a very strong- aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils; with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples, but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth; these protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale and at the tops extremely pointed, the chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of extraordinary pallor.

(22)

Although he is initially depicted as an old man, Dracula’s appearance evolves with his blood-drinking which gives him a more youthful look (his hair for instance turns back from
white to black). But Dracula's precise physical description, one of the only instances in the novel, does not dispel the aura of mystery which surrounds his character. In the initial Transylvania chapters, a few elements are given to piece together a representative portrait through his conversations with and his actions towards Jonathan. After that, Dracula recedes into the background, becoming an ever-present yet seldom-incarnated threat. The only two scenes in which he makes a full-blown appearance after that is when he kills Renfield and attacks Mina in chapter 21 and when he is surprised by the band of heroes in one of his lairs in chapter 23.

The only additional information which is given, mainly through Van Helsing's informational speeches, is characteristic of vampires in general and not particular to him. The following traits can be gathered from these few instances: Dracula is clever, displaying both cunning by anticipating on his enemies' moves and erudition (his English is flawless - unlike Van Helsing's - if a little stiff). He is noble and proud, as his speeches about his ancestry (which given his immortal nature might not be as remote as he presents them) demonstrate. He is manipulative as he never straightforwardly discloses his intentions or demonic nature to Jonathan but manages to instil in him doubts about his own sanity instead. In a similar vein, he is cruel but rather in a cold impersonal manner than as one who revels in it; he feeds and kills out of necessity and/or strategy but does not indulge in unnecessary pain and torture. His evil, like his nature, is in fact quite dispassionate, except when he is thwarted by his enemies:

It would be impossible to describe the expression of hate and baffled malignity - of anger and hellish rage - which came over the Count's face ... 'You think you baffle me, you - with your pale faces all in a row, like sheep in a butcher's. You shall be sorry yet, each one of you! You think you have left me without a place to rest; but I have more. My revenge is just begun! I spread it over centuries, and time is on my side. (326)
Dracula is thus everything we would expect of an un-dead creature with an un-beating heart: in one word, he is cold.

Abraham Van Helsing

Dracula’s nemesis and “leader” of the band of heroes, professor Van Helsing of Amsterdam first appears in chapter nine as is described by Seward as:

A seemingly arbitrary man, but this is because he knows what he is talking about better than any one else. He is a philosopher and a metaphysician, and one of the most advanced scientists of his day; and he has, I believe, an absolutely open mind. This, with an iron-nerve, a temper of the ice-brook, an indomitable resolution, self-command and toleration exalted from virtues to blessings, and the kindliest and truest heart that beats – these form his equipment for the noble work that he is doing for mankind – work both in theory and practice, for his views are as wide as his all-embracing sympathy.(122)

In chapter 14, Mina provides a more detailed physical description whose emphasis is on the professor’s strong build, using recurring vocabulary of robustness: strongly built, broad deep chest, the head strikes . . . as indicative of thought and power, the head is noble, well-sized, broad and large behind the ears, a hard square chin, a large, resolute, mobile mouth, a good-sized nose, the forehead is broad and fine etc. (194) Immediately one senses a physical contrast between the tall, pale, strong but lean and somewhat evanescent figure of the count and his alter-ego. They are inversions of each other physically but also morally as shown in Seward’s description of his possessing “the kindliest and truest heart that beats”.

It is no coincidence however that the first description Seward gives of the lovable, benign professor is ‘seemingly random’. As noted above, Van Helsing communicates in a peculiar way which cannot entirely be ascribed to his non-native mastery of English. There
are also many instances in the text of his social clumsiness which is very uncharacteristic of the Victorian ‘stiff upper lip’. The most memorable is the “King Laugh” episode towards the end of chapter 13, in which Van Helsing, just after Lucy’s funeral, breaks out into a hysterical fit over a joke which he alone finds amusing. However, it is precisely these flaws or rather eccentricities which make him human in the same way Dracula is not, and maybe even give him flesh-and-blood substance which some of the more restrained British characters lack.

Van Helsing is not only the oldest of all characters but also the most experienced in vampirism. It does not take an oedipal reading of the novel to notice the lack of firsthand paternal and maternal figures: Mina and Jonathan are both orphans, his employer, Mr Hawkins, which he comes to consider as a father dies in the course of the novel as do Lucy’s mother (already a widow) and Arthur’s father. Van Helsing thus serves as a kind of mentor and father figure to them all.

Jonathan Harker:

There is something peculiar and contradictory about Jonathan’s character and his development in the novel. The first four chapters filter everything through his perspective, and it is through him that we are introduced to Dracula and invited to share his terror vicariously. His integrally firsthand narration of events develops our empathy towards him: the ambitious, curious and lively young man gaining life experience abroad and who falls prey to pure evil. We grow apprehensive, shudder with him and eventually admire his courage (share his despair?) as he attempts to escape. And then suddenly we hear him and read him no more. As the novel shifts to other characters and Jonathan’s voice grows dimmer, the bond which we had formed with him is distended. The sympathy of which he had previously been the object is transferred onto Mina, his fiancée then wife and it is her anguish at his silence that we now share. And even though he is re-introduced into the plot by Mina before that, it is not until
chapter 14 that he resumes talking himself. By then, and also due to the sporadic nature of his entries, he no longer captures the readers’ interest. In parallel, it must be said that his personal evolution complements this lack of interest. Due to post-traumatic shock, the once dashing, if serious, young man has become a bland ineffectual individual, as noted (in less harsh terms) by Mina on Mr Hawkins’ death:

Jonathan is greatly distressed . . . He says the amount of responsibility which it puts upon him makes him nervous. He begins to doubt himself. I try to cheer him up and my belief in him helps him to have a belief in himself. But it is here that the grave shock that he experienced tells upon him the most. Oh it is too hard that a sweet, simple, noble, strong nature such as his – a nature which enabled him by our dear good friend’s aid to rise from clerk to master in a few years – should be so injured that the very essence of its strength is gone. (168-9)

Jonathan is no more than the ghost of his previous self. In this sense he is also a reversed image of Dracula, as the latter grows younger and stronger, he has lost his strength and aged prematurely. The inverted mirror image is complete when Jonathan’s hair turns completely white after Mina is bitten, although by then he has recouped some of his previous energy when proven sane by Van Helsing and his theories and given a newfound purpose in fighting Dracula.

As noted above, Dracula’s casting of a man in the role of the victim was unusual by Gothic standards, and it does seem that Stoker’s will to then re-cast him as the hero, or even worse as just another of the heroes, may have backfired and turned him into an inept sub-male instead. Wolf has also commented on the perceived passivity of Harker:

The reader, more than Mina (one assumes), has seen a good deal of Harker lying passive and supine: most notably of course, in his nearly flirtatious lassitude in the
presence of Dracula’s women ... The pattern of weakness noted here, however, is more revealing than the standard English masculinity Harker otherwise exhibits. (145)

*Wilhelmina (Mina) Murray Harker*

If Gothic fiction rarely displayed men as victims of horror and terror, neither was it usual to find strong heroines willing -while remaining within the scope and limitations of their female attributes- to participate in fighting evil. In that respect, Mina is a novel character who differs much from Lucy, who is closer to the traditional Gothic heroine.

Stoker’s novel has often been considered as misogynistic, to varying degrees. Dijkstra, for instance, says the following:

Stoker clearly was a man of limited intelligence typical of the fairly well-educated, fairly well-off, middle-minded middle class. But he had a remarkably coherent socio-logical imagination and a brilliant talent for fluid, natural-sounding, visually descriptive prose. Together these qualities made it possible for him to write, perhaps without ever completely realizing what he had done, a narrative destined to become the looming twentieth century’s basic commonplace book of the antifeminine obsession. *(Idols 342)*

The novel abounds in gender stereotyping, there are clear roles assigned to men and women and those who dare overstep these boundaries are subjected to mockery: the progressive ‘New Women’ are ridiculed on several occasions, notably by Mina herself in Chapter 8: ‘I believe we should have shocked the ‘New Woman’ with our appetites. Men are more tolerant, bless them!’ Generally speaking, Stoker ascribes emotional features to women and rational ones to men, a stance which is completely unoriginal by Victorian standards.

Yet, within this dichotomous view, Mina is something of an anomaly, or at least an exception. She is a traditional good-hearted Victorian woman, but she is also untypical in
some ways. First, she is a working woman, although her professional aspirations go no further than assisting her husband once he is able to provide for them. She is assiduous, curious and practical in a very modern way as her regular diary-writing (in a style which has been qualified above as observant and precise), shorthand and typewriting practice demonstrate. But more importantly and most untypically, Mina stands out because she is clever.

With the exception of Van Helsing, most of the novels' characters seem to be stranded in a state of unawareness and confusion as to what is going on with or around them: Jonathan in Transylvania; Dr Seward, who despite his medical skills, is at a loss both to understand Renfield and help Lucy, and even Mina as she fails to protect her friend from the unknown illness which plagues her.

Yet Mina, through her structured and straightforward approach to the bizarre events which pursue her, the disappearance and shocked re-emergence of her fiancé, her best friend's declining health and sudden death, never seems as lost as one would expect from a woman in her position. If her superior acumen had not been deduced from her actions and comments, which is unlikely, it is made explicit by the other characters' perception and description of her, especially Van Helsing's. When they first meet, in chapter 14, he addresses her twice as 'you so clever woman!' and a bit further describes her thus: "Ah, that wonderful Madam Mina! She has man's brain – a brain that a man should have were he much gifted – and woman's heart. The good God fashioned her for a purpose, believe me, when He made that so good combination."(250)

Mina will best display her cleverness when chasing Dracula in the later chapters; not only does her psychic bond help their trailing him (it is also her idea to use it through hypnotism, which did not occur to either of the two doctors present); when the band of heroes lose track of the vampire, she writes a detailed memorandum relying purely on logic and deduction which puts them back on his trail.
Submissive though she well may be, Mina is untypical both of the Victorian woman and of the Gothic heroine, mainly due to her superior intelligence and determination to use it rather than surrender to her victim status and expect external release. In that respect, Stoker is less of a misogynist than some make him out to be. The affective dimension of her character which stands out in her writing also makes Mina into one of the most – I would even contend the most- endearing characters in the novel. Where others may appear prototypical and impersonal, Mina is fathomable and instantly likeable. It is no coincidence that the heroes’ plight to destroy the vampire ultimately turns into a mission to save Mina, and it is only thus that it takes up momentum.

*Dr John (Jack) Seward*

Some of Seward’s characteristics have already been gathered on the basis of what was said about his status as a story teller above. An important character quantitatively, he is qualitatively secondary, a ‘teller’ rather than a ‘doer’. The action of the story would hardly be affected by his removal, which has prompted a series of revisions in adaptations: Seward has been recast as a paternal figure, as an ineffectual hardly present family doctor, has been assimilated with Holmwood and Morris as a single suitor or has been dismissed altogether. In the novel, he is more often a foil for the voices of Van Helsing or even Renfield than his own man. Nor have critics who gave him consideration rather than oblivion necessarily looked upon him benevolently. The general assessment of Seward is as unperceptive and ineffectual at best. This is part of the character’s nature; he is after all first introduced as a rejected suitor. But perception of him is also strongly tinged by the role he is given within the novel’s format. In this fragmented text, the readership is given access to all the different fragments and their global view is thus far richer than the individual characters’ restricted perspectives. More than any other character, Seward is made the buffoon of this strategy. He is cast as an
unimaginative ‘doubting Thomas’ who takes forever to realize what is really going on, even when Van Helsing (admittedly after an absurdly long time) takes him into his confidence. Even after he has visited Lucy’s empty tomb, seen one of her child victims and found the tomb occupied once again by an un-decaying body, does he have this reaction: “It is wonderful what a good night’s sleep will do for one. Yesterday I was almost willing to accept Van Helsing’s monstrous ideas, but now they seem to start out lurid before me as outrages on common sense.” (217)

Seward exemplifies the late nineteenth century rationalist who does not quite fit into the Gothic background. In the same manner as his individuality was diluted on two counts (between Van Helsing and Renfield’s), his scepticism and senselessness are made all the more apparent as they are reflected in two separate uses of dramatic irony. Lucy’s illness, as mentioned above, leaves the doctor baffled, inept and disbelieving of what we, as superiorly informed readers, know is really taking place. But he is equally puzzled, and this time in his area of expertise, by the madman Renfield’s erratic behaviour. It is the Harkers who make the connection to Dracula, Seward is once again a bit slow on the uptake:

Strange that it never struck me that the very next house might be the Count’s hiding place! Goodness knows that we had enough clues from the conduct of the patient Renfield . . . Harker has gone back and is again collating his material. He says that by dinner-time they will be able to show a whole connected narrative. He thinks that in the meantime I should see Renfield, as hitherto he has been a sort of index to the coming and going of the Count. I hardly see this yet, but when I get the dates I suppose I shall. (240)

When not reduced to indifference, Seward is generally judged as incompetent. Even Leonard Wolf, who is slightly more positive especially as far as the complexity of the character goes, reaches similar conclusions:
Of all the characters in this book, Seward comes closest to having a complex personality. He has the nineteenth century's faith in progress at the same time as he is prone to the sort of personal depression that comes from a confusion about one's self and one's motives. Throughout, he is doggedly honest and frequently ineffectual. (21)

**Lucy Westenra:**

Feminist outrage at Stoker's misogyny would be more justified when applied to Lucy's portrayal and fate than Mina's. Lucy is also much closer to earlier representations of the Gothic heroine; because of her death, she is particularly reminiscent of the 'sacrificed' pure young women who are the victims of the villains, such as Matilda in Walpole's *Otranto*, Antonia in Lewis' *The Monk* or Elizabeth (and even Justine) in Shelley's *Frankenstein*.

In the novel both girls are introduced simultaneously and thus rapidly contrasted with each other. Whereas Mina is somewhat serious, hard-working and already engaged, Lucy is more light-headed and capricious, first complaining of a lack of suitors, then, when three come forward, lamenting the fact that she may choose only one. The abundance of her suitors certainly qualifies Lucy as a beauty and a charmer. Even so, as readers, our sympathies tend to align with Mina instead. That may be ascribed to the fact that Lucy is presented both indirectly, through Mina's descriptions of her stay at Whitby and Seward's accounts of her decaying health, and directly in her letter and diary writing.

As mentioned above, Lucy is a character with a distinctive style; which matches the impression of frivolity which she exudes. She 'sounds' a bit spoilt, flippant and generally inconsiderate of others people's feelings. Her slow progression towards death and the exorcism which follows, change this initial perception and Lucy becomes more of a (not particularly willing) martyr who is made to expiate her former nature. Her flaws are in fact incarnated in her vampire form which is the epitome of selfishness and lust, two tendencies
which she had previously displayed and which were extremely undesirable in a Victorian woman. Yet, there is some degree of ambivalence and hypocrisy at play here since it is those same features that attracted three men to her in the first place. A conundrum that critics (especially feminists and psychoanalysts), adapters and revisionists will all pick up on. Lucy is in fact both emblematic and a precursor of a key female representation of the twentieth century, particularly in popular culture: the ‘femme fatale’ or aptly named vamp.

*Arthur Holmwood (Lord Godalming) and Quincey Morris*

Of all the characters in the novel, these two, which complete the ‘gang’ of Lucy’s suitors are the least developed and therefore most dispensable. Unsurprisingly, they hardly appear, if at all, in most adaptations. Their purpose in the story seems to be more emblematic than narrative-driven.

Arthur is the only character (other than Dracula of course) who is noble; he therefore serves as a kind of counterpart for the Count’s moral decay, as representative of the good side of Old World tradition. In their fight against evil, the band of heroes rely heavily on modernity, its inventions, scientific discoveries and techniques. The support which Lord Godalming provides is of a more traditional, but not less useful, kind: financial. Thus, unlike Dracula who is a throwback to the Dark Ages, Holmwood stands for Old World tradition in its positive sense: money, power, nobility in title but also of spirit.

In contrast with this affirmative but somewhat stifled depiction of tradition stands the modernity of the New World as exemplified by the Texan Quincey Morris. As mentioned above, Stoker travelled to America on several occasions and was a great admirer of the country. The inclusion of Morris in the novel is a homage rendered to its dynamicity and progressiveness; other than that, the Texan has no clear function in the story. It is all the more surprising then that, in the final scenes he is given the double honour of killing Dracula and
sacrificing himself in the process. Both his demise and Dracula's are fairly counter-climactic as, after a seemingly endless chase, they are both rapidly dispatched. In Quincey’s case, it seems almost as if, after Lucy’s ceremonial sacrifice, another death were required to make the fight against evil more epic in proportion, and the least notable character drew the short straw.

This unexpected and apparently rushed ending to the novel has opened the door to a series of alternative interpretations, most of which centre on the idea that Dracula was not really killed at all but de-materialized at the last moment. Less usual are the theories which foreground Morris’ death, questioning why such a seemingly unimportant character was given the honour of self-sacrificing to his cause. An interesting twist on his demise is that it was the result of retaliation or divine retribution rather than self-sacrifice.

R.M. Renfield:

The final character to be mentioned here is that of the madman Renfield, Seward’s ‘favourite patient’ and inmate in his asylum. He is immediately linked to the doctor right from his first diary entry in chapter 5 where Seward describes him as:

R.M. Renfield, aetat 59. Sanguine temperament; great physical strength; morbidly excitable; periods of gloom ending in some fixed idea which I cannot make out. I presume that the sanguine temperament itself and the disturbing influence end in a mentally-accomplished finish; a possibly dangerous man, probably dangerous if unselfish. (69)

Moretti, and Leatherdale after him, see no other reason for Morris’ inclusion in the story than as an accomplice of Dracula and go to great lengths to back up their theories with examples of the Texan’s ambivalence. An unlikely, mostly ungrounded, but unusual and creative reading of the story which requires extensive re-processing.
Why, and how, Renfield, a seemingly peripheral character to Dracula’s story, is linked to the Count remains mysterious in the novel. It might then seem as if the asylum episodes, for all their Gothic suggestion, are not quite part of the narrative’s weave. That has been the view of some adapters who have dismissed Renfield’s character entirely. Others have chosen the more rationally-driven course of trying to justify his link to the count or inclusion in the story in some manner. In Todd Browning’s 1931 version for instance, it is Renfield, not Jonathan, who travels to Transylvania and his madness is the result of the traumatic experiences undergone over there.

But in the novel, Renfield’s scenes actually blend into the global story quite well. First, they offer a welcome complement to Lucy’s slow decay which might otherwise have appeared as repetitive or circular. Second, they supplement some of the Gothic ambiance, the darkness of the irrational, which had been eminently displayed in the first chapters at castle Dracula but downplayed thereafter. As they are interspersed with some regularity amongst the rest of the story, the reader naturally accepts them as part of it and is not overly shocked at the arbitrariness of their connection.

Finally, Renfield would be sorely missed were he absent from the story, simply because he is a vividly entertaining and even engaging character. His madness, especially as it seems to come and go and randomly alternate with periods of well-behaved lucidity, is much more appealing than the bland prototypical nobility of character displayed by some of the other protagonists.
2.2.2.4 Themes

Although some of them will have emerged between the lines in the previous pages, rapid consideration will now be given to certain of Dracula’s themes. Although primary emphasis will be given to how they appear in the text of the novel itself, some references to their subsequent interpretation or development by secondary literature will be needed. Some of Stoker’s motifs have indeed been consequently emphasized above others and indeed overemphasized, at times stretching the author’s intentions to breaking point (and sometimes beyond). This is especially significant to this analysis since some films have reclaimed and even capitalized on these themes, not as they appear in the novel but as they have been decoded by others.

Blood:

It is undeniable that Dracula is first and foremost a horror novel, a quintessentially Gothic story about the struggle between the polar opposites of Good and Evil. The form which absolute Evil takes is that of the vampire, and his ultimate malicious aim is bloodlust. It is blood which he covets, desires, craves but it is also blood which nourishes him and gives him supernatural, eternal life and powers.

In a twist on the religious nature of good and evil, the madman Renfield, who worships a dark master and is also afflicted by bloodlust, quotes Deuteronomy (12:23) in his schizophrenic defence, claiming that “the blood is the life”. The larger quote is actually detrimental to Renfield’s bloodlust as it reads: “Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh”. References to blood consumption elsewhere in the Old Testament are often similarly prohibitive: for instance Genesis 9:4 "But you must not eat meat that has its lifeblood still in it" or First Samuel 14:33 “Then someone said to Saul, "Look, the men are sinning against the LORD by eating meat
that has blood in it." "You have broken faith," he said. "Roll a large stone over here at once."

In the New Testament however, Jesus' offering of his flesh and blood for consumption at the last supper, sheds a more equivocal light on the matter.

However the theme of blood consumption has often been overshadowed in criticism by the assimilation made between the act of vampirism and the sexual act. Blood was no longer blood but a substitute for seminal fluid (Craft), or breastfeeding and menstruation (Mulvey-Roberts).

But the theme of blood was to be re-integrated with a vengeance by the cinema thanks to its visual impact. It is no coincidence that this trend would await colour pictures to truly take off. Fisher's 1958 Hammer production prided itself on being the first colour Dracula, and immediately made use of it in the post-credit sequence in which bright red blood, with no apparent source or reason, pours down over Dracula's name. Nina Auerbach has commented on this innovative use of blood and colour:

Suddenly, bright red blood, the Hammer trademark, splashes on his white name from some indeterminate source, making a pattern as stylishly vivid as a painting by Jackson Pollock . . . Logic is nonexistent. It doesn't finally matter whose blood we are watching since it looks so good. . . . In these vivid spectacles, blood is beautiful, but it is no longer the life. (119-20)

Coppola, as will be developed below, is another author who was to make extensive use of blood both stylistically, making red Dracula's symbolic colour and contrasting it with other colour codes within the film and thematically, introducing microscopic close-ups of blood with animate cells moving around, reminding us that "the blood is the life". This newfound emphasis on blood in Coppola's case was frequently associated with a more contemporary comment on the disease of the age, AIDS, which, like vampirism, immediately conjured up images of blood and sex. Without dwelling on it, Coppola confirmed this interpretation. (5)
Sex:

Often linked with the above theme of blood is that of sex. Decades of criticism in that direction have made it an unavoidable stop on the way to decoding Dracula. As mentioned above, this trend originated with Richardson and thus with Dracula criticism itself and has proven a hard model to cast aside. It was not uncommon to see quotes such as this one by Stoker's biographer and relative Daniel Farson: “In Dracula, Bram Stoker wrote one of the most erotic novels ever published, yet no-one would have been more astonished by this information than himself.” (Haining, 147)

Stoker would certainly have been astonished by this claim, but then so would anyone who read the novel in a completely neutral context, exempt from any preconceptions of what a vampire is and does and other associations which have entered general knowledge. I would contend that this novel is by no means overtly erotic, with the notable exception of the scene in which Jonathan is seduced by the brides. It does display some covert eroticism in at least two more scenes (the vampire Lucy and Dracula’s attack on Mina) but that is still a far cry from Farson’s statement. Dracula’s often overblown claim to sexuality probably originated in two opposite temporal directions: first, stemming from its predecessors: both Lord Ruthven and Carmilla were very erotic figures; second, from the abundance of later criticism which highlighted these aspects often to the detriment of others.

Thankfully this view is now being increasingly not dismissed, which would be equally misguided, but put into perspective. William Hughes for instance argues that the novel has been over-sexualised and that this emphasis has at times obscured other aspects of the text. He argues for a more materialistic approach: “Sexuality, in other words, is not the stopping point for criticism, but only a marker given to it by the rising academic culture of the nineteen
sixties . . . much remains to be done before sexuality may be seen as an issue in the novel rather than the issue in its criticism” (137)

The theme of the sexual vampire is certainly the one which will be most blatantly integrated into the film versions, beyond what appears in the text of the novel itself. In the corpus of films chosen for analysis, all Draculas are sexual figures to varying degrees. Murnau’s Nosferatu is probably the least so, but the association between lust, blood and sex is ever present in the other versions and culminates in John Badham’s 1979 version in which Langella’s portrayal of a romantic, sexy count is miles away from what Stoker depicted.

Religion

The issue of religion in the novel is another one to have attracted a considerable amount of criticism. By foregrounding the mythical fight between Good and Evil, Stoker was obviously led to seek inspiration from religion notably as to the means by which this Evil could be fought off.

As has been mentioned, Stoker was a protestant in a deeply catholic country (until he moved to London), a religious man who was subjected to differences in faith and generally respectful of them; although feelings of distrust were frequent at the time especially as regarding Catholic abuses of the Ecclesiastical authority over the civil one. In the novel, most characters are protestant with the exception of Van Helsing. John Waters and Eleni Coundouriotus have also attempted to ascribe a religion to Dracula (Christian for the first, possibly Muslim for the latter), whom many traditionally consider as ‘Godless’. What is striking is that despite Stoker’s own background and that of his characters, the band of heroes

This does not appear straightforwardly but the reader may consult Wolf or Starrs on that matter. Starrs argues, somewhat exaggeratedly, that religious tension between Protestantism and Catholicism is one of the essential themes in the novel, and one which has been considerably neglected in adaptations.
rely quite heavily on traditional Catholic artefacts in their struggle: the crucifix, the host and holy water. This use of Catholicism can be explained by two plausible arguments.

First, Catholicism gives physical body to immaterial religious concepts in a way Protestantism does not. As Alison Milbank points out: “This is where the Catholic Sacramental system becomes so important, for it is a means by which a spiritual truth is made effective though a physical substance - the bread and wine of the eucharistic rite.” (22) This also applies to its artefacts, whose symbolic value is embedded in their concrete form.

Second, it could be argued that rather than Catholicism, it is religious superstition as exemplified by traditions and rituals which defeats the vampire. This is especially relevant if Dracula is considered as an Old World Christian who can only be vanquished on his own turf. Other religious traits which can be traced back to the novel are: the thematic inversion of the vampire as Antichrist, made apparent by Renfield in his references to his master, to the time which has come and his -perverted- use of Biblical quotes and the fragmented structure of the novel itself which could be seen as reminiscent of the different books of the two testaments and more particularly of the evangelists.

The general tendency in Dracula adaptations has been to retain the symbolic superstition of religion but to downplay the wider religious implications present in the novel, particularly its mythical dimension. Coppola is the only director to have re-introduced some of these themes, even making Dracula’s Godlessness an explicit rejection of Christianity.

**History and Modernity:**

Beyond the typically Gothic oppositions between Good and Evil, night and day, light and darkness, life and death, there are other polarities at play in the story, notably in terms of location (East vs West) but especially time: Old World vs Modernity.
This contrast is embodied by Dracula, who represents the Old World in all its dark aspects and depravity and the band of heroes who characterize present-day modernity, a beacon of progress. As seen above, the situation is not always as clear-cut. Old World tradition has its positive aspects (money and power, as epitomized by Lord Godalming) and it is tradition, not modernity, which finally defeats the vampire.

Gothic novels were traditionally set in a semi-remote past and, with the exception of Frankenstein, rarely integrated contemporary advances. Dracula was therefore highly unusual in its unabashed display of modernity in all its guises: working men and women as characters, technological innovations (shorthand, the typewriter, the phonograph, ...) scientific theories and discoveries (blood transfusions, hypnotism, mesmerism, ...). Stoker's integration of the latest trends can be traced back to a determination to make his horror novel more realistic, and therefore horrific, especially to a contemporary audience. However, that same determination sometimes led to a lack of credibility. The most striking example is the blood transfusions which were not sufficiently developed at the time to include the operations Stoker described: blood groups were not identified until some decades later and the repeated transfusions which Lucy received would probably have killed her. Saberhagen cleverly uses this theme in his revisionist rewriting of the tale *The Dracula Tape*: Van Helsing's blundering transfusions are kill Lucy and Dracula makes her into a vampire purely out of pity to let her "live" on.

Stoker's use of up-to-the-moment technological and scientific gimmicks and the impact it had on its contemporary readership is difficult to gauge in retrospect. Obviously, this striving for modernity has been one of the aspects which has lost most of its relevance through the passing of time and has consistently been downplayed in films. One counterexample is Fisher's *Horror of Dracula* in which certain scenes, somewhat ostentatiously, give centre-stage to such devices as the phonograph or blood-transfusion
instruments. The effect is, ironically, rather quaint, as these outdated tools are presented to a mid twentieth-century audience as the epitome of technology.

**Gender roles:**

A final theme to be developed here is that of ascribed gender roles in the novel. As was mentioned in the previous point, there are only two main female characters in the novel (for seven male ones, the five men comprising the band of heroes plus Dracula and Renfield) one of which dies halfway through. It would then appear, and indeed it often has been said (Rosenberg), that Stoker's portrayal of women was not particularly positive and certainly not progressive.

As was argued above, that seems to be justified in Lucy's case but not so much in his depiction of Mina, who stands out as a strong, memorable, exceptionally clever character, feminine both in a traditional and modern way. Although it could hardly be argued that Mina is masculine, she is at times, and explicitly so, the equivalent of men in terms of courage and cunning.

Similarly, some male characters display female characteristics: Jonathan is passive and even a subdued victim, a quintessentially female role, in the Transylvania episode; all three suitors have emotional breakdowns at different moments, again a female feature. Christopher Craft has argued that Dracula muddles these traditional dualities (to which he adds the sexual) and Van Helsing stands as their guarantor: "Dracula presents a characteristic, if hyperbolic, instance of Victorian anxiety over the potential fluidity of gender roles." (111)

Gender roles and their evolution will be subjected to different currents of influence in the adaptations, especially in their portrayal of women. First will be the evolution of feminism at the precise moment when the movie was made. Although set in Edwardian times, Badham's post-second-wave-feminism 1979 version for instance shows a very sexually aware
and emancipated Mina, who breaks free from the tyranny of the men surrounding her, especially her father and fiancé.

However another parameter will also have some influence in the way women are portrayed in these Dracula versions, namely Genre constraints. The portrayal of the female protagonists in horror movies has become to a certain degree stereotypical. With the emergence of the figure of the vamp in Popular culture, the women portrayed in vampire movies have been of two kinds, the saint (before transformation) and the demonized yet seductive vamp (after being bitten). This is clearly the case in Fisher’s version, where the subdued Lucy is born again as a bright-eyed temptress after being bitten and Mina undergoes an almost identical fate. Even Coppola, in 1992, resorts to this typecasting in his depiction of Lucy, although arguably she is already a vamp and a temptress before she dies.

2.3 The filmic corpus

Before they undergo analysis, the films (like the novel) demand contextualisation. They will therefore be placed in their environment of production. This term is to be understood in its widest sense and includes: production constraints, genre, film history and general tendencies, directorial and actor auras and associations, etc... Reviews and awards, as well as box office results (when relevant and available) will be used to gauge their reception both critical and general. Like for the novel, consideration of how the status and perception of the films have evolved over time and come to bear upon later productions will be examined. For the sake of clarity and readability, the films will be considered chronologically.
2.3.1 Murnau (1922)

*Nosferatu, eine Symphonie des Grauens* (a symphony of horror) directed by F.W Murnau is the first adaptation of Stoker’s text to the screen. Through posterity, this silent film has achieved the status of masterpiece, but it is also (in)famous for being an unauthorised version of the novel, which should have led, and almost did, to its destruction. The question of the copyright issues surrounding *Nosferatu* has been dealt with extensively (Marigny, Joslin and especially Skal). The film was produced by Enrico Dieckmann and Albin Grau, who founded the society Prana Film for its production but the society would in fact only produce this one film as its founders declared bankruptcy in a fruitless attempt to avoid being pursued for copyright infringement.

Although the producers had not obtained the rights to the novel, which belonged to the Bram Stoker Estate represented by Florence, his widow, they set Screenwriter Henrik Galeen to work on the script. In a naïve attempt at deception, he made minor changes in setting, period and the characters’ names. The film is set in Germany, in the imaginary town of Wisborg in 1838. Jonathan and Mina Harker are barely disguised as Thomas (or Waldemar) and Ellen Hutter, while the mysterious vampire is known as Count Orlok. Other characters are also reminiscent of Stoker, most notably Hutter’s employer Knock whose strange antics and hidden motives evoke the madman Renfield. Apart from these minor changes, Galeen retained most of the plot elements, especially in the first part (corresponding to the Transylvania chapters). There was no mistaking the original source and Florence Stoker would win her lawsuit for copyright infringement, following which all existing copies of the film should have been destroyed. Luckily, by the time this judgment was passed (July 1925) copies of the film had already been distributed worldwide and their complete erasure proved impossible, although this history would considerably affect the quality of some of the circulating copies.
Nosferatu is a masterpiece of German expressionism and its stylistic treatment of some of Dracula’s motifs, the use of shadows and light for instance, would ensure the lasting influence of this movement on the horror genre in film. It also introduces some interesting thematic links, such as the assimilation between vampires and the plague, which Joslin labels “valid anthropologically” (16) and which is consistent with Stoker’s depiction of Lucy’s decay.

But it is in its deviations from Stoker that Nosferatu would prove most influential, especially in how Count Orlok is dispatched. The vampire is not staked or beheaded but, now an exclusively nocturnal creature, he burns away as the sun rises. This argument would be reprised in the Deane/Balderston dramatic adaptation: the band of heroes try to kill Dracula by forcing him to face the power of God’s sunlight, he narrowly escapes by flying away as a bat. This will be repeated in later films which take the play as their inspiration, but Nosferatu actually predates the stage version by three years. This introduction of daylight as lethal, and not merely (as per Stoker) detrimental to supernatural powers would become standard on and off screen, and perception of vampires as night prowlers (with numerous variations) would henceforth dominate the genre.

Upon its American release in 1929, some critics were unimpressed by Nosferatu but that may partially be ascribed to the poor quality, and patchy editing of the prints in circulation. Others lauded the film particularly for its symbolic and aesthetic qualities. Variety labelled Murnau a “master artisan demonstrating not only a knowledge of the subtler side of directing but in photography”

Ninety years onwards, the movie is almost unanimously considered as a classic. It scores 8.1/10 on IMDb.com (for over 30,000 votes)\(^33\). This is the highest score in the corpus

\(^33\) Appendix two presents an overview of the scores which the films in the corpus have received on popular online review aggregators and some information on how these scores have been calculated.
of adaptations considered here; the number of voters is also notably higher than most other movies (only Coppola's film has twice as many voters).

Reviews of the film today are also generous in their praise. Bilge Ebiri, for instance commends Murnau's use of static techniques both aesthetically and thematically:

What's remarkable about Murnau's film ... is how cinematic it manages to be without relying on the kinds of things we regard today as cinematic. Murnau's background was in painting and art history, and there's a strong sense of painterly composition throughout the film ... The fear in Nosferatu comes from a fear of the inanimate, or a fear of becoming inanimate. Murnau the artist, so close to painting yet working within a medium of movement, who would later use technological advances to liberate the camera, must have been aware of this notion.

Beyond its link to Dracula the novel and its other adaptations, Nosferatu offers another interesting foray into intertextuality, more particularly into what Genette labelled 'hyperfilmicity' (215). It is derived from the model of hypertextuality where a text B (hypertext) is linked to a earlier text A (hypotext) through simple or indirect transformation. In this case, both texts are films. Two movies have used Nosferatu as their 'hypofilm', not burdening themselves with the Stoker heritage but referring directly to Murnau's film.

The first of these even shares its title: Werner Herzog's 1979 remake Nosferatu, Phantom der Nacht (Nosferatu the Vampyre). Made in homage to its precursor, the movie emulates Murnau's plot, and even recreates some of his iconic shots exactly.

There are however three notable changes. The first is the reintroduction of Stoker's names; Dracula had by then entered the public domain and copyright was no longer an issue. The only exception to this re-instatement is Mrs Harker, who, instead of the novel's Mina, is named Lucy. There does not seem to be any particular reason, other than phonetic or aesthetic preferences, for this change, but it is not the only adaptation which implements it. It dates
back to Balderston’s re-writing of Deane’s play and Badham also performs the name switch in his version, released the same year as Herzog’s. Skal contends that “Balderston had dropped “Mina” in favour of a name that had twin connotations of light: the redeeming and the luciferic.”(85)

The second change regards plot and more precisely the end of the movie. In the original, Ellen (Mina) sacrifices herself to rid her native town of the vampire ‘plague’ by enticing Count Orlok to feed on her and thus forget to flee the rising sun. She then dies in her husband’s arms and the movie ends on an image of Orlok’s castle. In Herzog’s version, Lucy (Mina) also sacrifices herself to keep Dracula behind but he is additionally staked by Van Helsing for good measure. Her ailing husband Jonathan recovers just after her death, the implication being that he has now been turned into a vampire. This is borne out by the fact that he has Van Helsing arrested, and then leaves town on a ‘mission’.

The third change, and maybe the one most closely related to its substance, is in the nature of Dracula’s character. Although he is still a despicable creature and physically repulsive (his appearance closely replicates Max Schreck’s in the original movie P134.1 / P134.2) another dimension has been added to his portrayal. He is depicted as a lonely, pathetic figure, for whom immortality seems more of a curse than a gift. In one scene he demands from Lucy what she gives freely to another human being, i.e. love, but is denied it. This theme of the lonely vampire, which is also at the core of Badham’s contemporary version, was to surface in many later versions, most notably Coppola’s.

Herzog’s film can be considered as a true homage to Murnau and, although reactions at the time of its release were mixed (see Chaffin-Quiray), it has developed something of a cult following.

Nosferatu was also the inspiration for E. Elias Mehrige’s Shadow of the Vampire in 2000. This film tells the (obviously fictionalized) story of what went on behind the scenes
during the shooting of *Nosferatu*. Its premise is that Max Schreck was not an actor at all but Count Orlok himself and thus a real vampire. Murnau had in fact made a pact with the monster, who, in exchange for an extremely realistic and memorable performance, got to feed on the main actress. Beyond its script, *Shadow of the Vampire* uses many visual references to Murnau’s masterpiece, recreating certain sequences exactly but also using structural elements typical of silent movies, such as intertitle cards. The film’s premise reads as comedy material but it is not, although it has some humorous moments. This determination to be referential (even satiric), without being parodic, makes for a strange end-product, especially given the degree of referentiality of the original film. It did earn some recognition and also a best supporting actor nomination for Willem Dafoe as Schreck / Orlok / Dracula.

### 2.3.2 Browning (1931)

In contrast with *Nosferatu*, this 1931 *Dracula* produced by Carl Laemmle for Universal Studios is the first authorized version of Stoker’s novel and also the first sound version. Contrary to Murnau, whose film can be considered as an “auteur’s” vision, Universal Studios was the true driving force behind this production and the director’s input was considerably less fundamental. Laemmle made sure he acquired the rights to the book, although the film which was ultimately made is much closer to the Deane/ Balderston play than to Stoker’s novel. It was initially a very ambitious project but was downscaled for budgetary reasons at the onset of the Great Depression. Todd Browning was chosen to direct it but it seems as though cameraman Karl Freund’s input was almost as considerable. Skal comments: “There is some controversy about the degree of director Todd Browning’s control over the film. Cast
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member David Manners told me personally that Browning directed none of his scenes, that
the production was very disorganized and that his only direction came from cameraman Karl
Freund." ("Audio")

The production team wanted Lon Chaney in the title role but Chaney's cancer and
untimely death would force them to look elsewhere. They sought inspiration from the stage
version. The Hamilton Deane British version opened in June 1924 at the Derby Theatre, went
on tour and came back to the Little Theatre. It was rewritten with John L. Balderston for an
American audience (essentially changes in dialogue) and premiered at the Fulton Music Hall
in New York on 5 October 1927. It ran for 261 shows. Bela Lugosi starred in the title role on
and off Broadway and was a tremendous hit. But he was not Universal's first choice, even
though his partner on stage Edward Van Sloan was to reprise his role as Van Helsing.
Eventually they settled for Lugosi, notably because he was cheap: Vieira states (42) that
Lugosi cost the Studio only 3,500 dollars, an excellent deal if one considers the movie's high-
grossing box office success which is sometimes credited with saving Universal from
bankruptcy. The producers would not regret their choice, for as Joslin states: "It is a
testimonial to the popularity of this film, and the hypnotic power of this performance, that to
this very day, despite the many other versions of Dracula that have been filmed in the interim,
Bela Lugosi is still Dracula to the general public."(26)35

Browning, along with the four other screenwriters who worked on the script (not all of
whom were credited), opted for a kind of compounded version of the novel and stage play. An
expository chapter introduces us to the Count through Renfield's trip to Transylvania. Apart
from Lugosi's portrayal of the vampire, this segment is quite close to the novel as will be seen
through analysis of some of its pivotal scenes below. The second part of the film is closer to

35 To test this notion, a little experiment was carried out. 120 students were surveyed as to their personal visual
representation of Dracula and how the corpus Draculas fitted within it. Appendix three presents the results.
the stage version and critics, especially in retrospect, have argued that it suffers from excessive staginess at times. Upon its re-edition in the 'Great Movies Series' in 1999, Roger Ebert commented in the Chicago Sun Times:

The scenes in Carfax Abbey are an anticlimax after the Expressionist terrors of the scenes set in Transylvania and aboard the ship. They're based on the same Broadway play in which Lugosi first played Dracula, and owe more to the tradition of drawing-room drama (and, it must be said, comedy) than to the underlying appeal of vampirism.

Upon its release however, it proved to be both a tremendous financial success, which would pave the way for more Universal 'Monster' classics such as Frankenstein or The Mummy, and generally well received by the press: the New York Times said it could “at least boast of being the best of the many mystery films” while Variety considered it superior to the stage production: “On the stage it was a thriller carried to such an extreme that it had a comedy punch by its very outré aspect. On the screen it comes out as a sublimated ghost story related with all surface seriousness and above all with a remarkably effective background of creepy atmosphere.”

Like Stoker's novel -although without its wealth of critical interest- this production would rise beyond the limitations of its initial ambitions, i.e. to be a top-grossing entertainment feature, and become a classic and pioneer of the horror genre, instituting some of its staples.

Chief amongst these would be the physical aspect of vampires as incarnated by Bela Lugosi. Exit Stoker's aquiline old man with hairy palms and bad breath; exit also Murnau's skeletal and rodent-like creature, who, in essence at least, was close to the feelings of repulsion Dracula was meant to inspire. Enter the smooth, suave, seductive figure of the mysterious foreign nobleman, whose terror no longer resides in his physical appearance but
rather in his peculiar intensity and, obviously, in his evil deeds. This portrayal was strongly inspired by the stage version whose text describes the vampire as a "tall mysterious man. Polished and distinguished. Continental in appearance and manner". This film's iconography would in fact set the stage for many future representations of Dracula, or even vampires in general. Evening dress (complete with cape, generally with propped-up collar), slicked back hair, intense dark eyes; these are the features we associate with the prototypical vampire (P138.1), as exemplified for instance, albeit in a harmless and child-friendly way by Sesame street's Count (P.138.2).^®.

Other lasting influences of Browning's version on later adaptations but also on popular culture and vampire lore will be examined in the sequences analysed below. The film's impact has been long-lasting and despite its flaws, which are generally readily acknowledged, its status as a classic is also borne out by its popularity even nowadays: it scores 7.7 on IMDb, second only, in this corpus, to Nosferatu.

Despite the Universal Dracula's success, or maybe because of it, it would take close to thirty years before another adaptation of Stoker was set in motion, although Dracula would appear in many sequels and derivations in the interim. Between 1936 and 1948, Universal, who now owned the rights to Dracula, produced five derived versions of the text.

---

^® When browsing the Internet, for instance, looking for images of vampire costumes, even a cursory glance shows that almost all (male) costumes are based on the Lugosi outfit. Interestingly, the extremely rare exceptions, are inspired by other filmic vampires: long curly wig and top hat (Oldman in Coppola's version), long leather coats (Wesley Snipes in the Blade series), baroque gentleman's attire (Tom Cruise as Lestat in Neil Jordan's adaptation of Anne Rice) etc...
2.3.3 Fisher (1958 / 1966)

In the 1950s Hammer Film Productions, a British company which specialised in low-budget productions, took an interest in re-inventing the horror classics. In 1957, they released *The Curse of Frankenstein* and encouraged by its success, not only in the United Kingdom but also in the rest of Europe and America, they decided to tackle the other classic monster, Dracula. They proceeded to negotiate a deal with Universal, not only regarding copyright but also funding, which the American studio helped with in exchange for worldwide distribution rights. Having had issues with the British Board of Film Censors on previous occasions, scriptwriter Jimmy Sangster submitted a draft to them before shooting, which generated this response:

The uncouth, uneducated, disgusting and vulgar style of Mr Jimmy Sangster cannot quite obscure the remnants of a good horror story, though they do give one the gravest misgivings about treatment... The curse of this thing is the Technicolor blood: why need vampires be messier eaters than anyone else? Certainly strong cautions will be necessary on shots of blood. And of course, some of the stake-work is prohibitive.

(Kinsey, 94)

The BBFC might have deemed the Technicolor blood a curse but for the Hammer Studios, it was to prove a huge blessing and in fact would soon become their trademark. Auerbach has commented on the huge impact Technicolor in the Hammer productions had on the horror genre, even re-defining the nature of the monsters:

The bright colours of Hammer movies were their exhilarating innovation. Hammer vampires and other monsters are not segregated in the black-and-white gloom of 1930s America. In vibrant colour they are substance, not shadows... Technically they remain children of the night... but the vampires we see are children of the light.

("Vampires" 147)
Not only would *Dracula* break box-office records, but its success would lead Universal to make over to Hammer Film the rights to remake their classic horror films. Between 1960 and 1974, the Dracula franchise would expand to include eight new movies, most of which, like in the original, starred Christopher Lee as Dracula and/or Peter Cushing as Van Helsing. Most interesting amongst these, if one is looking for Stoker's influence, is *Dracula, Prince of Darkness* directed, like its predecessor, by Terence Fisher.

Neither version follows Stoker exactly (or even loosely, for that matter), taking characters, plot elements and/or themes from the novel and then reshuffling them. In *Horror of Dracula* Harker, a librarian, goes to meet Count Dracula with a hidden agenda, he is in fact a vampire hunter, in league with Van Helsing. Lucy is the fiancée he has left behind, Arthur Holmwood is her brother and Mina is his wife. The whole story is set in Germany. Despite these changes, Joslin's judgment on the film is very favourable: "Cutting Stoker's plot back to its bare bones, eliminating the deadwood of the book, *Horror of Dracula* not only captures the essence of the novel; it distils it." (54)

Both films nevertheless include themes and sequences that are strongly reminiscent of the Victorian novel and which will serve the analytical purposes below. These movies have not achieved the same cult status as Murnau or Browning's versions, but Hammer horror with its Technicolor gore would prove a vivid and lasting influence on the genre and on impressionable young men and women, some of whom, like Guy Maddin, would grow to be film directors.\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\) The Zeitgeist Video DVD release of Maddin's film includes a CBC on-shoot documentary in which the director refers to the quintessential Van Helsing, Peter Cushing and acknowledges his debt to the previous version, notably in his use of colour splashes.
2.3.4 Badham (1979)

In 1979, Universal Studios decided to give their trusty money-maker another shot and to remake Dracula for a new generation of moviegoers. Like in 1931, they turned to a familiar source which had demonstrated its efficiency; and as blueprint for their script, they used the Deane Balderston play once again. It had just been revived on Broadway to much critical and public acclaim, running for over 900 performances. One of this production’s clearest assets was Frank Langella in the title role and the way in which his performance shed a new light on the Count’s character:

- Walter Mirisch [producer]: The play was very nearly the original play that was written in the twenties and the great difference was that instead of the menacing heavy [Dracula] that Bela Lugosi played, Frank played it young, marvellously attractive and breathtakingly romantic.

- Frank Langella: I began to see him in the early rehearsals totally as a gothic hero, and totally as a figure of romance and not a figure of fear.

- Mirisch: And that seemed to be an idea that revolutionized the concept of Dracula. ("Revamping")

John Badham, who had risen to fame with Saturday Night Fever two years before, was chosen to direct. The cast also included such illustrious actors as Donald Pleasance and Lawrence Olivier as Van Helsing. Yet despite a quite lavish production, shooting on location in the United Kingdom, and John Williams’ romantic score, the movie was neither a critical nor a popular success. Even today, it is by far the least popular of the films included in this corpus, averaging 6.1 for 3.000 votes on IMDb and also hitting the lowest scores, both critically and for the audience vote on Rotten Tomatoes.

The chief criticism received was that it tried, without success, to unite two irreconcilable opposites: romanticism and horror. The New York Times’ Janet Maslin
considered that it lacked “a guiding spirit that might have kept all these flights of fancy from cancelling one another out. This "Dracula" is so recklessly flashy that it winds up seeming vague.”

The film’s inclusion in this corpus is however warranted by the non-evaluative but comparative stance adopted here. It is further corroborated by the fact that some of its elements were certainly inspirational to Coppola, chiefly the determination to revisit the Dracula myth and endow the count with a vulnerability which goes beyond his monstrosity. Unlike Badham, Coppola would take this premise to the extreme, making Dracula both a romantic, charismatic, somewhat pathetic figure and a monster, something which Langella’s elegant portrayal never quite gets across.

2.3.5. Maddin (2002)

Before examining Coppola’s version, which, as the red thread in the analysis, will warrant more exhaustive contextualisation, Canadian Guy Maddin’s later version deserves an introduction. This film, unlike all the others in the corpus, was not destined for a theatrical release but was initially filmed for Canadian television. However, critical acclaim would attract attention to it and it would be released, in a limited number of copies, in the United States and tour the world in select film festivals (for instance winning best film at the famed Sitges Film Festival in 2002). It is by far the most confidential of the Dracula versions in this corpus, probably the most original and, more surprisingly, astonishingly close to Stoker.

Although it started out as a made-to-order film for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which wanted to film the Royal Winnipeg Ballet’s performance of choreographer Mark Godden’s Dracula, producer Vonnie Von Helnolt would clearly change the stakes to an ‘auteur’ film by bringing Maddin on board as director. In his previous shorts
and features, Maddin had shown his interest in the style, if not necessarily the themes, of early silent films. Accordingly, some of his films were shot in black-and-white, silent, or even both; which is the case here. As Von Helmolt explains (CBC):

We’re not shooting in colour because Guy felt it was more appropriate to the time period of the story and to the way he wants to work and to the kind of texturing and richness of look that you can get with black and white that you won’t get with colour. So . . . we’re shooting in black and white and we’re going to have that wonderful turn-of-the-century twenties look to film that Guy gets with overexposed whites and dense blacks and lots of contrasting cragginess and we’re going to add what will look like hand-coloured red bits.

Maddin being a great admirer of Weimar Republic German cinema, there are obvious aesthetic links to be made between his film and Nosferatu; but he transcends this obvious parallel and, quite the postmodernist, he includes references and allusions to many other previous versions. The manner in which he strives (and manages) to go back to the original source, Stoker’s novel, is then all the more striking: “I tried to use in the intertitles in this movie as much Bram Stoker text as possible, every now and then I had to tweak some of my own verbiage in there but strangely enough . . . in spite of this being a danced version of Dracula I aspired to make this the most faithful adaptation of the novel filmed yet.”

(“Director’s”)

2.3.6 Coppola (1992)

In 1992, ten years before Maddin, another director, Francis Ford Coppola, had aspired to return to Stoker’s text and stick to it as closely as possible. At least that was the marketing ploy that the film’s production team put forward and which they would abide by consistently:
Dracula might be a name that everyone is familiar with but who can remember the original, the textual, the real Dracula, the Dracula which might have been read but had never been shown before?

The title of the movie, *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, was the most explicit instance of this strategy: by building the author's name directly into the title, the film was authenticated in some way. Roger Ebert gives another explanation for the title claiming that Columbia had to be creative since Universal Studios still owned the rights to plain 'Dracula'. Beyond its marketing worth which proved profitable, it is undeniable that the claim to fidelity was, if not untrue, at least vastly exaggerated. Coppola may well state that "aside from the one innovative take that comes from history – the love story between Mina and the prince – we were scrupulously true to the book" (3): he can dupe only those who are not familiar with the novel. This is mainly because the "one innovative take" is the foundation of the whole script and it completely subverts and redefines the novel's plot and characters.

---

38 This sparked a trend for this type of validation through the title in the 1990s, especially for remakes of films which had seen countless versions, other examples include Branagh's *Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* (1994), and Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (1996).
2.3.6.1 Reception

Coming to the film from the perspective of academic criticism, if unaware of contextual reception, is quite revealing. Dracula and adaptation scholars alike have almost unanimously panned the film, most of their criticism stemming from the fact that it is *not* faithful to Stoker, which would probably not be such an issue if it had not claimed to be. Joslin's outrage seeps through the pages he devotes to the film, overflowing and tinging even his reluctant praise of some of its qualities:

Everything about *Bram Stoker's Dracula* is overwrought and overblown. Wretched excess is the only aesthetic. It is filmed in a frenzied, would-be-fever-dream style replete with gimmicky dissolves and rapid-fire editing. This visual style is wildly inappropriate for an adaptation of a 19th-century novel... Making a revisionist version of *Dracula*... is not the unforgivable sin;... But the claims that this is exactly what Stoker wrote fall short here. (109-10)

There seems to be some confusion here between the (filmic) text itself and, to use Genette's terminology, its 'paratext'. Judgment of a film should not be based on what is known or claimed beyond the text; at best this can feed the sterile 'fidelity' argument but by no means serve as an evaluative criterion. Joslin is similarly misguided when he labels Coppola's aesthetic 'inappropriate' to its subject matter and verges on the absurd when he argues that the film's treatment (of its supernatural material) is unrealistic! Although he fails to state it overtly, Joslin's approach to the films he analyses is in fact highly subjective throughout; he continually bases his argumentation on the notions of the gist, the spirit and the letter of the novel, without ever defining these concepts.

He was by no means alone in slaying the film, Desmond and Hawkes unambiguously list it as a failed adaptation (256) and Botting accuses it of killing off the Gothic genre: "With Coppola's *Dracula* then, Gothic dies, divested of its excesses, of its transgressions, horrors
and diabolical laughter, of its brilliant gloom and rich darkness, of its artificial and suggestive forms. Dying, of course, might be just the prelude to other spectral returns.” (180) Welsh (“Sucking”) is also critical although it is not so much the film’s lack of fidelity to the novel which he laments but its lack of fidelity to the historical figure of Vlad Tepes. Sipière manages to see its strengths as some kind of justification to its flaws:

On a dit et redit à quel point Coppola prétend, à partir des mêmes bases narratives, revenir au texte de Stoker alors qu’il offre l’apogée d’un demi-siècle de contresens. Mais au-delà du détournement de la trajectoire initiale de Dracula, son film est aussi l’aboutissement de ce que le mythe offrait de potentiel spectaculaire, un film total dans lequel la caméra est partout, voit tout de façon simultanée. (198)

By itself, this abundance of negative criticism would paint a sombre picture of the film indeed, which is why its reception both by the viewing public and the general press needs to be considered to redress the bias.

Although not unanimous, critical response to the film was in the main positive. It is generally lauded for its visual aesthetics although its lack of narrative drive is often pointed out as its main flaw. Variety’s McCarthy stated that “overall, this Dracula could have been less heavy and more deliciously evil than it is, but it does offer a sumptuous engorgement of the senses.” The New York Times’s Canby was also mesmerized:

With its gorgeous sets and costumes, its hallucinogenic special effects and mad montages . . . this "Dracula" transcends camp to become a testimonial to the glories of film making as an end in itself . . . "Dracula" has the nervy enthusiasm of the work of

---

29 The fact that Coppola claims to return to Stoker’s text, on the same narrative bases, when in fact he offers the apex of half a century of going in the opposite direction, has been mentioned again and again. But beyond diverging Dracula’s initial trajectory, his film is also the culmination of the myth’s spectacular potential, a complete film where the camera is everywhere and sees everything.
a precocious film student who has magically acquired a master’s command of his craft. It's surprising, entertaining and always just a little too much.

And whereas Roger Ebert enjoyed the film and its operatic climaxes he did lament that “the one thing the movie lacks is headlong narrative energy and coherence. There is no story we can follow well enough to care about”. The Washington Post’s Dessen Howe writes against the movie, arguing that Coppola “loses the narrative war” whereas Hal Hinson writes for it: “It's sexy and bloody . . . but in a stylized, Grand Kabuki manner that lifts the action (including the sex and violence) from our normal sphere of reality to the realm of timeless, primal tales.”

Reviews abroad were often even more enthusiastic than the domestic ones. In Belgium, for instance, such varied publications as La Libre Belgique, La Dernière Heure, Le Vif, L’événement, Knack and Het Belang van Limburg all praised the movie but it also had its detractors: Het Gazet van Antwerpen and Humo both considered it beautiful but empty (or as Humo put it “cinemasturbation”).

It is a truism that there is no indefectible link between the general (or specialized) press and the viewing public, and that positive or negative critical reception of a film will have a limited impact on its box-office success. But in the case of Bram Stoker’s Dracula the press’s enthusiasm would be mirrored by its audience’s. The film debuted very strongly on its release weekend in the United States (with an estimated 32 million dollars worth of tickets for close to 2,500 theatres) and would continue to generate profits ($82,493,000 domestically) for Columbia, its distributor, and American Zoetrope, Coppola’s production company. It

Richard Corliss also alludes to Coppola’s operatic style: “Coppola composes movies as Wagner composed operas, setting primal conflicts to soaring emotional lines. The force of his will is as imposing as the range of his art. He goes for majesty over subtlety and, often as not, finds what he’s looking for.”

All statistics and box office information are taken from http://www.boxofficeguru.com and http://www.boxofficemojo.com
would perform even more strongly abroad (generating 61.8 percent of its profits) and end up as the ninth highest grossing film worldwide for the year 1992, with an estimated total of $215,862,692.

It was undeniably a box-office hit, yet it also earned a certain degree of peer-recognition as exemplified by its three academy awards won for four nominations, admittedly all of them for technical achievements (Best Costume Design, Best Sound Effects Editing and Best Makeup and a nomination for Best Art Direction-Set Decoration). Compared to other films with multiple awards and/or nominations in 1992, *BSD was exceptionally high-grossing*.\(^{42}\)

Today, reception of the movie, through DVD or online viewing and reruns seems to still key in with initial perception upon its release. Browsing the web for reactions delivers this general assessment profile: *BSD is entertaining, memorable, visually striking, it stands apart from traditional ideas of Dracula but it is also often considered uneven, confused and overblown. Its score on IMDb is 7.3, right in the middle of this corpus but it is the result of 62,000 votes, more than all the other films in the corpus put together. It may not have achieved cult status yet, but it has definitely achieved that of “popular modern horror classic”. This is borne out by the results found on another, very popular, online review aggregator ‘Rotten Tomatoes’. This site takes into account not only reviews -making a further distinction between Top critics (major film reviewers) and all critics- but also an audience voting score. A note out of 100 is then given to the films, based on the amount of scores they receive as positive instead of the review scores themselves, the audience score is based on the same model. Here Coppola’s film scores a critical 82, not a bad average but which nevertheless

\(^{42}\) Domestically, it stands way ahead of Ivory’s *Howard’s End* ($25,919,211), Redford’s *A River Runs Through It* ($43,216,110) or Brest’s *Scent of a Woman* ($63,095,253). It is only superseded by Eastwood’s hit western and winner of four academy awards *Unforgiven* ($101,157,447). Worldwide, however, *BSD steps ahead once more as Unforgiven ranks ‘only’ 13\(^{th}\) with a total of close to 160 billion dollars.
places him behind all the other films in this corpus except for Badham’s. However this considerably changes when one looks at the audience’s votes; once again the amount of votes is much higher (232,000) than for all the other movies compiled (108,700), more than twice as high. But more strikingly, the audience’s score for the film is high, 79 and places it directly behind Nosferatu as the most popular movie in this corpus.

There is then a kind of attraction/repulsion, love/hate relationship between this film and its viewers, which is eminently appropriate for a vampire tale. But an essential question lurks behind this statistical review of available information. If BSD can be considered as successful commercially and fairly, if not unanimously, successful critically, what makes it an almost undisputed failure from the point of view of academic scholarship? Even though the film is successful as a movie, does it mean that it somehow fails as an adaptation? These are questions which will be addressed in the next section and which detailed analysis will, hopefully, attempt to provide an answer to.

Before embarking on this path however, now that the context of reception has been outlined, the context of production needs to be addressed.

2.3.6.2 Production

The idea for a new version of Dracula emerged with scriptwriter James V. Hart. Hart’s only claim to fame was the script of Spielberg’s Hook, already a revision of a popular classic tale. He started work on his vision of Dracula with the (financial) support of producers Robert O’Connor and Michael Apted. The script landed in the hands of Winona Ryder who then passed it on to Coppola, with whom she had struck up a friendship while auditioning for the role of Mary Corleone (Ryder eventually turned down the role, which famously went to Coppola’s own daughter, Sofia and attracted much criticism). Coppola was enthusiastic not only for
Ryder to portray Mina but he also expressed an interest in directing it. Coppola's only previous foray into the horror genre had been his first feature film Dementia 13, for which he also wrote the script⁴³. This was a typical double-bill cheap production, half of its funding coming from Coppola's employer at the time Roger Corman, who had considerable influence over the whole production⁴⁴.

By the time Coppola came to direct Dracula of course, he was a multiple award winning, critically praised and high-grossing director, producer and screen-writer. The most notable of his successes were The Godfather Trilogy, the Conversation and Apocalypse Now. He received six academy awards (for screenwriting, directing and best picture) and two Golden Palms.

However, and even though he had been making movies uninterruptedly since then, his biggest successes dated back to the seventies. In 1990 he had released The Godfather Part III, which, despite not generating the praise the two first instalments had, was a box-office success. Since then, Coppola has considerably slowed down his directing pace, releasing only five movies to date and never renewing with the previous heights of his career. BSD was in fact his last commercial success.

Coppola had been spending the previous decade in and out of debt due to some disastrous box-office failures (and the disastrous money-guzzling shooting of Apocalypse Now) and although his non-artistic ventures (wine-making, food distribution, restaurants, ...) helped him redress his finances, one may wonder to what extent those movies made during the 1990s were personal projects close to his heart or made-to-order, money-generating, studio ventures. BSD's success would in any case be the final push to bring his capital back in

⁴³ Information about Coppola's life and work is taken from Schumacher.

⁴⁴ Coppola has just returned to the Gothic genre with his latest release Twixt (2011), which also features vampires.
the black. This is what Coppola had to say about the stakes surrounding the movie: “You know I was very aware that I wanted to make a film in Hollywood for Columbia pictures in which they experienced total smooth sailing, that was made on budget, on schedule. There’s millions of dollars at stake and there’s politics... I wanted it to go very well and be very commercial, you know, a good job”. (“Bloodlines”)

All cynicism set aside, Coppola’s interest in the project seemed genuine enough and the end product clearly reflects a very personal vision, markedly different from what had come before and was expected from the genre. As Hal Hinson stated “if [...] Coppola is attempting to make himself bankable again, he’s not doing it by playing safe.”

As a filmmaker, Coppola could also not help but step up to the challenge of trying his hand at a classic such as Dracula, almost a genre unto itself. The director himself mentions his childhood memories of the Universal Dracula productions starring John Carradine, but also of Lugosi and states his admiration for Nosferatu. As Von Gunden has argued, the “New Hollywood” generation, young filmmakers who came to fame in the 1970s, present features of post-modern auteurs and certain generational experiences, such as the emergence of TV and popular culture and a certain nostalgia for the Golden Age of cinema, were major influences on them.

The shooting began on October 14 1991 and would last three and a half months. The film was shot almost entirely in Sony Studios in Culver City, California. The fact that it had no exterior location shoots, rather than rendering the film overly artificial, seems to have unified it and created a kind of personal alternate background which suited its subject matter. As Iain Johnstone notes: “what engages more is the way the artifice of a studio-bound picture can cunningly collide with the viewer to create a world that exists only in the imagination.”
The shooting stayed on schedule, with Coppola’s son Roman in charge of the second unit, as did the editing and post-production processes, enabling a rapid release.

As stated above, Coppola had clear ideas on how he wanted his Dracula to stand apart from the rest:

After I had read the script, I had a couple of takes about this film. First, I wanted it to have a very young, talented, attractive cast. Second, and related to the first, I wanted to lead with the costumes, let them be the jewel of the show. Rather than tax the production with elaborate sets, I wanted to make a more imaginative use of space and shadow. (3-5)

The film’s cast was indeed one of its most bankable assets.

Winona Ryder, who played Mina—the first character to be cast—, was a fairly popular actress; especially for a younger audience since most of her starring roles had been teenage characters. Ryder, who was (a very fresh) twenty-one when the movie was shot, was looking for a role which would provide a new challenge and bring credibility to her portraying more mature women. Mina offered a unique combination of youth and maturity. Ryder, and Keanu Reeves, who played her husband Jonathan, were the only two non-British actors amongst the “band of heroes” (apart, of course, for Bill Campbell who plays the part of the Texan Quincey Morris); even Dracula and Dutchman Van Helsing were portrayed by British actors. Her performance as Mina was generally well-received, in a somewhat underwhelmed manner. Gleiberman, for instance, lamented her “usual nicey-nice girlishness”, whereas Hicks, who disliked the movie judged the performances generally over-the-top and deemed that “only Winona Ryder seems as if she’ll escape unscathed”. The production team may have had an ulterior motive in choosing Ryder for the part; at the time she was engaged to fellow actor Johnny Depp. They were the perfect tabloid couple and constantly in the public eye: Ryder represented America’s young innocent sweetheart and Depp was the older, wilder, slightly
dangerous heartthrob. Some element of this tumultuous off-screen relationship must have been transferred onto her on-screen vampiric liaison.

Gary Oldman in the title role was a more unusual choice for a big-budget Hollywood production. His previous starring roles had gained him a lot of positive criticism, especially when impersonating real-life characters such as Sid Vicious in Cox's *Sid and Nancy* (1986) or Joe Orton in Frears' *Prick Up Your Ears* (1987); but since he had moved to the United States, Oldman was more often cast in strong supporting roles, such as Lee Harvey Oswald in Stone's *JFK* (1991). As he had stated, Coppola wanted something new, something which had not been done previously. When Oldman tried out for the part, associate producer Suzy Landau noted of his performance: "It was singular and mercurial. He had tremendous weariness, which none of the other actors who read for the part had" (Coppola and Hart, 162)

Thus he brought to the part of Dracula a newfound soulfulness which was in key with the revisionist script.

This Dracula was considerably more difficult to portray than in the past, mainly due to the fact that he had so many guises. The movie tallies ten manifestations of Dracula's character, some of which were brought to existence only through special effects but others which Oldman, with the help of a very prolific and talented make-up team, had to enact. Most notable is the contrast between the revolting Old Count whom Jonathan meets in Transylvania, and the dashing prince who seduces Mina back in England.

Critics have agreed that Oldman is at his best when portraying the older (version of the) vampire, a most relevant comment since it is the character closest to Stoker's text and yet never before shown on screen. *Washington Post* critic Hinson lauded the performance, gushing that:

What Oldman does vocally in these early scenes is nothing short of genius. The dexterity and snaky complexity of his line readings is both awesome and inviting. His
voice is that of a somnambulist, soothing and playful . . . ever so slightly, we hear the
perverse timbre of Bela Lugosi's inhuman intonations in Oldman's Transylvanian purr.
This is a subtle reference, but it conveys the spirit of playfulness that drives his
performance.

However he also notes that "Oldman is less compelling as a younger man . . . and
when his magnetism wanes, the movie suffers". As does Gleiberman: "Oldman is so vivid and
funny as the cackling, centuries-old Dracula that we look forward to seeing what he'll do in
the London scenes. Yet after that superb first half hour, he never quite seems in the movie."
Variety was similarly disappointed: "Oldman is a fine character actor who lacks the charisma
and insinuating personality that would put across Coppola's conception of a highly sexualized
vampire". Howe was unconvinced by the movie globally but praised Oldman in all his guises:
"Through a wide variety of mutations, from bloody warrior to dandy, from old man to young
lover and from man to wolf, he maintains a mournful, powerful, lovesick presence. The
makeup serves him, rather than the other way around. He may well have reached his acting
zenith here."

This novelty Dracula as an old man, who is in fact not novel at all but rather the
novel's character, is thus one of BSD's strongest points and one which will warrant closer
inspection.

If Oldman excels as the older Dracula in those first Transylvanian scenes, the same
cannot be said of Keanu Reeves as his counterpart, Jonathan Harker. Coppola's wish to film
the script with young, beautiful actors seems to find its apogee here; however it also puts into
perspective the wisdom of this decision. When approached for the part, Reeves, like Ryder
was mostly known for his roles in movies targeting a teenage audience, and especially for the
*Bill and Ted* franchise, which had typecast him as a dim-witted teen. He was attempting to
break that stereotype by taking on more manly roles (such as in Bigelow's *Point Break* in
1991) or starring in more challenging independent productions (such as Van Sant’s *My Own Private Idaho* in the same year). Like Ryder, he was a ‘bankable’ figure, ideal to draw the young, mainly American, movie-going audience to theatres. Despite the fact that Reeves could draw on his childhood memories of growing up with a British mother to develop his character’s accent, his portrayal of Harker has often been cited as one of BSD’s weakest points. Hicks labels him “stiff as a board (and very uncomfortable with his affected English accent)” while Gleiberman points out his particularly “lightweight performance”.

The role of Jonathan is in fact trickier than might originally appear. As was seen in section above, even in the novel the character is ambiguous and ethereal: pivotal but not central, a victim yet a survivor. To this, Hart and Coppola added another layer by making him Dracula’s cuckold, as Mina willfully chooses the vampire over him. The burden was a heavy one to carry and Reeves’ shoulders were arguably not wide enough.

Standing on more familiar ground was Anthony Hopkins as Professor Van Helsing. In the 1960s and 1970s, Hopkins’s work in the fields of theatre, television and film had been recognized in the United Kingdom, notably by stage awards, a BAFTA won for his role as Pierre in the BBC’s adaptation of *War and Peace* in 1972 and other nominations. But throughout the eighties, Welsh actor Hopkins had been trying to make it big in the United States. He had almost given up when he was chosen to star as Hannibal Lecter in Demme’s *Silence of the Lambs* in 1991. Despite the shortness of the role, its impact was tremendous and earned him a Best Actor Academy Award, opening wide the doors of Hollywood. Fresh from this role, Coppola’s choice was very deliberate: “I wanted Tony Hopkins, who has this wonderful madness of his own, to play him with a little orneriness and madness rather than the kindly Dutch doctor to make the Stoker character come alive more.” (154) Hopkins, as to him, was so eager to work with the director that he accepted the role without having even read the script. And bring madness to the role he did, so much so that critics were sometimes
dismayed, sometimes amused but generally surprised at his performance. Hicks describes his
professor “as a wild-eyed goof”, Howe points out the character’s unusual display of “bizarre,
intentionally campy humor” while Gleiberman considers that “Hopkins steals the movie by
default, spitting out witticisms with impeccable “I'm not worried, why should you be?”
panache.” But it is Hinson’s interpretation of the performance which rings closest to
Coppola’s —and maybe even Stoker’s— desires: “He’s mad, of course, and capable of saying or
doing just about anything, but he is on the side of the angels. And Hopkins uses just the right
pinch of comic hamminess to season his performance.”

As was developed above, there is in fact an element of folly, or at least of
whimsicality, to Van Helsing’s character in the novel. The critics’ reaction was therefore not
based on the performance itself but on what they had expected to see; and their expectations
were not based on the original Van Helsing from the novel, but most likely on the Van
Helsings they had seen in the previous film versions. First amongst these probably stood Peter
Cushing, who had reprised the role several times for the Hammer productions, and portrayed
the Professor not as an eccentric Dutchman but as a very British, incorruptible and slightly
stiff gentleman. No wonder Hopkins’s unconventional performance was found distracting.

_Bram Stoker’s Dracula_ is unique in this corpus for including all the major characters
in Stoker’s tale. Renfield has not been amalgamated into another part, nor have Lucy’s three
suitors. Tom Waits, singer and occasional actor, portrays Renfield, bringing his distinctive
voice and physique to the role. Waits was in fact a friend of Coppola’s since he had written
the score for his musical venture (and first major flop) _One From the Heart_ in 1982. It earned
Waits an Academy Award nomination. Following that, Waits had had cameos in other
Coppola films but this was his first ‘major’ role. His performance was generally well-received
considered compelling or even “wonderfully lunatic.” (Howe)

45 With the exception of Maddin, whose least developed character, Renfield, is nevertheless glimpsed.
Sadie Frost, as an unusually lascivious Lucy Westenra, also received a few honourable mentions. Howe noted: “More interesting work comes from British newcomer Sadie Frost as Ryder’s friend and soon-to-be vampire. She’s not only talented and vivacious, she may be the only actress around with little need for stage teeth.” But this would turn out to be her only memorable film role.

Although all three suitors are present on screen, they are developed as little as they were in the book, or even less so in the case of Seward, given that Renfield and Van Helsing are able to speak for themselves. They are played, to general critical indifference, by Richard E. Grant (Dr Jack Seward), Cary Elwes (Arthur Holmwood) and Bill Campbell (Quincey Morris).

Coppola’s second clear aim, after securing a young dynamic cast was to lead with the costumes: “Let’s spend our money not on the sets but on the costumes, because the costumes are the thing closest to the actors. Let’s dress these young actors in beautiful exotic, erotic costumes that have so much of the emotion right in the fabric.” (126) He collaborated with Japanese artist Eiko Ishioka. Coppola had been fascinated with Japan since shooting Apocalypse Now in the neighbouring Philippines and becoming acquainted with its culture (especially Kabuki theatre). He met Ishioka on the set of Mishima (Schrader, 1985) where she was in charge of Production Design, and which he helped produce. They then worked together for a TV production of Rip Van Winkle for the Faerie Tale Theatre series in 1987. But it is with BSD that Ishioka’s vision really comes into its own. Coppola wanted the costumes to be much more than just costumes, rather “a set design worn by the characters.” (126) Beyond establishing period, which is more traditional for this type of movie, they also set the mood not only of the characters but also of certain scenes and even the atmosphere of
the film in general. Ishioka also introduced a symbolic language, mainly linked to colour-coding, to denote certain traits, and their evolution, in the characters.

Conferring meaning(s) to costumes beyond the costumes themselves was central to her approach: "Costumes should be more than just items that explain the role of the actors who wear them . . . Costumes must have enough force to challenge the actors, the cinematographer, scenic designer, and director. And at times, the costumes should challenge the audience and make them think about why the actor is wearing that costume." (Coppola and Hart, 126-7) Ishioka's inspiration spanned a variety of sources. She dwelled on Eastern flavours, at times Middle Eastern but at others more specifically Japanese and alluding to such traditions as the Kabuki theatre; but she also sought inspiration from artistic movements which were contemporary to the novel, most notably symbolism and especially Gustav Klimt whose influence on certain costumes (the cloak which Dracula wears to return to Transylvania and in which he is killed P158.1 / P158.2) is palpable. Orientalism, Romanticism and Symbolism were also strong influences on other aspects of the production, particularly set design, where the influence of Caspar David Friedrich's landscapes (P158.3) and Gustave Moreau's mythological settings (P158.4) stood out.

Ishioka's work on the film was almost universally praised and rewarded with an Oscar, although some critics were impervious to its many dimensions. Joslin, for instance, lamented the costumes' lack of realism, arguing that they 'look like costumes (109). A more pragmatic criticism that could be levelled at the film is that its costumes are not always "unified", presenting realistic details alongside more fanciful interpretations.

As mentioned above, the costumes were to 'be the set' and early on in the film's production Coppola even considered the idea of dispensing with sets altogether and use only lighting and projecting effects instead. Although sets were introduced, the guiding idea was still to put the accent on surreal, imaginative and emotional backgrounds rather than reality
and the importance of light and shadow remained paramount. Production designer Tom Sanders was given a wide margin to work within; other than the storyboard and the visual influences that Coppola had put forward, his directives were: “to make it look like any other Dracula movie—and to make it strange.” (43) This quote demonstrates once again how Coppola aimed for references (or in Bak’s term “reverences”) and fantastic eeriness, but not for costume drama realism. Whereas the British scenes still have an ‘authentic’ feel to them, this is particularly relevant when the action shifts to Dracula’s territory, Transylvania, where anything goes. Sanders’ work, especially in collaboration with cinematographer Michael Ballhaus, also imbued the film with other instances of symbolism (light vs. dark, East vs. West, colour coding, …) which will be examined below.

Other aspects of the film’s production (editing, music, sound effects, etc…) will be dwelt on as they relate to specific scenes but one last element deserves a final, if rapid, mention here: the visual effects, which were coordinated by Coppola’s son Roman.

Budgetary restrictions had dictated that the film would be shot entirely on Sound Stage rather than on location, and instead of restraining the film’s Production Design, it both liberated and unified it. The same goes for the special effects: lack of means signified that the film could not compete with other productions which used state-of-the-art techniques such as computer animations and blue screens. So, Roman Coppola and his team decided to make the best of a bad job and opt instead for old-fashioned naïve effects which they thought would additionally “give the film almost a mythical soul” (Coppola and Hart, 52). Mirror effects, trapdoors, projections, manipulations of film exposure, speed and direction are amongst the in-camera effects used to give BSD its eeriness. This technique also presented more material advantages: instant preview of the scenes the way they were shot and less laboratory manipulation of the shooting film. Viewed in retrospect, it is one of BSD’s most successful aspects as computerized special effects tend to age more readily than in-camera effects. It also
allowed the crew to indulge Coppola’s penchant for reference, notably to classic films and directors such as Murnau, of course, but also Welles, Pabst and Cocteau.

2.4 The context of situation

Before proceeding with the close application of the systemic functional analytical model proposed, another, more intimate, form of contextualization needs to be effected. To remain within the SF framework, one could consider the previous sections in this chapter as: exploring the context of culture how the given cultural products (novel and films) fit within the wider scope of their production and reception. Within that perspective, a Hallidayan approach would suggest that closer attention be paid to the context of situation, notably in terms of field, mode and tenor.

There is of course no sense in creating a strict separation between situational context and stylistic features: the analysis is enlightened by the context while, reciprocally, the context is more clearly informed by the analytical observations. The relation between context and meanings is in fact termed dialectic by functional grammarians, insofar as the meanings display the context and the context is realised in the meanings. However, some preliminary considerations regarding field, mode and tenor may help situate the ensuing analysis as long as they do not seek to pre-determine it in any way.

In the present case, this situating process is further complicated by the novel’s structure. Each of the perspectives reflected by the multi-vocal text has its set of distinct characteristics, particularly regarding tenor and mode. Thus, particularly in the case of the novel but also to some extent for the films, the context of situation should include another rank for consideration. It should be subdivided into the global context, which takes into
account the text in its entirety (the whole novel or film) and the individual contexts surrounding each scene (each segment of text and/or mise-en-scene complex).

Before individual consideration is given to the different excerpts, the overall context can then be outlined.

2.4.1 Field

As it links to the experiential domain, the scope of field is concerned primarily with human experience and activity in and beyond the text. Dracula is a Gothic narrative, a text whose primary aim is to entertain by inducing fear. Beyond this short term goal, the novel’s status as a classic horror tale, as established in the relevant sections above, has inevitably brought along consideration of its place within the larger scheme of things (particularly literary and cultural). This could be construed as a long term goal, or at least effect, of the text. The shape of the story and its impact on the narrative itself stretches beyond field into the mode of the text and will thus be developed below.

As to the films, there is also room for exploring the field of discourse, be it multimodal in this case. O’Halloran, despite the systemic functional grid she proposes, chose not to emulate or adapt Halliday’s categories for the context of situation. Following Bordwell and Thompson whose terminology she also uses, she classifies the films instead according to type, form and genre. She then subdivides the film into a rank constituent structure which comprises the levels of plot and motifs within and beyond sequences/scenes, although her analysis confines to mise-en-scenes, and furthermore mainly to visual imagery over language.

Following O’Halloran, all the Dracula adaptations would probably classify as fictions (type), narratives (form) and pertaining to the horror genre. As will be developed below, this is a deliberate oversimplification. The movies in this corpus all differ from one another and it
is precisely therein that their interest lies. The labels given here would by and large fit all films but they would often have to combine with other categorizations, such as experimental types, associational forms, and a whole variety of genres, hybrids and sub-genres: expressionistic, comedic, romantic, musical, ... to name but a few. The category of genre is indeed particularly flexible since its conventions and classifications may vary according to subjects, emotional effects, plot elements, themes, techniques, iconography etc... However, these conventions are considered as perceptible by the audience, ritualized and therefore to a certain degree “satisfying because they reaffirm cultural values.” (Bordwell and Thompson, 99)

Resorting to Halliday and using his typology to consider these film-texts within their situational context in terms of field, tenor and mode of (multimodal) discourse, might then help clarify the situation.

To begin with field then, the experiential domain is quite similar to that of the novel. The films may be grouped together as horror narratives which seek to thrill for the sake of entertainment. Like with Stoker’s text, long term goals shed a new light on this fairly harmonious picture. Some of these films have explicitly set out to transcend the horror genre - and its limitations- and include other experiential meanings which then come to inform the field more generally. For others, the situation is similar but less deliberate and rather an effect of the passage of time and the particular status/stature which the films come to acquire. Thus the makers of Nosferatu might not have set out to create an Expressionistic masterpiece which would simultaneously define and transcend the genre it belonged to, yet it is precisely what ensued and thus comes to bear heavily on any contemporary analysis of the film. Even more striking is the example of the Hammer Horror productions whose short-term goal was explicitly un-ambitious from an artistic perspective, yet they managed to attain an iconic status which would serve as future reference within the horror field
To use genre terminology, it could be specified that within the horror genre, the vampire sub-genre is a category unto itself within which Dracula movies then constitute a further sub-category. As has already been mentioned above, this corpus includes only movies which have a fairly explicit link (referential or inspirational) to Stoker’s text, yet even so the level of intertextual intricacy, as exemplified by the generic complexity of the material, is very strong. Thus all these film-texts participate in a double movement. On the one hand they belong to a unified ‘family’, with its family traits, common drive and sense of belonging. On the other, each member is an individual with their particular idiosyncrasies, characteristics and desires. And each film not only positions itself with regard to the illustrious ancestor (Stoker’s novel) but also to the previous generations, including the family core, but also more distant relatives.

Within the corpus, some distinctions are more striking than others; one film stands out as glaringly different in style and intent from the others, Maddin’s *Dracula; Pages from a Virgin’s Diary*. Despite its similar content matter, the field is at variance with the other movies. Here the short term goal might still be entertainment but it is of a more subtle nature. It no longer stems primarily from fear but is the result of a combination of elements, from which fear is almost completely absent. Maddin’s film is intertextual to the extreme, replete with cultural and stylistic allusions and references. Early silent movies are consistently used as primary stylistic reference and, along with the exclusively musical soundtrack, emulated through a series of devices: black-and-white photography, variable speeds of projection, fade-ins and fade-outs, fake flaws such as burns and scratches on the film, title cards etc... But Maddin’s ambition does not rest solely on contemporary re-creating early cinema, he introduces other visual techniques which make the general picture more complex, such as the use of colour touches but also the, seemingly haphazard, use of tints over whole sequences.
And that is not to mention its most bizarre - and possibly most ambitious - feature: from beginning to end, it is filmed ballet.

Thus, beyond its aim to entertain, Maddin’s film clearly displays other short and long term goals. Chief amongst these, a tension between two poles stands out; on the one hand the film reads as a homage, not only to its predecessors but to the artistic medium of cinema itself; on the other, by its systematic recourse to unconventional and/or unexpected devices within the genre, it embodies a palpable determination to distance itself from, and perhaps even stand above, the rest. Although it is by no means the only movie within this corpus to have artistic ambitions and achieve them, Maddin’s version’s unabashed ‘auteurish’ scope is what sets it apart from the others. To return to generic terminology, ‘horror’ is probably not the first label it would receive; it would have to contend with ‘dance/musical’, ‘indie’ or even ‘experimental’, to mention but those.

In terms of variation, almost every film in the corpus could in fact be considered as a combination of genres, horror reigning chiefly but not exclusively amongst them. The most common blends are instances of comedy, often as a means of lightening the tension, and romance. The mixture with comedy is chiefly the case with Browning (and particularly the characters of Renfield gone mad and servant Martin) but also Coppola, mainly through Hopkins’ controversial portrayal of Van Helsing (see above).

Although these instances of comedy remain peripheral to the main horror-driven narrative, one of them has actually made its way across the corpus. It is the famous line in which Dracula apologizes for not sharing his visitor’s (Harker) meal by declaring “I never drink ... wine.” The line has been modified, but is in fact absent, from Stoker’s text. It is obvious its humorous potential stems entirely from the dramatic irony induced by the fact that the reader/spectator knows that Dracula is a blood-drinker. With Stoker’s original count, that
is of course not the case. Thus the line in the novel simply states: “You will, I trust, excuse me that I do not join you; but I have dined already and I do not sup.” (24)

Browning is the first to introduce the line as such and it is clearly due to Lugosi’s striking accent and enunciation that it is remembered with such clarity. From then on, it has become a staple of vampire movies. In this corpus the line appears in two more films: Oldman’s accented and pausing delivery for Coppola is strongly reminiscent of Lugosi although Stoker’s text has been brought in as backbone: “You will, I trust, excuse me that I do not join you but I have already dined and I never drink...wine”. Badham’s version uses a much more intricate pattern of reference. It is spoken at a British dinner table, where Dracula is a guest and simply declines the drink he is being offered: “No, thank you, I never drink wine.” There is no meaningful pause and Langella’s delivery is straightforward and deadpan. If it were not for the line’s fame, it would have blended seamlessly into the surrounding dialogue. Like Lugosi, Langella had starred in the Broadway stage version of Dracula before portraying the count on screen. Both film and play were intent on divesting the character from his usual gimmicks (accent, exaggerated gestures, make-up and fangs) and making him more human. This was very likely the message which the dialogue was trying to convey; the manner in which it came across, through indirect reference, strengthens its point.

It is precisely as he wished to revisit the story that Badham blended horror with another genre, the romantic movie. Vampirism had long since been associated with sex, but linking it to love was more unusual. Langella’s romantic count certainly lost something of his potential for terror but maybe, as many psychoanalytical readings of the novel had argued, his potential for female seduction is what made him all the more terrifying to men.

The romantic drift would be reprised (and then some) by Coppola, who set out to put together the ultimate love story as exemplified by the film’s promotional slogan “Love Never Dies”. Coming almost two decades after Badham, and in the wake of this version’s poor
results both financially and critically, Coppola’s ambitions stretched much further: he was not willing to sacrifice the story’s horrific potential to romance, quite the contrary. Dracula would be the hero, he would be romantic and seductive but he would also be cruel, horrific and terrifying. To what extent this balance was successfully achieved — or is indeed possible at all—is open to debate, as has already been developed above.

In the corpus chosen, the only films which remain clearly within the boundaries of the horror genre without delving into parallel styles are the two Hammer productions. Their story lines differ the most from Stoker’s, and they are developed in a serious straightforward manner with no tongue-in-cheek references. The original Dracula, is used —or, some might argue, abused— with little respect of or concessions to its status. The foundational dialogism of intertextuality appears somewhat unilateral here, as the features of the original are disguised almost to the point of obliteration. But even as the plot and characters are manipulated and transformed, The Hammer productions’ unabashed drive restores to them something of the powerful raw potential of Gothic literature. This may account for their success in terms of audience despite the paucity of means involved in the production. This popular success has been long-lasting since Hammer films have become something of a cult phenomenon, in which the nostalgia for bold, straightforward and untainted horror narratives plays a major role.

One may choose to situate the objects of analysis within a Hallidayan context of situation and investigate the experiential domain by exploring field. Or one may prefer to apply to film the Bordwell/Thompson distinction between type, form and genre. Or, even better, both methods may be combined to map out a broader, more adequate understanding of an unmistakably complex picture. The family metaphor used above illustrates the perceptible constant tension between similitude and idiosyncrasy in the objects examined. If one chooses
to delve further into Halliday however, there are two more aspects left to round off the exploration of situational context: tenor and mode.

2.4.2 Tenor

Tenor of discourse explores the relationship between the participants; it is particularly here that a distinction will have to be made, especially as far as the novel is concerned, between the whole text within the empirical world and the different segments within the diegesis. As a fragmented novel, Dracula displays a variety of writings (more about which under mode) by a variety of hands meant for a variety of eyes. It goes without saying that this is true only at the fictional sub-level. Therefore, before examining tenor of discourse and its possible variation in each individual extract, we should consider the novel as a whole.

*Dracula* is a novel, a piece of fiction addressed by one man, Bram Stoker, to an audience of many. Stoker’s status as a writer can likely be reconstructed from the introductory sections, and on its basis some idea of his relative power can similarly be induced. What Bram certainly had no inkling of was the scope of the audience which his novel would eventually receive, with hardly any limitations in space or time. This obviously has no effect on the text itself but any analysis should take into account this shift in the power relations of the participants in the discourse. Reading an entertaining horror tale is by no means the same as reading a canonic classic, and the impact this has on interpretation will be proportional.

In the case of the films, addressing tenor and delineating the respective roles of the participants is relatively more complex. Right from the outset, a standpoint as to authorship of the films selected for analysis has to be chosen and abided by. Film theory has frequently addressed this question: who is the author of a film? Film, being a collaborative process, the answer is not self-evident. Even if less-encompassing categories such as costumes, music,
acting, sets etc... are set aside, four contenders, who all generally have a strong impact on the final result still remain to claim authorship of a film: the scriptwriter, the director, the editor and the producer.

As mentioned above, Bourdieu had pointed out the often misconstrued importance of the producer of any cultural product:

Who is the true producer of the value of the work – the painter or the dealer, the writer or the publisher, the playwright or the theatre manager? The ideology of creation, which makes the author the first and last source of the value of his work, conceals the fact that the cultural businessman is at one and the same time the person who exploits the labour of the ‘creator’ by trading in the ‘sacred’ and the person who, by putting it on the market, by exhibiting, publishing or staging it, consecrated a product which he has discovered and which would otherwise remain a mere natural resource; and the more consecrated he personally is, the more strongly he consecrates the work.

(“Production” 76-7)

What Bourdieu applies to culture as a whole is twice as true for film: although commonly underestimated by the general public, the importance of a producer, without whom the ‘product’ would probably not even exist let alone be seen by others, is paramount and acknowledged as thus within the profession. But as far as ‘parenthood’ of the artistic product itself is concerned, another view is both more frequently held and sounder, as summarized by Bordwell and Thompson:

Most people who study cinema regard the director as the film’s “author”. Although the writer prepares the script, later phases of production can modify it beyond recognition. And although the producer monitors the entire process, he or she seldom controls moment-by-moment activity on the set. It is the director who makes the crucial
decisions about performance, staging, lighting, framing, cutting and sound. On the whole, the director has more control over how a movie looks and sounds (40-1).

This is clearly the outlook which has been chosen here, as typified by systematic reference to the director as author. It must however be acknowledged that, even within a restricted corpus such as this one, the directors’ grasp on the eventual result varied widely. Fisher’s personal input was probably considerably outweighed by the Hammer Horror specifications, whereas Maddin, whose authorial touch and originality was the cornerstone of the production, was given free rein by producer Vonnie Von Helmolt.

If the film’s director is considered as its author, what naturally follows suit is that the director’s aura, particularly in terms of fame and reputation, will have a strong impact on the audience’s reception of the film, maybe even on their appraisal of it.

When BSD was released, its marketing campaign had to address the issue of the many versions which had preceded it and find a distinctive angle of approach. Two of them were actually put forward, neither of which really holds under closer scrutiny: the movie would innovate by introducing a love story, something which Badham had already done; it would also be Bram Stoker’s Dracula, remaining closer (truer?) to the novel than had ever been done, a fairly controversial and/or exaggerated claim, as developed above.

But another argument would weigh heavily, albeit less explicitly, in the balance and draw audiences to the theatres: Coppola’s status and notoriety as a cult director. Even though Coppola was by no means at the peak of his career when he started working on this film (quite the contrary), he had directed movies which assured him a special standing in the history of cinema at large. The Conversation, Apocalypse Now and the Godfather trilogy. The Godfather parts I and II in particular are touchstones of cinema and recognised as such not only by film professionals but by an extremely large popular audience as well. This coincidence of professional and spectator enthusiasm is in fact quite rare; seldom do the same
films top the lists of film publications and popular surveys, like *the Godfather* does. When it revised its list of 100 years' 100 best movies in 2007, the American Film Institute placed the Godfather second. The acclaimed poll conducted every decade by the British magazine *Sight and Sound* distinguishes between critics and directors, who also get polled. In 2002, *The Godfather 1&2* ranked number four with the critics, number two with the directors; when the movies were evaluated as to direction, Coppola ranked tenth with the critics but fourth with his fellow directors. This goes to demonstrate the tremendous esteem Coppola was, and indeed still is, held in both within his direct profession and the film world at large, as exemplified by the critics. But, beyond the critical acclaim and recognition it inspired, *the Godfather* is also a huge popular success, both financially - it was an unmitigated box-office success- and in terms of long-lasting impact. It topped the lists of surveys conducted by *Entertainment Weekly, Time Out* and *Empire*. It also currently holds the second spot on the IMDb list, which computes the grades received with the number of voters; *The Godfather 2* ranks third. The name of Coppola is thus instantly recognizable and usually favourably connoted even to an audience of less-discerning filmgoers. Which is not to say that it necessarily sells, as his numerous box-office flops, both pre- and post- BSD, have shown. But in the case of Dracula, there seems to have been a kind of palpable convergence between the director, his subject and his previous work. The darkness, the epic dimension, the violence present in the Godfather trilogy would transfer well to the vampire saga. So spectators flocked to the theatres not only, or even chiefly, to see Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* but Coppola’s *Dracula*: what would the man who had breathed life into such landmarks of evil as Don Corleone and colonel Kurtz make of the ultimate vampire villain? Thus the audience for the
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film transcended the usually more restricted horror-movie-going public: the escalating
canon status of the novel, combined with Coppola’s aura and a high-billing cast drew in a
wide, and varied, crowd of spectators. Their reaction to the film would accordingly fluctuate
but, as seen above, this alchemy of factors would result in a generally positive response.

In the corpus of films examined, Coppola is not the only ‘cult’ director, Mumau is of
course an emblematic cinematic figure in his own right. Unlike Coppola, however, that
reputation did not precede his Dracula but followed or even resulted from it. The film’s
pivotal role in the history of cinema, its classic status and the length of time that has since
elapsed, set it apart from all the other versions considered here. It is undeniable that the
subsequent impact on reception of the movie is huge: a contemporary spectator discovering
*Nosferatu* rarely comes at it from an unknowing detached perspective, but rather sees it as the
archetypal horror/vampire classic which it is. Thus, the film’s tenor is inevitably tinted by its
superior reputation and the participants who receive it as discourse, the audience, cannot fail
but to be exposed to this positive bias.

As may be inferred from these developments, it is worth noting that the standing of the
addressee, the film’s director, will influence the type of addressees, the audience, who are
likely to come into contact with the text. It is of course not the sole criterion or even the
primary one as would be the case in literature, where an author’s name ‘sells’ the book to its
audience. But it is a key which may help distinguish and account for variations within the
corpus, in the same way subdivisions within field were presented above.
2.4.3 Mode

The last parameter which must be considered to delineate the context of situation is mode of discourse, which is primarily concerned with the text’s linguistic features. Like tenor, mode will have to be re-defined and re-appraised when excerpts from the novel are examined microscopically. Each of the pieced-together ‘fragments’ has its individual features and the originality of the novel’s structure stems precisely from the variety they display: journal entries, letters, newspaper excerpts, phonograph recordings etc.

As far as the novel as a whole is concerned, a few preliminary considerations may be drawn. The medium is of course written, and the text is transmitted through a graphic channel. The role of language is constitutive, not being subordinated to any other activity. The rhetorical thrust is globally literary and/or entertaining. If we consider the text from its most exterior layer, a novel written by a single author, it is monologic in its interaction.

As to the films, it is within the perspective of mode that they are most at variance with the novel. Here again, different films present their content differently and the way their meanings are shaped may also differ from one scene to another within a single movie. This will be significantly illustrated below.

But another essential difficulty in discussing mode within films stems from the fact that the metalanguage used relates very narrowly to ‘traditional’ monomodal language. The language of film is of course, as has been established, multimodal, and a certain degree of confusion as to which language is under scrutiny may ensue. Distinctions such as medium and channel start breaking down. A film text is, nowadays, often spoken but not exclusively so: it generally comprises written fragments. This corpus also includes two ‘silent’ or rather non-spoken films: one of them, Nosferatu, through the technical restrictions of its time; the other, Maddin’s Pages from a Virgin’s Diary, through aesthetic preferences, relating both to the director’s nostalgia for early cinema and the format of filmed ballet.
Even though some meanings and information are thus conveyed phonically and/or graphically, the language of film is also visual to an extremely high proportion and as some would argue, primarily visual. But it is not language in its traditional understanding which is visual, as would be the case in signed language for instance. Thus, a multiplicity of channels coexist and interact with each other and can be roughly split into two classes: the visual, of which written language is but one dimension, and the aural with phonic language but also music and sound effects. Another essential tenet to take into account is that these classes interrelate and are often difficult to detach from one another, and that it is precisely at their point of convergence that the language of film resides.

Other terms used to qualify mode of discourse appear similarly ambiguous or even inadequate when applied to film. Whether the role of language is constitutive or ancillary to the film obviously depends on the understanding of the term language. If it is the single track of speech within the multimodal text, it is ancillary; if it is film language, the complex compound of visual and aural information, it is constitutive.

The type of interaction at play within film is similarly plagued by multiple interpretations. In Stoker’s case, the different strata which the novel comprised were relegated to individual analyses while the novel as a whole was considered as monologic. The same may be done here: the film-text is the global product and as such is realised by one ‘speaker’, the director.

But considering film as monologic is more readily debatable than in the case of novels. First, as seen above when exploring tenor, whether a film can be ascribed to a single author is already a contentious issue. Second, although it is perceived in a unified manner, the multiplicity of matters of expression which are interacting with one another to create this result crops up just beneath the surface. The confrontation of the two main classes of image
and sound, and particularly their interface which is mediated by the film’s editing, results in an impression of multivocality.

This impression is furthermore strengthened if one isolates the single track of spoken language within film. This is particularly relevant in the case of adaptation; one of the most obvious differences between written text within a novel and spoken text in a film is the shift from monologism to dialogism. It is of course no absolute requisite: many novels have sections of dialogue which can vary in quantity according to the text’s format and film may introduce or even heavily rely on devices such as voiceovers, which are monologic in their intent. Yet on the whole, language in film is extremely prone to dialogue, making the label monologic somewhat uncomfortable, even though it applies to a different textual level.

Mode of discourse is thus probably the least enlightening of the criteria which constitute the Hallidayan context of situation, especially at this level, if applied to a film text in its entirety. However, it will prove more useful when affected to text excerpts, especially in contrasting the differences in linguistic uses.

Now that the novel and films have been properly introduced macroscopically, close analysis may proceed. A series of scenes which are believed to be emblematic or pivotal to the story have been chosen to undergo scrutiny.

They have been ordered according to the book’s chronology from a “syuzhet” perspective. This is fairly close to the manner in which the story is presented in most films, but narrative film being essentially more temporal than written text, the films tend to follow
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48 As explained above, this thesis examines novel to film adaptation and does not consider drama, whose dynamics are different and obviously depend a great deal on dialogue. An extreme example of the reversal of balance between dialogue and monologic narrative in a novel would be Corey Mesler’s *Talk, a Novel in Dialogue*, whose title is self-explanatory.
the “fabula” construction more closely. This is especially true regarding two key aspects of the novel.

First, the afore-mentioned fact that the novel can be split into two distinctly constructed sections: the initial Transylvania chapters, featuring only Harker and the Count, and the rest of the novel and its complete cast. Few films have emulated this drastic division. Browning’s *Dracula* is the only one to actually begin straight in the Carpathians. Other versions have either deleted, transformed or justified the initial section through the introduction of preliminary scenes.

Second, the epistolary structure of the novel had enabled Stoker to manipulate the story’s narrative for dramatic effect. Amongst the many examples which could be quoted, the dramatic irony of Mina’s worrying over Jonathan and the threat of Dracula himself is made all the more palpable to the reader who, of course, has already read the initial section some of which is chronologically posterior to the action being recounted. Other more punctual uses of this strategy recur throughout the novel such as Van Helsing’s telegram of warning in chapter XI, which is presented chronologically but which in fact arrives twenty-two hours late, a delay which will ultimately lead to Lucy’s demise. Within this corpus, Coppola is clearly the director who tries to emulate the novel’s structure most closely by using voice-overs, superimpositions, fade-ins and fade-outs, alternating sequences, etc… yet, as the film narrative progresses more linearly, this dimension of dramatic irony is generally lost even here.

To return to the analysis, the scenes chosen will then be scrutinized on the basis of the grids proposed in the previous chapter, and elements of interpretation will be put forward and eventually contrasted. In each case, the segment in the novel will be examined first, followed by the corresponding scene in Coppola’s movie, which includes all the relevant scenes and
thus serves as red thread for the analysis. Subsequently, all the other films in the corpus which present similar scenes will be observed and presented in chronological order.

Practical adjustments have been carried out to make this analysis more straightforward and enable a transversal reading of the different sources; the names of certain characters which have been changed in some films, for instance, have been turned back to the corresponding names in the novel to make possible parallels more evident (whenever this has been done, it is clearly signalled within the analysis).

The manner in which these analyses are structured also requires some introductory remarks. Seven different scenes are presented: four correspond to the Transylvania chapters (Encounter with locals/warning, calèche scene, first encounter, Brides scene) and thus offer some unity in terms of mode and tenor of discourse. The number of scenes chosen in the first four chapters might appear disproportionate to the total weight of the novel. Two reasons justify this choice, one of them pragmatic, the other more “instinctive”. First, as mentioned above, few filmmakers have chosen to include both sections in their final product; giving equal weight to the two parts thus allowed for a more balanced examination of the filmic corpus49. Second, as critical investigation confirms, Dracula’s success and permanence results mainly from the impact of this first section with its Gothic setting and introduction of the incarnated villain, and thus some proportional redress was deemed necessary.

The three remaining scenes (Lucy’s exorcism, Mina’s attack, Dracula’s death) are part of the second, more fragmented, part of the novel. These analyses will then be preceded by a global reflection on the nature of this fragmentation and its transferral to the screen. Each film

49 Murnau and Browning have focused extensively on this initial section and will thus feature more prominently in the first part of the analysis, whereas the balance will be reversed in the second part to favour Badham and Maddin. Fisher and (obviously) Coppola are prominent in both sections.
will be examined separately (and chronologically) on this issue before closer scrutiny of their particulars resumés.

Although they follow the same basic premise and pattern, it must also be mentioned that the analyses will not necessarily be presented in a redundant fashion. Again, this is deliberate: a more "organic" presentation was preferred to a systematic but repetitive arrangement. A progressive approach was deemed more relevant: the initial analyses are cautious and inclusive but, once the model has been established, the observations gain momentum and associations and interactions are more freely conducted. It ensues that digressions might unexpectedly take place, although their relevance is always ascertained.

Finally, hypotheses about the global construction of the filmic corpus and its relation to the novel will be presented. These will proceed according to two governing premises. First, are certain meanings, which transcend time, means and directorial preferences, found to be equivalent between the novel and some films? Second, can these meanings then be correlated to each other and reveal a more general consensus about the manner in which different media inherently convey meanings differently?

2.5  Scene 1: Encounter with locals / warning

2.5.1 Stoker

In the novel, the scene is in chapter 1, it is Jonathan’s second diary entry on his second day abroad. He is staying at an inn in Bistritz, waiting for a coach to take him to the Borgo Pass where Dracula’s carriage will meet him.

All the excerpts from the novel are gathered in appendix four.
At the experiential level, examination of this passage shows that, while it is written in diary form, this is not an introspective piece of writing but a narrative. And, at this stage, Harker does not so much appear as this story’s protagonist but rather as its narrator.

As other patterns (circumstances, noun-groups etc.) are not particularly marked here, the analysis will bear primarily on processes. These show that Jonathan is rarely a participant in the active sense. He relates and relays the doings of others and, to some degree is affected by them, but is rarely the doer himself. As the form would lead to expect, there is a fairly high proportion of verbal processes (answer, tell, say; direct, implore, speak, enquire, mumble...) of which Jonathan is almost in equal measure the sayer and the receiver. This balance is not to be found with other processes, in which Jonathan is generally more absent. There are in fact very few material processes in this passage; other than verbal, the emphasis is primarily mental (numerous occurrences of know, understand, seem, feel,...).

Through their scarcity, material processes thus stand out more and the little action that is conducted through them seems to carry more import. Frequency is obviously not an argument in itself but open to individual, and even contradictory, interpretation(s). As Fish had argued (see above), there is no ultimate objective “truth” to stylistics yet that does not in itself invalidate the subjective assumptions that are made on the basis of measurable features. Here, actions converge when the landlady takes a crucifix and slips it round Jonathan’s neck:

“She then rose and dried her eyes, and taking a crucifix from her neck offered it to me.” It is thus perceived as the pivotal moment in a generally more background-setting scene; the crucifix’s (goal) essential role will be borne out in a later chapter as it saves Jonathan (beneficiary) from Dracula’s attack.

Whereas the experiential metafunction presents Jonathan as a narrating figure who is somewhat passive in the ongoing story, the interpersonal level shows that the reader is encouraged to engage with him more forcibly. Even though there is a multiplicity of processes
and participants, if the absolute frequency of subjects is considered, first-person pronoun I is the one which recurs most often. This is, of course, highly consistent with a first-person narration, yet it also goes to show that a narrative can be simultaneously descriptive and involved, without its being overtly introspective. The prism of Jonathan’s view through which the readers are introduced to the story is also perceptible in certain clauses in which the finite, chiefly through its modality, conveys his personal appraisal or perspective: “this could not be true”. “I could allow nothing to interfere with it”, “I must go.”

This personal outlook, which is exposed for the readership to share, is also built into certain choices in lexical register which counterbalance Jonathan’s fairly neutral stance and introduce elements of subjective appraisal: “he seemed somewhat reticent, and pretended that he could not understand my German.”, “the old lady came up to my room and said in a hysterical way”, “It was all very ridiculous”.

In the last paragraphs of the scene, a new sense of immediacy is introduced as tenses shift from past to present (simple and continuous):

“I am writing up this part of the diary whilst I am waiting for the coach, which is, of course, late; and the crucifix is still round my neck. 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.”

The individuality of the voice and the manner in which it engages the reader seems to be borne out at the textual level as the pronoun I dominates the initial and final paragraphs, giving the middle section room for narrative extrapolation, but finally bringing Harker firmly into focus, where he belongs. Thematically, there are not many marked instances in this passage with the exception of the landlady’s lament whose interrogative structure is unusual, as it is more of a warning than an actual question. It is furthermore made (rhythmically) salient by parallel arrangement and repetition thus giving the passage an incantatory feel:
"Do you know what day it is?" I answered that it was the fourth of May. She shook her head as she said again:

"Oh, yes! I know that! I know that, but do you know what day it is?"

On my saying that I did not understand, she went on:

"It is the eve of St. George's Day. Do you not know that to-night, when the clock strikes midnight, all the evil things in the world will have full sway? Do you know where you are going, and what you are going to?"

A metafunctional analysis of this excerpt thus seems to correlate the following interpretations and render these meanings implicit. The passage oscillates between narrative detachment, incarnated by the “passivity” of the narrator Jonathan, as perceived at the experiential level and a more forcible engagement with him at the interpersonal level, through the use of subject, mood and lexical markers of subjective appraisal. Textually, the arrangement of this movement is harmonious, with a more exterior narrative core and (relatively) more subjective and therefore empathy-inducing initial and final sections.

What now remains to be seen is how movies in our corpus have dealt with this scene, when they have included it, and whether similar meanings can be deduced, albeit expressed through different means. As previously stated, Coppola will lead the way and other movies will follow chronologically.

2.5.2 Coppola

In Coppola's version, there is no inn scene but some of the novel's elements have been transferred onto the coach ride which takes Harker from Bistritz to the Borgo pass, and thus

---

51 All film excerpts are available on the accompanying DVD.
will serve the analytical purposes developed here. In the novel, this coach passage is quite long and develops many scene-setting elements both picturesque, as Harker extensively describes the scenery he is driving through, and atmospheric, as the wariness of the driver and passengers is recounted. Yet it remains essentially descriptive and offers no direct interaction between Harker and other characters.

Whereas the novel opened in the Carpathians and the scrutinized scene was introductory to the story as a whole, the movie has already developed four sequences, introduced some of the characters and thus contextualised Harker’s voyage to a greater degree. The first of these sequences is the infamous historical prologue, introducing Dracula as pre-vampire warrior Vlad Tepes and “explaining” his monstrous transformation as the result of his wife’s suicide and his hatred of a reproachful Church. The second scene, and first contemporary one, takes place in Carfax asylum and introduces Renfield, whose connection to Dracula, unlike in the novel, has been hinted at: Renfield travelled to Transylvania as a solicitor and returned to London mad. Jonathan is then sent as his replacement, as is subsequently shown. Finally, there is a shorter scene which shows Jonathan taking his leave from Mina.

Except for the fact that they are summarized and accelerated, the different steps of Harker’s voyage follow their depiction in the novel. Jonathan is seen travelling by train and by coach and different means are used to succinctly reflect the length of the trip: the images are accompanied by Harker’s diary read in voice-over and commenting on the scenery, while superimposed images are used, notably a map of the region in which Transylvania is highlighted. Voice-overs and superimpositions are two techniques which Coppola employs abundantly in the film, as will be seen, to a variety of ends. But the most obvious aim which they pursue is to emulate the novel’s construction as a “fragmented” text, multiplying, crossing and re-arranging points of view by relying on multiple visual and aural perspectives.
A very succinct "warning" scene takes place next. It is linked to the previous shot of Mina typewriting her diary by her voice-over, commenting on Jonathan's travels.

This scene consists of nine shots. The first of these is an establishing shot depicting the coach travelling down a very dark and ominous mountainous scenery. It is followed by a medium shot of the coach drivers as they are driving through a storm and lightning strikes behind them. Another full shot then shows the coach coming to a halt. The following shot is more intriguing: the angle is similar to the previous one (only the coach is shown in profile), but the perspective is more remote and the point of view, framed by spindly bushes, resembles that of a lurking predator. This impression, furtive as it is, is however correlated by the use of the soundtrack: grunting is heard and while it could be interpreted as the horses neighing as they come to a stop, it seems louder, and therefore closer, than the sounds of Jonathan alighting and talking to the driver. There is no clear referent at the representational level either for the visual or aural impressions conveyed by this shot, its purpose is most likely to instil a feeling of menace, an intangible threat.

Whereas the novel dwelt on the unnamed threat which awaited Harker on the eve of St George, and which the locals' reticence to voice seemed to stem from superstition, here the threat is also immaterial but more directly experienced by the viewer as he/she engages with it modally without the mediation of either the locals or Jonathan's recounting it. The next shot closes up on Jonathan as he exits the coach. A local, apparently gypsy, woman grasps his hand, hands him something and, speaking Romanian says "For the dead travel fast". A close up on Jonathan's face is followed by another close up on the palm of his hand holding a crucifix. The previous frame is then resumed as the woman's companion, another gypsy whose face is hidden by an intriguing veil made of gold coins, slams the coach door shut. The final medium frame, reminiscent of the coach's initial arrival, shows Jonathan standing by the coach's side as it exits the frame. The close up on the crucifix in Harker's hand, at the
member rank, is emblematic of its importance both representationally and compositionally, as there are few close-ups in this particular scene – and few close-ups of objects in the movie generally. Thus, as in the novel but by different means, the crucifix is rendered salient and the pivotal role which it will come to play in protecting Harker in a later scene is hinted at.

The scarcity of dialogue combined with the abundance of sound effects in this scene but especially in the next one as will be developed below, gives an eerie connotation to the gypsy’s utterance, which is obviously enhanced by the obscurity of its meaning. In the novel, although the line is also spoken by one of Harker’s companions, the context in which it is uttered differs: the mysterious carriage driver is present and the passenger is commenting on his haste to get to the meeting point. Its literary origin, in the poem Lenore by German poet Burger is also quoted, whereas in the film it is left obscure, thus contributing to the general impression of mystery and unease which pervades the scene.

2.5.3 Murnau

Nosferatu also has a “warning” scene, in which local colour is emphasized through the use of set and costumes. The contrast between townie Harker and the local peasants is paralleled by their superstitious warnings to him and his jolly dismissal of these. Again, Harker’s travels have been contextualised; previous scenes have illustrated Jonathan and Mina’s marital bliss and the reason for his departure. A sinister and more evil than deranged Renfield is Harker’s employer and as he sends him off, his mission is tinged with danger from the outset. As per the novel, the warning scene takes place in an inn and Harker interacts mainly with the landlord.

For the sake of clarity, the names as they appear in the novel will be used here, as is generally the case in later prints of the film, once disguising the original source to avoid copyright infringement was no longer an issue.
The scene consists of thirteen shots, if counting the intertitles as shots. There have been diverging opinions on the subject. In keeping with David Bordwell ("Cinemetrics"), this analysis will include them in the total.

It begins with an establishing shot, displaying the outside of the inn, and the coach pulling up next to it. The next shot shows Jonathan alighting and being greeted by the landlord; both of them then enter the inn. Another wide shot, of the inside of the inn, shows Jonathan being seated at a table and presented with a drink. Modally, this wide shot affords the viewer the opportunity to take in the exoticism of the new surroundings, through the cosy set and two groups of locals standing in the background. They are not particularly salient at the rank of temporal episodes; they are relegated to the backdrop, framing Harker on each side as he takes centre stage, both by being closest to the camera (and closest in focus) and by being positioned almost exactly at the centre of the frame. At the rank of temporal member, in this shot and the next ones, their costume style makes them stand out as foreign, especially in relation to Jonathan; they are other or rather, he is other in respect to them. This otherness will centre particularly on their fears and beliefs, which Harker dismisses as superstitions.

The next shot closes up on a buoyant Jonathan addressing the landlord. The intertitle which follows mentions castle Dracula for the first time. The next shots close up on the two different peasant groups and show their instantaneous reaction of shock at the mention of the castle. The contrast with Harker’s laughing demeanour, exacerbated by the expressionist style of acting, is again quite striking.

The next shots similarly alternate between Jonathan and the landlord, but also between full shots and medium close-ups as the warning appears on the next title card: “You must go no further so late at night. When darkness comes, evil spirits become all powerful”. Like in the novel, the reference is vague but foreboding, although here it is conveyed through the
peasants’ physical reactions rather than through repetition, as is of course appropriate to especially silent-film.

The scene ends on a medium close up of Harker and the landlord laughing companionably together, although, one now suspects, for different motives: the innkeeper is relieved to have kept his guest safe and Jonathan is playing along with local traditions while jokingly undermining them. This contrast will continue in the next scenes and will be similarly borne out by the editing. The very next scene, for instance, shows Jonathan taking to his room, reading a book on local vampire folklore which he finds there and tossing it to the floor with a laugh. Surrounding shots within this sequence show foreboding omens such as horses running away, a hyena lurking outside, and the locals signing themselves in reaction to its squeals.

2.5.4 Browning

Browning’s film, as mentioned above, is the only one in this corpus to follow Stoker’s dramatic presentation and open directly with Harker in Transylvania.

For practical purposes, we will refer to the character as Jonathan, although in the movie it is in fact Renfield’s voyage that is being chronicled. Browning, who, unlike Murnau, had secured the rights to the novel from Florence Stoker, was nevertheless under the influence of the Deane/Balderston stage version, which started directly in London. The Transylvania opening chapter seems to have been conceived as an atmospheric prelude, albeit a most successful one, to the second, more story-driven but also more stagy, part. This version, like others, would find it challenging to reconcile the novel with the play. As Skal commented: “Deane’s dramaturgical surgery served the purposes of the production he could afford to produce, but would wreak havoc with future stage and film adaptations. Like a macabre
Halloween Humpty Dumpty, the scattered pieces of *Dracula* would not fit back easily.”

(Hollywood, 69)

As in the novel, this introduction delineates the threat that Dracula poses before it becomes tangible, i.e. before he infiltrates the Western world. As has been mentioned above, Harker's character recedes in importance in the second part of the novel, both from a quantitative and qualitative point of view. Yet he remains one of the main characters, whom the readership most easily empathizes with given his connection to Mina, which goes a long way towards justifying the somewhat fragile cohesion between the two sections. That is clearly not the case with Renfield and therefore Browning's film never quite manages to convincingly paste the two parts together, regardless of how persuasive they are independently.

The movie opens directly with a coach scene, then shows the coach stopping outside an inn. The set is reminiscent of Murnau's film, and is also full of local colour. It even has the added bonus of sound to emphasize the exotic dimension, and Browning uses this abundantly with the locals exchanging freely in Hungarian. Although, it is currently part of Romania, Transylvania has been dominated by several different peoples and empires over the centuries. The Magyar (Hungarian) empire's influence was long-lasting and witnessed the advent of Vlad Tepes, the historical figure believed to be the inspiration for Dracula. Which language or dialect was around at Stoker's time and should therefore be used in a historically accurate adaptation is however a matter of debate amongst Dracula scholars (Welsh). McNally and Florescu offer the most exhaustive investigation(s) into the region, the history behind and the links to the novel.

This scene has seventeen shots. In the first shot, the camera tilts down from the top of the carriage, where the drivers are seated, to the standing figure of Harker, who states his willingness to continue towards the Borgo pass and then tilts back up to focus on the drivers’
heated reaction. The next shot shows the driver addressing the innkeeper; it is followed by a medium close up on Jonathan where the landlord joins him in the frame and asks him, in English, to delay his trip till the morning. Jonathan then states that he is expected by Count Dracula. The landlord repeats the name in complete dismay. There is a rapid cut to a woman (presumably the landlady) in medium close up signing herself, clearly at the mention of the name. The previous frame then resumes as the landlord tries to dissuade Harker from pursuing by mentioning vampires. The next shot is a close-up on the landlord who is now facing the camera frontally (rather than three-quarters as was the case at the episode rank previously) as he develops: “Dracula and his wives they take the forms of wolves and bats”. It is clear that the scene had first been construed without this particular shot and that it was inserted later for explanatory purposes, to justify Dracula’s powers of metamorphosis, the presence of the brides, or indeed both. The insertion is seamless neither from the technical point of view, causing a jolt in continuity editing both visually and aurally, nor from the narrative standpoint as the sentence has no cause-effect links to the dialogue surrounding it. The shot thus appears, clumsily, as salient, but in this case, this is the result of poor, or speedy, editing choices rather than directorial intent.

The earlier shot then resumes, as does the conversation, only to be interrupted by a local pointing at the sun receding on the horizon. The innkeeper first, then Jonathan, exit the static shot; there is another cut to the landlady’s clearly fearful face. Jonathan then appears in a long shot, within a group of locals. The camera pans with him towards the coach as he expresses his determination to continue. As he is about to enter, the woman walks up to him, handing him something. A close-up of her hand holding a crucifix is accompanied by the line “For your mother’s sake. It will protect you”. The first part of the line is exact Stoker; the second part overtly states the importance of the crucifix and its protecting values, which had only been hinted at in other versions (as in the novel). The line is made to stand out even more
as it is the last one spoken, clearly and in English, in this scene. Thus the pivotal role of the crucifix, which has here become unambiguously protective, is conveyed not only visually but through language as well. The next shot frames the woman as before, while she kisses the crucifix and slips it around Harker’s neck. Different shots then alternate, showing locals reacting, with fear and sorrow, to Harker’s departure and the carriage moving away along the hilltop, the whole thing accompanied by the lamenting murmur of Hungarian voices.

What is striking in this version, as opposed to Nosferatu, is the way in which Browning uses sound, and more particularly the contrast between English and Hungarian, to create a foreign atmosphere and subtly contrast it with the quintessentially British Harker. Beyond the difference in language, other contrasts are drawn by the same token, especially that of superstition vs. pragmatism, which reflects the wider opposition between East and West, or tradition and modernity. Thus, the representational level meets the modal as image and soundtrack interact to present us with the rational figure of Harker, estranged in an unfamiliar land and prey to a menace which he has not yet taken the measure of.

Amongst the sequences in this corpus, this one most resembles the novel, not necessarily because it follows its narrative drift but rather because it conveys similar meanings.

At the level of the representational and logical metafunctions, it fulfils its introductory purpose admirably by succinctly providing a wealth of information: Harker’s function, his purpose, his destination and the threat which the latter poses. To achieve this end, it uses language more explicitly than Coppola, for instance, whose immaterial threat was steeped in mystery. Beyond the directors’ individual styles, it is obvious that the two movies came at different times with different production constraints and expectations. In 1931, Dracula was a somewhat familiar fictional character but nowhere near the cultural icon, immersed in intertextual references, that he had become by 1992. Accordingly, Coppola had more leeway
to be vague or even dispense with certain features of the novel. As will be seen below, at
times he even refers directly to previous films rather than the text itself.

2.5.5 Fisher

As mentioned above, both Hammer productions used in this corpus took extensive liberties
with Stoker’s text, yet certain scenes, while not reflecting plot elements, are strongly
reminiscent of the novel in atmospheric or thematic tenor.

_Horror of Dracula_ has no warning scene but _Dracula Prince of Darkness_ has an
extensive sequence which may be considered as an equivalent, even though it does not star a
solitary Englishman but two British couples: Diana and Charles Kent and the latter’s brother
Alan and his wife Helen. As the younger man, Charles is the closest to the Harker figure, he is
also presented as the story’s protagonist, or even hero. Although it is preceded by two other
sequences (the first of which repeats the last minutes of the previous Dracula instalment,
which show Van Helsing dispatching Dracula by using daylight to burn him to ashes) this inn
scene is the first one of this new narrative and is thus expository to a certain degree.

It is also a mood-setting scene; by 1966, Hammer Productions were famed for their
mastery of horror movies and expertly contrasted moments of explicit gore with ominous
ambience segments which prepared the audience for the horrors to come. The scene is then
unashamedly long, close to six minutes, and comprises about forty different shots.

Like Murnau and Browning, Fisher opens with a wide establishing shot, showing the
inn within its mountainous surroundings. The next shot moves straight to the inside of the inn.
There is no scope here, and very little purpose, to detail every single shot individually, but
taken as a whole, the scene displays a quite dynamic editorial rhythm, especially at the
beginning.
The foreigners are shown interacting with the locals within the inn, more particularly Charles, who is trying the local specialities and buying rounds. Both the editing and the camera movements are quite lively and in key with the jolly atmosphere. There are alternating shots of Charles and the locals and counter-shots of his companions looking on. Not only does the framing vary, from long to medium to close-up (in no particular order, there is no clear deliberation to lean in or out), but the camera is inconspicuously but unmistakably mobile, alternatively dollying in and out and/or panning left and right. The general effect is one of vibrancy and good humour. The inn is a lively set and offers a good dose of local colour; Charles, the most mobile of the characters, appears quite at home in it, in contrast to his companions who remain seated and whose framing, although not identical, is more static than his. This is mirrored by the dialogue, which has Helen, the older woman, stiffly disapproving of his generosity.

After this dynamic introduction, the pace slows down somewhat: a long shot of the inside of the inn shows a Monk, father Sandor, entering. His character had already been introduced in the previous scene in which he berated a group of peasants for their superstition. As he enters, a stillness falls over the inn, the crowd goes quiet and the camera dollies out, following him as he moves towards the English group and warms himself by their fire. As they strike up a conversation, the camera becomes completely static and offers an alternation of shots and countershots which mirror their exchanges almost exactly. The emphasis is then solely on the conversation and its content.

The English voice their intention to go to Carlsbad, to which the father reacts unexpectedly. He insists, several times, that they should steer clear of Carlsbad and especially of the castle there. There is an interesting linguistic contrast in one of his lines; noting the father's reaction to their schedule, Alan says that they might change their plans, to which the father answers "I suggest that you do so". From the point of view of intonation, this
suggestion, which lexically seems to warrant a mitigating falling rising tone, is in fact uttered with a fairly definite falling tone, giving it the appearance of a more or less forceful order. This likely interpretation can be appreciated fully in the next shot in which Helen’s face displays a mixture of surprise and offended shock, a reaction which the simple suggestion, had it been uttered as such, would not have prompted. The next exchange is conducted along similar lines and Sandor’s advice that they “shouldn’t go to Carlsbad” is again uttered with a markedly falling tone and the –inappropriate– force of an order.

The exchange draws to an end and the camera accordingly comes back to life. The shot widens again to include the set and the camera follows the Monk as he exits. Before he does so, his last piece of advice is made salient by a close-up on his face as he voices the word “castle”. The English’s reaction is shown in close-up as a counter-shot, before the shot becomes long again to show him leaving.

Thus this expository scene is modally framed by the editing and especially the camera movements, to focus the audience’s attention on the ongoing conversation and its contents. The menace inherent to all the warning scenes is forcefully, yet not explicitly, voiced.

But what makes this version stand out from the ones previously examined is that, although it seeks to conjure local colour, the contrast between the tourists and the locals and the wider implications that were perceptible elsewhere (especially in terms of rationality and superstition) is not as marked here. Two motives may explain this. First, the fact that the English’s main interlocutor, father Sandor, is not an average peasant but an educated man of God, whose disapproval of superstition and folklore has already been repeatedly expressed. One might argue that this feature only makes his warning all the more ominous. Second, and despite the relatively lavish display of exotic sets and costumes, the contrast is undermined by the fact that the whole scene is conducted in impeccable RP English, by British tourists and locals alike. This aspect may appear more disturbing to the linguistically-minded than the
average viewer, but there is no denying the intrinsic Britishness of the whole scene, the film, or indeed Hammer productions in general; which accounted for much of their obsolete charm and ongoing success. But this particular scene, which sought to emulate the novel's sentiment of displacement and play upon its fear-inducing connotations is found lacking in that respect.

2.6 Scene 2: The calèche scene

2.6.1 Stoker

This scene follows shortly on the previous one and closes the first chapter: Harker arrives at the Borgo pass where a calèche, specially sent by Dracula will bring him to the castle. As in the rest of the Transylvania chapters, the whole passage is recounted by Jonathan.

At the experiential level, the segment fluctuates between processes narrating the ongoing action and therefore often essentially material and Harker’s depiction of his ever-increasing fear which sees a higher frequency of mental, behavioural and relational processes. As before, Harker is the witness and narrator of the story; although it unfolds around him, his involvement in it again seems restricted to the sidelines as illustrated by the scarcity of material processes in which he participates. The only time he is an actor in the initial section of the passage is when he descends from the carriage. The coach driver, the mysterious calèche driver, the other passengers and even the horses, are all participants in the different material, but also verbal, behavioural and relational, processes which relay the narration. Once the calèche sets on its way, Jonathan’s writing becomes more introspective and he accordingly becomes the main participant in the processes: behavioural (look, see) but especially mental (feel, think, find, fear, like).
At a later point in the narrative, after the atmosphere of fear has been building up, Jonathan is driven to atypical action as the calèche is surrounded by wolves:

_I called to the coachman to come, for it seemed to me that our only chance was to try to break out through the ring and to aid his approach, I shouted and beat the side of the calèche, hoping by the noise to scare the wolves from the side, so as to give him a chance of reaching the trap._

The expression of Jonathan’s fear is interesting in itself; in the previous sections, as illustrated in the preceding analysis, he had mostly been relaying the superstitious reactions of the locals whom he interacted with and which gave rise to a mild feeling of unease. Now, the unease is seen growing into full-blown fear, if not terror, and Harker is alone to face it.

Tracking this evolution is especially revealing at the interpersonal level, through observation of the selections of lexical register within the residue but also of subject within the mood block. As the coach and his fellow travellers leave him behind, he first experiences a “strange chill” and a “lonely feeling”. This very soon escalates into more explicit voicing of fear: “I felt a little strangely, and not a little frightened. I think had there been any alternative I should have taken it, instead of prosecuting that unknown night journey.” At this stage, Harker discloses his fear more straightforwardly but still in accordance with the stately image of the Victorian gentleman who is supposed to keep a stiff upper lip under any circumstances.

As was highlighted in previous sections, Stoker’s choice to have a male protagonist fall prey to the count was unusual by Gothic standards. At times, it seems to put Jonathan in a conflicting stance where he should embody both the morally untainted hero and the victim, whose willingness to succumb is sometimes questioned. This will culminate in the “Brides” scene analysed below.
As Harker’s dread spirals into downright fear, he seems to lose his gentlemanly, and ever-so-British, composure. As he is divested of his manly self-possession, his fear becomes of a more instinctive animal kind and he even aligns himself with the horses on several occasions:

Then, far off in the distance, from the mountains on each side of us began a louder and a sharper howling, that of wolves, which affected both the horses and myself in the same way. For I was minded to jump from the caleche and run, whilst they reared again and plunged madly.

Then again: “I grew dreadfully afraid, and the horses shared my fear.”

In that same paragraph, there is an interpersonally salient shift of engagement as pronoun we/us suddenly becomes remarkably prominent. Used sporadically before then, the first person plural pronoun occurs seven times in subject form and three times in object form in this single paragraph, mainly to designate the carriage (passenger, driver and horses) progressing through a hostile environment. Although some of these uses simply appear as the most straightforward lexico-grammatical choice, that is not systematically the case and their repetition in this paragraph reinforces the feeling of assimilation between Harker and the horses, reduced to a stage of common primal fear.

As Harker’s fear increases and is expressed in ever more dramatic terms, it is noteworthy that its articulation reverts to a lexical register which is steeped in human agency: “For myself, I felt a sort of paralysis of fear. It is only when a man feels himself face to face with such horrors that he can understand their true import.” Or: “This was all so strange and uncanny that a dreadful fear came upon me, and I was afraid to speak or move.”

Although this passage is important narratively and a lot of cause-effect action is reported at the experiential and logical levels, its main focus is interpersonal as it depicts Harker’s fear and attempts to have the reader vicariously participate in it. As mentioned
above, the expression of terror and horror are staples of the Gothic genre and first-person perspectives facilitate their articulation. The previous entries had been building up to the avowal of terror and so as this chapter ends and castle Dracula has been reached, the stage is set to gradually glide from there into horror.

2.6.2 Coppola

In Coppola’s film, this scene follows the “warning” one directly, so both could be seen as part of a wider sequence. This is incidentally the case for most of the movies examined here; in their deliberation to be succinct, they have dispensed with the less essential episodes in between. Other than the fast-paced editing and somewhat eccentric framing, what may first strike the viewer in this scene is the almost complete absence of speech. Upon closer scrutiny, it appears that this absence is compensated by the overbearing presence of sound in a variety of effects.

The scene opens with a wide shot and side view of Harker standing by the coach and the coach exiting the frame. Jonathan is then similarly framed but from a high angle which includes a shrine in the background. Lightning flares and thunder growls. The next shot almost seems to offer a counter-perspective to this one as Jonathan is framed in medium close-up and from a low angle looking up. The next shot is presumably his point of view as we are shown what the shrine represents: the grotesque body of a grimacing wolf. The shot zooms in on the figure to the accompaniment of a perceptible yet unidentifiable hissing sound. This shot is emblematic of what Coppola is doing in this scene: like Stoker, he wants to instil a sense of terror in his audience, but the means at his disposal, and the choices he makes, are different.
Stoker had relied on Harker’s subjective voice to relay his explicitly voiced anguish to his readership. This, excepting an intrusive voice-over, is not an option for a filmmaker, who must express and/or provoke terror differently. Thus Coppola uses the tools at his disposal to create a threatening atmosphere; the angled shots give the impression of a predatory figure hovering over Harker, which is accentuated by the use of sound. Since Harker does not react to the sound and it has no identifiable source, it is fair to assume that the hiss is non-diegetic. Its sole use is then to convey surprise/fear directly to the viewer. Thus, at the modal level, Coppola combines framing and sound to interact directly with his audience and get his meaning across: it is time to be scared and this fear need not necessarily be mediated by the characters’ predicament. This had already been hinted at through the eeriness of the preceding scene (and notably the “lurking in the bushes” shot) and will be used abundantly hereafter.

The next shots continue this strategy, giving it a more concrete incarnation: the threat of wolves, as per the novel. The shots lean in with a wide shot of Jonathan in the background and the wolves prowling about in the foreground, then two close ups, one on a growling wolf, the other on Harker turning about amidst growls and howls. In this last shot, his face is lit by something he is peering at and which is revealed in the next shot to be the calèche pulling up. Again, both visual imagery and soundtrack contribute to the general eerie atmosphere: a strange mist suddenly emerges from the ground to the accompaniment of unidentifiable, non-diegetic screeching noises. The camera gently moves, zooming out and simultaneously tilting up to reveal the ominous figure of the driver. Stoker had described “a tall man, with a long brown beard and a great black hat, which seemed to hide his face from us.” Harker will later question the driver’s identity and debate whether he and Dracula could have been one and the same person.

Filmmakers have dealt with this ambiguity in a variety of manners. One stance - as will be seen with Murnau and Browning- is to convey two different meanings at the
representational (logical) and modal level; in the first case, Harker’s view and subsequent opinion remain hazy but in the second, the viewer is left with little or no doubt about what he/she sees. In other words, the resemblance is evident to the audience but not (immediately) perceived by Harker within the story framework. This directorial choice has some interesting effects; it displaces the source of fear from doubt and suspense to dramatic irony. As he/she helplessly witnesses the unfolding of the narrative, the viewer knows more than the character and this knowledge feeds his/her anguish. As is typical of the Gothic, there is also an element of “schadenfreude”, which this increased knowledge makes all the more powerful.

In Dracula, the novel, dramatic irony is used to good effect, often through the overlap of elements from within the unconnected characters’ perspectives. It is an element which, as mentioned above, films have not always been able to reflect; which makes this displacement all the more interesting. It might be retorted that the more realistic medium of film presents a visual potency which affects the viewer straight-on (especially at an attention-grasping moment such as the introduction of a new character in a fairly desolate landscape) and that maintaining ambiguity is therefore not an option here. But that would be denying the visual medium’s incredible power of manipulation and dissimulation.

Coppola, for one, chose this path. As the driver is revealed in the shot, he is entirely clad in a black crow-like outfit. The upturned collar of his coat and his matching hat/helm obscure his face completely and even his hands are hidden in claw-like gloves. Mystery is increased by the fact that he does not speak, nor will he, and the only sound to be heard is something between laboured breathing and animal grunting. Whether the driver is the source of this sound or not remains ambiguous. As Coppola commented: “The high point of this sequence is when Harker is picked up by the ghostly coach. The Dark Driver should be an Ichabod Crane image, extremely frightening. We don’t see his face clearly, only his hat and
his body and his enormous strength.” (33) Not quite headless, but effectively faceless and voiceless, one step further than Stoker, is thus how the driver is depicted.

As alluded to earlier in this chapter, the importance of Ishioka’s costumes, especially in instilling atmosphere, is paramount in this movie. To repeat Coppola’s quote: “the costumes will be the set”. The “crow armour” has no clear reference, but the connotations which the bird conjures up, mainly images of darkness and death, are clearly portentous. Thus, at the rank of temporal figure, the costume projects more than what it stands for representationally.

This is the case with many of Ishioka’s costumes. A previous example is the armour which historical Dracula / Vlad Tepes wears in the prologue (P198); it is blood-red (one of Dracula’s thematic colours) and its striated parts resemble the skinned human bodies, consisting of flesh and muscles, that can be glimpsed in anatomy books. His helmet is made of the same material but is more animal-like, with a set of pointy ears, in shape. Thus the warrior is presented as a bloody, raw, animal figure, a depiction which substantiates the real Vlad Tepes’ reputation. This representation is however more unusual for a cold-blooded vampire.

As the driver pushes Jonathan into the calèche, stretching his arm in an almost preternatural way, there is still no dialogue. The soundtrack, however, is replete as before with howls, grunts and unidentified whizzing sounds. At the level of the compositional metafunction, sound also guides the transitions: the cut to the next shot – with Harker seated inside the carriage- is marked by a slamming door; then a whip’s crack is heard and there is a cut to a long shot of the scenery and the carriage driving through it, still pervaded by howls and growls.

The only line of dialogue in the scene is spoken a bit later by Jonathan, questioning the driver on the castle’s whereabouts, and receives only a grunt as an answer. The shots leading
up to this line show a clear progression: first a close up of Harker inside the carriage, leaning out the window, then the reverse perspective (still on Harker but from outside the carriage) while the last shot shows his point of view (the driver’s back). Two later shots will also represent Jonathan’s POV (point of view). In the first, he looks down out the window and sees the dangerous proximity of the ravine. The second is the penultimate shot in the scene: the carriage is entering the castle courtyard and Jonathan looks back. A swaying camera emulates the calèche’s movements and we see, as Jonathan does, two sets of hearses closing behind it.

It is generally considered that using a “subjective camera” facilitates the viewer’s identification with the character through a shared perspective. Coppola relies on these shots sporadically, against a background of more detached mises-en-scènes but he uses them at key moments to convey important meanings: Jonathan is in danger (ravine shot), he has no one to turn to (unanswered question), he is cut off from the rest of the world (hearses closing).

But the most salient “matter of expression” which the director uses in this sequence is most definitely sound effects. The soundtrack is saturated with noises and these stand out all the more due to the (quasi)absence of any other aural cues, such as music or language. Some of these sounds have an identifiable and/or diegetic origin, others are more ambiguous; but it is their combination and global effect which is striking. The outcome could be qualified as strange, in both its understandings: unfamiliar but also mysterious. This combination leads to a certain degree of edginess, if not yet fear, which is very much in keeping with Harker’s state in the novel and its reflection upon the readership.
2.6.3 Murnau

Upon viewing the initial section of *Nosferatu* and particularly the articulation between the different scenes, one can only marvel at Galeen and Murnau’s naivety in thinking they might avoid a lawsuit and/or condemnation. Where most adaptations made selections in their introduction, everything that is in Stoker is found mirrored in Murnau’s film: there is an inn scene and there is a coach scene and there is a calèche scene. The previous (coach) scene repeated the motifs found in the inn scene: fear and vague warnings from the locals, jolly dismissal from Harker.

As he leaves the coach and starts walking towards the castle, an intertitle hints at things to come: “And when he had crossed the bridge, the phantoms came to meet him.” This title card reflects the exterior perspective which had introduced the story and goes on providing narrative transitions. The visual style and arrangement of these intertitles clearly evokes a book’s layout. The movie opens with the book cover which reads “A Chronicle of the Great Death of Wisborg in the Year 1838 A.D.”. The book is written in the first person by a narrator who is obviously familiar with all of the story details but whose name and connection to it is never mentioned.

*Nosferatu*’s production team thus not only “borrowed” Stoker’s plot but were also drawn to its structure. At different moments in the film, written documents are alluded to, displayed within the image or used directly as title cards: the initial diegesis-framing book, correspondence between Jonathan and Mina and newspaper articles. What is noteworthy is that the most pervasive device, the Wisborg Chronicle, is used as a unifying instrument where Stoker relied exclusively on, and made good use of, the novel’s fragmentation. As developed above, Murnau’s framing of the story within a more grounded pseudo-historical perspective is quintessentially Gothic.
After the phantoms title card, the scene opens with a shot displaying a distant building, later to be revealed as Dracula’s castle, atop a steep hill. It is shown from an extremely low angle thus hinting at the future menace which it, or rather its inhabitant, poses. The next shot is of a carriage descending the hill, then the editing returns to Jonathan’s progression before the calèche arrives into the frame. The image then closes up on the driver who is wearing a cape with upturned collar and hat which disguise but do not quite obscure his features.

Murnau’s option has been to follow Stoker here too; although, given Max Schreck’s striking appearance, there is no mistaking the driver for anyone else but the count. As with Coppola, the driver remains silent, he points Jonathan into the carriage and towards the castle when he alights but there is no further interaction between them. Except for this peculiarity, the drive goes rather smoothly, especially compared to the other versions, filmic or novelistic. No wolves, no blue flames, no immediate threat, supernatural or other. The only hitch seems to be the mysterious driver and his somewhat speedy riding, as exemplified by a shot of a dizzy Jonathan leaning out of the side window.

Yet the usually jovial Harker, who had laughed in the face of his fiancée’s grief and of the inn landlord’s warnings seems unnerved here for the first time. The silent driver, his rigid frame and jerky pointing are certainly unsettling but not as much as this sudden reversal would suggest. The progression of Jonathan’s wariness is a bit hasty and unjustified (as yet), but as the figure of the vampire looms close Murnau needs to increase the general atmosphere’s gloominess.
2.6.4 Browning

An interesting feature of Browning’s version of the calèche scene is that, unlike the other excerpts presented here, it does not immediately follow the previous atmospheric scenes depicting Jonathan’s progression to castle Dracula.

Instead, a series of shots are introduced between them and give a picture of his destination which leaves no ambiguity as to what awaits him there: outside views of the castle, followed by an inside expository shot of the crypt; coffins on the ground opening up and Dracula and vampire women exiting; rats scurrying across the ground to the accompanying sound of wolves howling etc... There is even a shot of a bee flying out of a mini coffin-shaped box, which holds no reference to the story or vampire lore at large and whose effect, rather than terrifying, is surreal and arguably awkward.

More noteworthy is the close up on Dracula’s face when he exits his coffin: Lugosi’s features are clearly shown thus introducing the count (to the spectators) before he first meets Harker. This throws a decidedly different light on the latter’s encounter with the coach driver, or rather on the audience’s perception of it. When Harker meets Dracula, after interacting with the driver, he may fail to see the connection; but to the viewer it is unmistakable. As explained above, Browning has chosen to dispense with one effect, i.e. suspense and unknowing anguish, and focus on another: dramatic irony and helpless voyeurism. The narrative thus follows one track logically within the story-framework, while another is developed at the modal level.

The calèche scene in fact opens directly with Lugosi as driver, then cuts to a wider shot of the whole carriage. As with Coppola, the eeriness is accentuated through special effects (mist) and sound effects (howling). The camera then pans left to show the coach pulling up, the luggage being dumped and the vehicle rapidly exiting to reveal a dazzled Harker. A series of shots and countershots then depict Dracula and Harker’s first encounter.
One of these, a close-up on Lugosi’s face and very intense look, framed by the surrounding darkness definitely dispels any doubts an unfocused spectator might have had as to his identity.

Unlike Stoker, but like Murnau and the later Coppola, Browning chooses to keep the driver silent in this scene; when Harker addresses him, he just points for him to enter. Given Lugosi’s unmistakable accent and diction, the director was probably aiming at maintaining some plausibility as to Harker’s failure to see the connection. But another more deliberate effect of this silent treatment is to instil into a still-confident Jonathan the premises of discomfort and fear.

As the calèche sets off a wide-angle view shows its progression along a mountainous pass. It is followed by a shot of Jonathan bumping around the carriage. An outside shot then shows him passing his head through the window to speak to the driver and his features dissolving into dismay. The explanation is given in the next shot: a close up on the back of the horses’ heads with a bat flying and appearing to lead them on. The manner in which the shot is framed, especially the angle and distance which distinctly emulate Jonathan’s point-of-view, imply that the driver, who would otherwise block the view, is missing. To drive the point further, this shot/countershot alternation is repeated. As Harker is left perturbed by the experience, he or the viewer may remember the innkeeper’s warning of vampires turning into bats and wolves. This again goes to demonstrate that dramatic effect, rather than suspense, is the aim here.
2.7 **Scene 3: First encounter of Dracula**

2.7.1 **Stoker**

An obviously pivotal scene is the introduction of Dracula. The evolution and variation(s) of the title character both in terms of moral depiction and of physical characteristics have been outlined above. Despite these changes, the dynamics of the introductory scene in the novel and the films which emulate its storyline are fairly similar.

Jonathan has just alighted from the calèche and is standing alone in front of the castle door. The next passage is evidently still mediated through his perspective, but for most of it the focus is again primarily descriptive. Typically processes tend to be behavioural (stand), mental (see, hear, seem, notice, doubt) or verbal (say) rather than material; with Dracula more frequently the actor (motion, move, hold out, grasp) than Jonathan (step over). This, again, is consistent with the overall narrational and descriptive tone of the initial Transylvania chapters.

More remarkable in this particular passage is the use made of adjectives, particularly in the noun phrase. The first description of Dracula, in which relational processes might have been expected, is instead presented through modifying adjectives (and one post-modifying noun-phrase): "Within, stood a tall old man, clean shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him anywhere."

This description is remarkably succinct, and although it will later be completed by other accounts, the general impression remains, most likely deliberately, mysterious and unsettled.

In the introductory paragraph, adjectives are also heavily relied on to a double end: conveying the subjectivity of Jonathan’s perception, in this case through what he hears before he sees anything and instilling a sense of eerie foreboding through choices in lexical register (heavy step, rattling chains, clanking of massive bolts, loud grating noise). The few relational identifying processes which remain in this segment then stand out all the more and this seems
to correlate their importance within the text. Especially as Jonathan remembers the calèche driver's strength and wonders whether he and his host "were not the same person" but even more as the latter dispels his doubts and emphatically states: "I am Dracula".

At the interpersonal level, the oscillating motif which has been observed in the previous Transylvania scenes is reprised: Jonathan is by turns involved then distanced from the action he depicts, as is borne out by the observation of subject selection in the mood block. The Wordsmith wordlist reveals that *He* has a percentile frequency of 1.88 whereas *I* has 3.13. Of course the last two instances of pronoun *I* no longer refer to Jonathan but to Dracula himself, and two other verbs have Dracula as subject with a different referent than the personal pronoun, which evens out their frequencies. The alternation between the first and third-person perspectives is as usual quite even, but not evenly distributed within the passage.

Lexically, it is interesting to point out that the keyword in this passage is *welcome* and that three of its four occurrences are uttered as direct speech by Dracula himself. A telling contrast is then established between the permeating angst which had preceded the character's introduction and the 'welcome' which he extends to his guest. The warmth of this welcome is however immediately tempered by Jonathan's chilly appraisal of events and surroundings: "quivering shadows", "a strength which made me wince", "(his hand) seemed cold as ice, more like the hand of a dead than a living man". The mood then remains apprehensive. Dracula's lines of dialogue contribute to this ambiguity: "Welcome to my house! Enter freely and of your own free will!" Then again, later: "Welcome to my house! Enter freely. Go safely, and leave something of the happiness you bring!"

'The slightly abrupt use of imperatives, the unusual greetings (which could almost equally be construed as warnings or threats) and the incantatory impression given by the repetition all correlate at the textual or lexical level to make Harker's arrival at castle Dracula ominous rather than comfortable.
This passage continues the depictive movement that had been initiated in the preceding chapters, while at the same time it provides a turning point for the story to begin. The scene is now set, the players have (to some degree) been introduced, and one would expect action to take place. Although this is true to a certain degree, one of the main traits of Gothic literature in general, Dracula in particular, is its heavy reliance on allusive atmosphere to induce terror rather than explicit horror. The first chapters’ evocative style will then not quite recede into the background and make way for an action-driven narrative as much as it will continue to shape the story and frame the comparatively more dynamic sequences (e.g. Lucy’s “exorcism” and Mina’s attack, see below) all the more effectively.

2.7.2 Coppola

This scene again links into the two previous ones as part of a larger sequence. At the same time, as in the novel, it marks a transition from background-setting atmospheric descriptions to more action-driven plot developments, through the introduction of the main villain.

The scene opens with Jonathan standing alone in a torch lit courtyard as the calèche exits, and starting to ascend the stairs leading to castle Dracula. Next follows a plunging shot corresponding to Harker’s POV of an awe-inspiring derelict castle; the camera pans up to show its tremendous scale. Here the soundtrack picks up again, comprising non-diegetic music and sound effects resembling sighs whose source, as before, remains ambiguous. Still to the accompaniment of music, the next shot frames Jonathan from behind as he walks up the stairs and squeaky gates open to let him in. A medium-close frontal shot of Jonathan is then followed by a wider shot of a strange shadow projected onto one of the room’s walls. The camera pans as it follows it towards its source, Dracula who is standing in the foreground, framed from the waist up.
As we advance from the shadow towards the man, the music recedes and sound effects become more prominent: a whizzing sound, strongly reminiscent of that which accompanied the calèche driver’s movements and human sighs are perceptible. They complement Dracula’s welcome speech to his guest. The words he speaks are a condensed version of Stoker’s, with their strange double-entendre formulations: “Welcome to my home. Enter freely of your own will and leave some of the happiness you bring.” However, in Oldman’s heavily accented but good-natured tone of voice, this sounds less threatening than the effect of the printed words on the page.

As they complete their introductions, the two characters are framed by the same shot and countershot perspectives as before. As Dracula repeats his welcome and urges his guest in, a mid shot presents Jonathan’s profile and then pans down to show only his legs as he steps over the threshold. There is a strange kind of hesitancy about the manner in which he takes this step, underlined as before by breathy sound effects. Roman Coppola, the director’s son, who headed the second shooting unit and was in charge of special effects, commented that this was one of the instances where he simply inverted the direction of the film, shooting Reeves walking backwards and then playing the film backwards to make him step forward. The effect is one of purposefulness: at the modal level it shows the viewers that Harker is entering, albeit hesitantly, something that he might later find difficult to exit. The emphasis given to this moment, and thus its portent, is echoed in the novel by the contrast in Dracula’s movements: “He made no motion of stepping to meet me, but stood like a statue, as though his gesture of welcome had fixed him into stone. The instant, however, that I had stepped over the threshold, he moved impulsively forward . . .”

It is interesting to note that both novel and film use physical movement to convey the moment’s significance; though in one case the focus is on Dracula, in the other on Jonathan. The important nuance here is that the focus on the Count (in the novel) is of course mediated
through Jonathan’s perception of it, which is what makes it striking to the readers in the first place. This nuance might prove difficult to convey visually, which may account for Coppola’s shift of perspective. The eventual implication which one is led to draw, although neither text nor film state it explicitly at any stage, is that guests at castle Dracula cannot be forced in but must enter of their own volition, although it will of course become apparent that this will not be the case upon their departure.

To an audience with an even perfunctory knowledge of vampire traditions, this may well strike a familiar chord, especially if reversed: it is well known that a vampire cannot willingly enter his prey’s house unless he has been invited to do so. This restriction actually appears in Stoker’s text, when Van Helsing lectures to the band of heroes on vampire lore: “He cannot go where he lists, he who is not of nature has yet to obey some of nature’s laws, why we know not. He may not enter anywhere at the first, unless there be some one of the household who bid him to come, though afterwards he can come as he please.” (255) This has come to be one of the foundational traits of vampire stories. Popular culture has expanded this feature and uses it commonly as a pivotal element in plots: how a vampire is barred from entering a household, or tricks his/her way into one, later to be able to walk in as he/she likes etc. 53

Yet the novel does not strongly rely on this feature, except at two distinct points. Although the fact is not dwelt upon, Dracula seems to enter both the Whitby residence and Hillingham to visit Lucy quite freely. If the author is consistent with the vampire’s limitations, there is only one plausible explanation: the count has been invited in by Lucy herself, maybe in some kind of hypnotic state. This interpretation ties in with the depiction, and critical construal, of Lucy as a sexually driven femme fatale and willing victim.

53 Abundant recent examples can be found in books, films and television series such as Buffy, the Vampire Slayer, Twilight and The Vampire Diaries.
The case is quite different when a later use is made of this restriction. Dracula exploits Renfield to get invited into Carfax asylum and attack Mina who is staying there. This is one of the rare instances in the novel when Renfield is straightforwardly associated to the progression of the novel’s plot and to the other characters’ lot.

Another point of interest in this excerpt is the manner in which Coppola makes use of shadows. The previous scenes have shown that the director does not shy away from using all kinds of visual and sound effects to convey the Gothic dimension of the tale. Their accumulation is even baroque at times. Play on lights and shadows is then only one of the multiple effects which the director has opted for but it is a particularly effective and referential choice. Vampire lore generally has it that vampires – as per Stoker – carry no reflection and cast no shadow, or in Van Helsing’s approximate English: “He throws no shadow, he make in the mirror no reflect, as again Jonathan observe.” (255)

But there is at least one notorious visual precedent to Coppola’s silhouettes. Murnau’s use of shadows is one of the most remarkable and memorable Gothic features of Nosferatu. Extreme play on light and darkness, in black and white photography, was one of the staples of expressionist films and Nosferatu is reminiscent in this respect of prime examples such as The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari. Although Max Schreck already casts a striking figure as the vampire with his height, slenderness and extended pointy appendices (ears, fingers, nails), Murnau makes him larger than life through the use of the elongated shadow which he projects. At times it seems as though the shadow moves of its own volition and closes in on its preys, as in the scene in which the vampire creeps up to a sleeping Jonathan and is interrupted by Mina’s telepathic scream. The effect is highly memorable and is given further relief in a scene in which Harker reads from the book of vampires he found at the inn; the intertitle shows the following text: “At night said Nosferatu sinketh his fangs into his victim and feeds on the blood that constitutes his hellish elixir of life. Beware of his shadow. Do not let it haunt your
dreams." Nosferatu's shadow thus has an evil dimension all of its own and it is no wonder that Elias Merhige's 2000 homage to the film was titled Shadow of the Vampire, in reference to the title card which closes the film.

But whereas Nosferatu’s shadow was overblown but otherwise consistent with the count’s movements, Coppola brings in another dimension. He makes the vampire’s shadow subtly but quite definitely asynchronous to his movements. Whenever Dracula moves, his shadow moves just a few tenths of seconds later. In this scene, we are presented with the vampire’s shadow before we see the man himself, but when the camera pans round to show the shadow and its source in the same frame, they are faintly but perceptibly out of sync.

Coppola’s aim with this shadow play is probably double: on the one hand it is a non-invasive playful way to introduce surreal, if not quite supernatural, bizarreness into his background; on the other he pays tribute to his film’s predecessor(s) and acknowledges the baggage which his subject carries by the inclusion of this intertextual allusion. Once the film’s action shifts from Transylvania to London, Coppola will no longer use the vampire’s shadow in this way but rather as a gloomy menace, bringing death (withering flowers) to whatever/whomever it is cast over. (P210)

It is by no means the only nod towards previous versions of Dracula included in this movie. Even though Coppola deems Nosferatu “the greatest film made on the Dracula story” (2), he also mentions his admiration for Lugosi’s portrayal, especially in the early castle scenes. Oldman similarly voiced his regard for his fellow actor: “The film image I can’t get away from is Bela Lugosi. He was really on to something: the way he moved, the way he sounded.” (Coppola and Hart, 162). This influence on director and lead actor is perceptible at many different moments in the film.
The enjoyment that intertextual references can provoke (when they are recognized as such) has been mentioned in the case of adaptations. It is obviously all the more relevant for a multi-layered corpus such as this one. To quote Sanders:

"Texts feed off each other and create other texts, and other critical studies; literature creates other literature. Part of the sheer pleasure of the reading experience must be the tension between the familiar and the new, and the recognition both of similarity and difference, between ourselves and between texts. The pleasure exists, and persists, then, in the act of reading in, around, and on (and on)." (14)

She even creates a label for cases such as this one, mentioning that "hypertexts often become "hyper-hyper texts", allusive not only to some founding original text or source but also to other known rewritings of that source." (107)

The option which Coppola chooses is interesting not only insofar as it emulates and transcends Murnau but also in itself. In the novel, Jonathan is unsettled by the fact that the vampires, Dracula and his brides, cast no reflection or shadow. The absence of reflection is reprised in almost every film in this corpus and indeed in many other vampire features (films, series etc...). This is not necessarily - and indeed rarely - the case with their shadow. This seems to be indicative of the fact that what is potentially disturbing when evoked does not necessarily have the same impact visually. A person standing in front of a mirror and casting no reflection conveys an immediate effect of eeriness to someone viewing the scene. The absence of a shadow, however strange in itself, is less perceptible and would probably require verbal mediation or more contextualization. Displaying shadows in an exaggerated (Murnau) or uncanny (Coppola) way is thus another manner of instilling this awkwardness.

---

54 Other literary works have developed the disquieting effect produced by the absence of a shadow. J.M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* is one obvious example. A.S. Byatt also tells the tale of a shadowless and incomplete boy who embarks on a perilous journey to retrieve his shadow in her 2009 novel *The Children's Book.*
This is then a case of verbal and visual media resorting to different means to convey similar meanings, as is foundational to a multimodal understanding of adaptation.

But beyond the characters’ exchanges, actions and interactions in this scene lies the more crucial issue of how Dracula is depicted. Since we are dealing with a medium which is partially (it not predominantly) visual, the accent is obviously no longer on Jonathan’s descriptions, but on what the audience is given to see, what it is shown.

In the novel, Harker’s initial accounts of Dracula oscillate between the descriptive yet evocative tone which can be seen as his staple and a more subjective tenor. A negative bias can clearly be perceived through appraisal motifs at the lexical level. As in this later passage:

His face was a strong, a very strong, aquiline, with high bridge of the thin nose and peculiarly arched nostrils, with lofty domed forehead, and hair growing scantily round the temples but profusely elsewhere. His eyebrows were very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion. The mouth, so far as I could see it under the heavy moustache, was fixed and rather cruel-looking, with peculiarly sharp white teeth. These protruded over the lips, whose remarkable ruddiness showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years. For the rest, his ears were pale, and at the tops extremely pointed. The chin was broad and strong, and the cheeks firm though thin. The general effect was one of extraordinary pallor. Hitherto I had noticed the backs of his hands as they lay on his knees in the firelight, and they had seemed rather white and fine. But seeing them now close to me, I could not but notice that they were rather coarse, broad, with squat fingers. Strange to say, there were hairs in the centre of the palm. The nails were long and fine, and cut to a sharp point. As the Count leaned over me and his hands touched me, I could not repress a shudder. It may have been that his breath was rank, but a horrible feeling of nausea came over me, which, do what I would, I could not conceal. (24-5)
Dracula’s representation is then mediated through and tinged by Harker’s negative appraisal. It might seem that a dimension such as this would be lost in the transition to the screen but Linda Hutcheon has commented on film’s versatility, even when evoking subjective motifs:

External appearances are made to mirror inner truths. In other words, visual and aural correlative for interior events can be created, and in fact film has at its command many techniques that verbal texts do not... Although it is a naturalistic medium in most of its uses, film can also create visual, externalized analogues to subjective elements... (58-9)

Coppola’s manner of dealing with Dracula’s depiction is quite unique, not only on the basis of objective visual representation but also in the feelings of fear or repulsion the vampire instils in other characters and/or spectators.

As has been mentioned above, Dracula has become such an iconic figure of popular and general culture that mention of his name generally conjures up a prototypical representation: an elegant, intense (in a sometimes sexy way) dark middle-aged foreign gentleman. The main source and influence of this figure is Lugosi’s portrayal of the count in one of the earliest, most widespread and influential versions. But Coppola breaks with this iconic tradition quite dramatically as he returns to Stoker’s text and the latter’s initial representation of the vampire. Although, in the novel as in the film, Dracula grows younger through fresh blood as he leaves for England, he is first introduced as an old man, unusually vital but unmistakably advanced in years. Coppola is the only director in this corpus, and even in derivative versions of Dracula, to have emulated Stoker in this respect55.

55 The case of Nosferatu, as will be seen below, is particular in its own right, but the vampire’s age is not of the essence there.
The count whom Harker first meets is indeed an old man, covered in wrinkles and hands sporting age spots. As per the book, his hair is completely white and pointy nails and hairy palms complete the picture. Gary Oldman jokingly referred to this feature: "I think there is one close-up in this film and it is on my silky palms." (Coppola and Hart, 40). The only element which differs from the novel is the absence of the very Victorian gentleman’s moustache.

But whereas the age and many small details of the novelistic count are respected, Oldman’s garb and hairdo are strikingly different from Stoker’s description, actually taking the character into a completely different dimension. As mentioned above, Ishioka’s costumes were among Coppola’s main instruments not only to aid characterization but also as mood-setting and symbolic elements. As Hutcheon had hinted at, costumes are in fact one of the filmic techniques used to introduce subjective elements into the more “naturalistic” visual medium. Thus at the rank of temporal figure, costumes come to bear not only on meanings pertaining to the representational metafunction but also to the modal and compositional ones. Modally, viewers can process the costumes in terms of styles, motifs they evoke, colours and their symbolic values; compositionally, they stand as one element in correlation with others and contribute (sometimes strongly) to the general atmosphere of the gestalt. Coppola’s determination “to lead with the costumes” has however been deemed by some as detrimental to logical elements in the plot. (Joslin, 109)

When the old figure of the count is first shown, he is framed from the waist up. The striking cloak he is wearing is not completely displayed yet but his hair already demands attention: the extremely long and profuse white hair is gathered, behind a strongly receding hairline, into an elaborate arrangement of side buns and a complex plait running down the vampire’s back. It is inspired by and immediately reminiscent of the Kabuki theatre. An extremely high angle shot which provides the transition to the next scene displays the costume
in its full glory: a flamboyant red silk cloak with an enormous train and embroidered in gold on the breast with Dracula’s crest. The crest itself is striking in its appearance, representing a baroque and very ornate Dragon/Phoenix figure symbolic both of Dracula’s historic origin (the order of the dragon) and, through the image of the phoenix, of his immortality. Make-up is also used to age Oldman and give him, in Stoker’s words, “a general effect of extraordinary pallor”.

Overall, the combination of hair, make-up and costume is glaringly unlike Stoker and any representation of the count which had come before, or followed since for that matter. Film reviewers picked up on the novelty of this representation and on its fear-inducing potential:

Small and ancient, Dracula has skeletal hands, the mottled gray skin of a mummy, and long white hair that has been wound, as if on a spindle, into two tight bubbles atop his head. Clad in a long red kimono, he’s like a wizened alien: Bela Lugosi meets Yoda...

This old, lusty Drac seems a true mystical creature, a freakish blood demon.

(Gleiberman)

Some might argue the costume’s originality verges on the ridiculous, but its arresting qualities cannot be denied, and these prompt us to consider the different dimensions they project. Ishioka’s aim with this costume was to emphasize Dracula’s androgynous qualities and convey a “haunting asexuality” (Coppola and Hart, 38). The costume is certainly successful in this respect and takes us away from the over-sexualized image of the vampire which had often been put forward in general culture and entertainment but also in criticism of Stoker’s novel. Two other motifs, linking to important themes in the novel and its criticism are, more or less explicitly, conveyed in this costume.

First, the cloak is red, one of Dracula’s symbolic colours in the film and whose most obvious connotation here is blood. Ishioka’s inclusion of an oversized train was meant to
convey a sea of blood, accompanying the count wherever he went. This mention of a “sea of blood” is also reminiscent of the prologue in which Dracula (Vlad Tepes) stabs the cross and blood comes gushing down, literally flooding the scene. Within the overall scope of the film, the colour red will not restrict its symbolism to blood but also evoke love and passion, but that is most likely not yet the case here. In a later romantic scene, for instance, Mina wears a red dress (her colour scheme had previously been green) as she twirls around the dance floor with her Prince (the Count) (P216).

Second, the style of the kimono-like cloak, the oriental connotations which Dracula’s hair suggests and even his pallor evoke his Eastern provenance. It would seem that Ishioka was strongly influenced by her own Japanese traditions although she prefers to cite Turkish culture. But the main issue at stake remains the opposition between the East and the Western world that Dracula will enter next. Coppola noted about this scene: “Here’s where we really introduce the world of Dracula, and we ought to feel as though we’re coming into his world... with that Byzantine, oriental feel to it.” (38)

Modally, the depiction of the vampire as an old man creates an interesting conflict in the viewer’s perception of him. He is at once extremely unusual and mildly repulsive in his appearance but also, through the apparent weakness that old age confers to him, deceptively innocuous. The audience is drawn towards the figure of this eccentric and harmless old man. The contrast will then be stronger when it appears that he is anything but helpless. The next scene already hints at this state of affairs, although more dramatic displays of Dracula’s force and palpable terrors are to come later in the story. Harker is seated at a table and quietly discussing Dracula’s ancestry when the latter is quite suddenly offended by a dismissive laugh of his and springs forward, drawing a massive sword which he swings about in an unnaturally fast and effortless manner. The contrast with the stooping, wrinkled old Count of before is staggering. This disparity, which was present but not overtly utilized in Stoker’s text, is
exploited to the extreme by Coppola who makes Dracula not just “a tall old man” but a truly antique character who displays not just “astonishing vitality” but rather supernatural vivacity. The medium used obviously participates strongly in this contrast and to a certain extent even generates it: the count’s initial innocuous appearance and later unexpected terror-inducing strength and behaviour is all the more powerful when it is unmediated by language and straightforwardly displayed visually.

Reviewers of the film have responded to this contrast positively, generally preferring the old Dracula to his other incarnations, and highlighting both his entertaining and terrifying qualities:

We laugh, too, at Gary Oldman’s Count Dracula, but that may be a case of whistling in the graveyard. This Dracula is truly frightening... There he is, the perfect marriage of 100-proof predatory aggression and seductive mandarin decadence -- with his nine-inch nails, his absurdly prissy bouffant and his Caligula giggle: "The Prince of Darkness. (Hinson)

It has been pointed out above that Coppola and his production team’s claim to present the original Bram Stoker’s Dracula was overblown and consequently provoked outrage amongst some Dracula scholars. Yet in this particular instance, Coppola seems to have successfully gone back to Stoker’s text to seek inspiration to re-create or rather re-invent the old vampire as he is initially portrayed.

2.7.3 Murnau

As before and as with Coppola, this scene in Nosferatu follows the calèche scene immediately. Harker has just alighted from the calèche and the first shot is on the castle door
standing tall and ominous as Jonathan approaches. A close-up shows him turning back and in the next shot we see the calèche leave from his point of view. The shot then widens again as the doors open by themselves to let in the visitor. The next shot, whose location with respect to the castle’s entrance is unclear, shows an alcove of darkness out of which a figure, Dracula, is stepping forward.

The vampire’s arrival is then made modally salient on two counts as the spectator’s attention is drawn to elements placed at the centre and/or front of the frame but also to the contrast between the background darkness and the figure which is emerging out of it. As Bruce Block points out: “What attracts the audience’s eye? Movement is first . . . brightness is second” (132). Both converge here to underscore the character’s importance. Once he has stepped forward and placed himself right in the middle of the frame, he stops and there is a cut to the reverse perspective. At the rank of action/movement in the shot, this instance may appear somewhat stagy and unnatural, especially to a modern audience, but it is of course consistent with the film’s expressionist (and not naturalistic) background, genre and date. Like his host, Jonathan is shown stepping forward into the courtyard as the doors slam shut behind him. He turns briefly, then makes his way ahead. In the next shot the camera is placed behind Dracula (he is on the right hand side of the frame, his back towards us) and frames him quite widely, enclosed by the courtyard’s two sets of arches as Harker enters the shot to the left, becomes aware of his host’s presence and salutes him.

As an audience, our introduction to Dracula’s character is then not immediately mediated by Jonathan since we are shown the vampire a few instants before him, maybe all the better to gauge his reaction. The following shot is closer, from the waist up and shows both characters in profile before an intertitle appears, displaying the dialogue: “You have arrived late, young man. It is almost midnight. My servants have already retired.” The next shot shifts the camera angle again as it is now set behind the characters, with Dracula standing
to the left and Harker to the right. The count proceeds into the castle and Jonathan hesitantly follows his lead until they are both engulfed by the darkness behind them. The camera shutter closes in on the image, narrowing its central circle until it dissolves completely to black. Macro-structurally, the transition is important since it marks the end of Act I, as the next title card indicates.

As has been hinted at above, one of the striking elements which this scene displays is the multiplicity of frames, alternating between both characters and framing them from a variety of angles and perspectives. So far, most of the figures which had been presented had been mediated through Jonathan’s encounters: the inn’s landlord, the coach and calèche drivers. Here the effect is different: Jonathan’s progression into the castle is counterbalanced by his host coming to greet him. Representationally, this does not have much import on the count’s introduction to the story, but modally it shifts the perspective: the vampire steps in and takes over as the story’s protagonist. Viewers are encouraged to engage with him directly, and accordingly experience feelings of repulsion and/or terror. Jonathan is still an important actor in the unfolding narrative but he is no longer its focal point, and fear need not be mediated through him to be effective.

Another interesting feature which this scene presents is the contrast in setting between the castle’s courtyard, which despite it being close to midnight remains thoroughly visible, and the utterly dark passage which leads in and out of castle Dracula. Symbolically, it seems to warrant the reading that the castle is a place of darkness and its owner a similarly dark character; as Harker follows him in and is engulfed by obscurity, there may be no turning back. In this manner, it is reminiscent of the threshold episode present in the novel and

56 The scene was most certainly shot during the day and as Skal explains, the “day for night” effect was later lost: “Night scenes were shot in broad daylight, then tinted deep blue for release. Most prints in circulation today lack this key effect, and are in effect stripped-down skeletons of the original.” (Hollywood, 48)
Coppola’s version. The fact that Murnau has structured his story into acts and chosen this point as the first junction bears this out.

But what makes this scene most portentous is the first glimpses we are given of the villain. Murnau’s representation of Dracula is at once close to and distant from Stoker. As in the novel, the vampire is tall (extremely so in this case), clad in black, with an aquiline nose and eyebrows which are “very massive, almost meeting over the nose, and with bushy hair that seemed to curl in its own profusion”. But this figure is also preternaturally thin and elongated, conferring a lanky awkwardness to his demeanour. Unlike Stoker’s old man, Nosferatu is ageless: bald and without facial hair but virtually wrinkle free. In these early scenes, he is not shown in his terror-inspiring “glory”, as will later be the case. He initially seems to hide from his guest’s scrutiny; he is hunched up in his jacket’s collar and wears a head-covering which looks like a night-cap. He is more bizarre than frightening. His apparent wish for concealment backfires since this attire makes him resemble the calèche driver, who was also hiding in his cape and hat. Jonathan does not seem to pick up on this; to the audience, however, it is unmistakable.

Murnau thus introduces a notion which he will drive in at various moments: the vampire is isolated but powerful, he has no one to serve him, but serves himself well. The title card about the servants’ absence further develops this theme, as will later scenes (most notably when the vampire prepares for his trip by loading earth boxes into a cart and climbing into the last one). The card echoes Stoker but the paucity of dialogue makes this line, and its likely implications, more remarkable in the film. In the novel, it reads as such: “Nay, sir, you are my guest. It is late, and my people are not available. Let me see to your comfort myself.” (23)

If the count’s appearance in these introductory scenes is unusual, it is not yet horrific but as the story progresses it will not take long to become so. About one third into the movie,
just as Jonathan reads the book of vampires and the clock strikes midnight, he catches his first
glimpse of Dracula’s real nature. Through a half-open door and from Harker’s point of view,
in a fairly wide expository shot of a crypt which then dissolves into a closer shot of the
standing vampire, we are given to see the eerie figure he cuts. In the next shots, he starts
making his way forward, moving closer to the camera and allowing all the details of his
persona to be visible. His height is the first remarkable feature; he no longer stoops in disguise
but stands erect with his dangling arms in front of him. Every part of his body seems
unnaturally elongated: his black outfit lengthens his limbs, his already long fingers are
continued by unusually long and sharp nails, his ears, no longer hidden beneath a cap and
easy to discern through his baldness, are extremely pointy and accentuate the general
verticality. This is given further emphasis by the set as Dracula walks through a very narrow
ogival door, which seems cut out to his specific shape with his height, falling shoulders and
domed bald head. The absence of hair and/or head-gear makes his facial features stand out:
his beak-like nose, deep-set eyes, emaciated cheeks and prominent teeth.

Stoker’s text comprises 32 mentions of the word teeth associated with vampires. Its
colloctions are telling: the first lexical word it most frequently collocates with is white
(fourteen times) and the second is sharp (eleven times). There are also four mentions of the
word canines in the text, all of which appear in collocation with the adjective sharp. This is
consistent with the classical depiction of fang-bearing vampires which would outlive the text
and come to be so vividly represented in film.

Murnau, however, has another take on the matter. It is not Nosferatu’s canines which
are striking but his unusually long and sharp, somewhat crooked, incisors. The effect is
equally disturbing but less typical of vampiric descriptions. One almost unavoidable
association this representation carries is rats. The prominent front teeth, in conjunction with
his hairless pallor dark beady eyes and long claw-like fingers and nails confer an unmistakably rodent-like appearance to him.

Skal has commented on Schreck’s characterization of Dracula as a kind of human vermin, and sees it as drawing its energy not only from Stoker, but also from universal fears and collective obsessions. He also saw a quintessentially German metaphorical dimension to this portrayal, one that could account for its favourable reception: “Profound metaphors were perceived, with Nosferatu and his accompanying plague representing aspects of human malaise (and, by extension, the German soul itself in the wrenching years during and immediately following World War I, providing a cathartic image for Germany . . . )” (Hollywood, 55)

Rats play a major thematic rôle throughout the film, mainly through their association with the plague. A later scene has sailors loading Dracula’s cargo of earth-filed coffins aboard the ship that will take him into the Western world. As they check the contents, rats come scurrying out of the earth, one of which bites a sailor. Later on, the ship’s crew will fall prey to an unexplained epidemic (supposedly the bubonic plague) which, as we are given to witness, is in fact of Dracula’s making. The rats will later be seen fleeing the ship as it docks. Throughout the film, the vampire’s actions intermingle and are confused with the spread of the disease; from the outset where the introductory titles mention the “Great Death of Wisborg” to the end when they read: “And the miracle shall be told in truth. At that very hour the Great Death ceased and the shadow of the vampire vanished as if overcome by the victorious rays of the living sun.”

This link to the plague is Galeen’s most innovative (one might argue his sole) change to Stoker’s text. It is what makes the shift in time and setting more palpable and enhances the story’s credibility, as per the Gothic “framing” tradition. As Gordon Thomas points out:
Linking Stoker's concept of the undead to the scourge of the Black Death is more than clever — it raises the quotient of horror by adding epidemic physical disease to Nosferatu's infliction of soul sickness and death on individual victims. It's as if the vampire's arrival and taking up residence were enough to blot out the sun over the entire town.

The count's deliberate rat-like appearance is part and parcel of this thematic drift and it is what makes Murnau's villain stand out from the vampiric crowd. Nosferatu may not be the character we associate most readily with Dracula but he is none the less a memorable and iconic figure in his own right.

2.7.4 Browning

The "first encounter" scene also follows the "calèche scene" in this version, but with one major difference: Dracula has already been unambiguously presented as a vampire to the audience (in his castle crypt, exiting a coffin then later easily recognizable as the calèche driver). The emphasis here is then as much on presenting the figure of the vampire to Renfield/Harker, and by extension to the audience who are superior in their knowledge, as on observing and enjoying the latter's unknowing reactions.

As mentioned above, there are elements of schadenfreude and voyeurism to the Transylvania section here. It is therefore not surprising that it is in fact Renfield, a secondary character who is not emotionally linked to the band of heroes, rather than Harker who undertakes the voyage. It allows the audience to revel all the more in his predicament and also
logically structures the plot as to Renfield’s connection with Dracula, a moot point in the novel.

The scene opens with a wide shot of the calèche pulling into a courtyard. Jonathan exits and makes his way towards the driver to reproach him for his reckless driving only to realize that no one is there. As a closer shot focuses on Jonathan and the empty driver’s seat, the creaking sound of an opening door is heard. The next shot then cuts to a huge wooden door slowly but deliberately creaking open. Harker is then shown in front of the stairs, staring up and then slowly progressing forward. The next shot shows him entering a huge but derelict hallway with high vaulted ceilings whose height literally dwarfs him. There is a cut to a closer shot of a, quintessentially Gothic, ogival window with bats flapping outside it and squeaking. Jonathan is then framed again more closely, and details of the surrounding setting become more discernible, notably the general state of disarray of the castle as exemplified by the many cobwebs. The next shot introduces the title character: a wide expository shot of the large hallway staircase with Dracula standing at its top and beginning his descent. The next shot is a close up of the ground where more creaking sounds are heard and armadillos are seen scurrying around.

Like the “window and bats” shot before it, these animal-featuring temporal episodes have a notable role to play at the level of the modal metafunction. Not generally or necessarily perceived by the characters within the diegesis, the animals are meant to inspire feelings of eerie dread in the audience. As living creatures, they represent a threat which is beyond human control.

In the novel, Van Helsing explains the vampire’s link to the animal kingdom: “He can command all the meaner things, the rat, and the owl, and the bat, the moth, and the fox, and

---

37 It is an argument which Coppola will reprise without dwelling on it. When Harker leaves for Transylvania, it is to replace his predecessor in the company, a Mr Renfield.
the wolf.” (252) The most common animal associations found in Stoker’s text are wolves, bats and rats, and these have been abundantly reprised in the films. But some directors have sought to increase their bizarre quotient by including less usual or expected creatures: such as hyenas prowling in the night in Nosferatu, or armadillos scuttling about castle Dracula and bees flying out of mini-coffins in Browning’s version. Whether these uncanny choices are actually effective or distracting is a matter of debate.

The following shot is quite remarkable for its effortless symmetry which is both visually effective and symbolically loaded. A wide shot shows the hallway with the staircase in its backdrop: as an overwhelmed Harker is taking in the scenery, he walks backward towards the stairs, unaware that Dracula is coming down to meet him at exactly the same pace. The audience is once again made into an unwilling accomplice as it witnesses Jonathan unknowingly walking into the trap which awaits him (literally turning his back towards it).

After a few seconds, he turns around slightly startled. The scene cuts to a wide shot of Dracula, central in the shot, now the unmistakable centre of attention and who descends to meet his guest. The high angle countershot is on Jonathan from Dracula’s perspective. The new shot closes in on Dracula (medium close-up from the waist up) as he speaks his famous line “I am Dracula”. The reverse perspective on Jonathan is the same as before as he expresses his relief after the mysterious trip and arrival at the castle. Dracula (framed standing) bids him welcome and begins his ascension. The countershot on Jonathan is the same again as he follows suit.

Compositionally, the organisation of the shots and countershots in this scene is noteworthy. The high angle on Jonathan hardly varies, the camera seemingly emulating Dracula’s point-of-view. Dracula, however, is framed at different heights and the camera is almost frontal; there is only the slightest hint of a low-angle view, not sufficient to represent Harker’s reciprocal point-of-view. This has two main effects as far as meanings are
concerned. It would be excessive to say that the viewer is encouraged to associate with the vampire (through his POV) but it is obvious that he/she is distanced from Harker. Dramatic irony and the audience’s superior knowledge create a chasm between the character and the viewers which is borne out by these visual presentations.

But the staircase and the characters’ place on it also carry a symbolic meaning: Dracula always stands above his guest, physically asserting his dominance, never descending to his level. This theme will continue throughout this scene as Dracula remains a few steps ahead, leading a somewhat subservient Harker to his doom. A wider shot shows both characters ascending at different levels; they are interrupted by the howling of wolves and turn towards the window. As above, there are alternating shots of the count as he speaks and his visitor reacting in medium close-up with the former on a level with the camera and the latter from a high angle. Lugosi delivers one of the lines which made him famous: “Listen to them, children of the night. What music they make.” Except for its development, it is identical to Stoker’s text: "Listen to them, the children of the night. What music they make!" Seeing, I suppose, some expression in my face strange to him, he added, "Ah, sir, you dwellers in the city cannot enter into the feelings of the hunter." (25) The line, with its curious yet poetic connotations and delivered in Lugosi’s singsong rhythmic accent stands out quite markedly in this otherwise sparsely dialogue encounter. It was to prove so memorable that it, like “I never drink ... wine”, would become one of the movie’s catchphrases and thereby set an intertextual precedent for later adaptations. Dracula aficionados would expect to hear in other versions of the story.

In the present corpus, it appears twice more, but at different moments and with subtle variations. Coppola keeps the addressee the same but situates the line later in the plot, once Jonathan is starting to have serious misgivings about his host. Although he does not fully
measure the extent or exact nature of the threat, he knows that he is some kind of prisoner in the castle

H: I've seen many strange things already...bloody wolves chasing me through some blue inferno!

D: Listen to them, the children of the night. What sweet music they make.

H: Music? Those animals?

Oldman's delivery of the line is reminiscent of Lugosi (the actor himself acknowledged being inspired by his predecessor, especially vocally) but is even more playful: his eyes are full of glee as he revels in his power, the addition of the adjective "sweet" makes his meaning all the more surreal. Dracula is only keeping up the slightest pretence of normality as he toys with his guest.

In Badham's version, the line also takes place much later in the plot and it is not addressed to Harker (the story takes place entirely in England and emulates the Deane-Balderston version's dramatic structure). Dracula is courting Mina for the first time and they are together at Carfax:

D: Listen to them, the children of the night. What sad music they make.

M: Do you think it's sad?

D: So lonely, like weeping.

Again, the simple addition of the adjective "sad" takes the utterance into a completely new direction and plays into Langella's portrayal of a romantic, nostalgic, centuries-weary count.

In Browning's version, once Dracula has uttered the line and it has been contrasted with Harker's startled expression, both resume their ascension. The next shot frames the count from behind and a large cobweb can clearly be seen spread across the staircase ahead of him. Harker is then framed as before and is shown suddenly starting at something; the next shot
comes back to Dracula but with the cobweb behind him as if he had walked past/through it leaving it unperturbed. The next series of eight frames similarly alternate from Jonathan to Dracula as they show a bewildered Jonathan left to make his own way through the web. As he does so with the help of his cane, an extreme close up of a spider scurrying away interrupts this symmetry. The camera closes in on the count as he comments “The spider spinning his web for the unwary fly” then on his guest as he concludes “the blood is the life Mr Renfield” and the latter bemusedly agrees. A wider shot of both finishing their ascension closes the scene as it dissolves into the next sequence.

Throughout the excerpt, verticality (mainly expressed compositionally through spatial positioning in the frame and camera angles) is used to accentuate interpersonal interactions between the characters, especially in terms of power. Dracula is clearly the dominating figure and is consistently depicted as such as he towers over his guest and leads him forth. The use of sets and props, particularly the cobweb, is also effective at two different levels. First, representationally (logically): the untouched web is a fantastic, unexplainable element which confers to the vampire an ethereal ghostlike quality. Second, modally: the cobweb is unavoidably linked symbolically to the idea of an inextricable trap with Dracula, the predator, waiting beyond it and Harker, the prey, with no other choice but to walk straight into it.

Lugosi’s speech correlates this idea but the second part “the blood is the life” is also interesting in another respect. The line again comes straight from Stoker and although it only occurs three times in the novel it is fairly memorable: spoken by the madman Renfield, it is associated with his zoophagous practices (the line’s memorability is heightened by its scriptural origins as explained above). Although probably not perceptible to an audience that isn’t closely acquainted with the original text, this then makes an appealing intertextual twist.

58 Without being directly linked to either of them, this « absence of matter » ties in rather well with the other features traditionally associated with vampires mentioned above: absence of reflection and absence of shadow.
In this film, the line is not spoken by Harker/Renfield but addressed to him. He will reprise it -or rather expand it--once he has gone mad, presumably as a result of Dracula's attacks. A later scene shows both characters aboard the Vesta, heading to England with Renfield addressing his newfound master thus: "You will keep your promise when we get to London, won't you, master? You will see that I get lives...not human lives but small ones...with blood in them. I'll be loyal to you, master. I'll be loyal."

This symbolically and referentially dense yet slow-paced "first encounter" scene is both atmospheric and mesmerizing. Its relative stillness, hypnotic rhythm and striking use of sets for aesthetic and symbolic purposes, make it a highpoint of the initial section and, arguably, of the whole film.

2.7.5 Fisher

Fisher's presentation of the Count in *Horror of Dracula*, is strongly reminiscent of Stoker, especially in the characters' interactions and polite exchanges. There is a fundamental difference but the audience is not yet aware of it as the narrative unfolds: Harker is not at the count's service but has an ulterior motive, he is in fact a vampire hunter, in league with Van Helsing, and he has come to destroy his host.

The "first encounter" scene has been preceded by introductory mise-en-scenes and an accompanying voiceover: Harker arrives at a furnished, plush, and relatively welcoming castle. The building itself is threatening neither without nor from within. This is strikingly different from all the other films in this corpus, where castle Dracula and/or Carfax Abbey are semi-deserted ruins, imposing by their scale but suggesting past grandeur through their decay. They are eerie places in which evil spirits are expected to loom.
The more polished aspect of Dracula’s castle was to become typical of Hammer vampire productions as what was lost in atmosphere was gained in contrast. The wickedness of the creatures which inhabit those seemingly innocuous locations stands out all the more against the smoothness of the background. And of course there are the hidden crypts which are a staple of the productions, and in which the Gothic returns with a vengeance. Yet, when Bernard Robinson designed the set, it was so radically different from the previous versions (especially Browning’s) that the Hammer executives almost decided to hire another designer instead. (Kinsey, 99)

As Harker arrives at the castle, he makes himself comfortable and seems unfazed by the arrival of a beautiful woman clad in a flowing toga complete with Grecian hairdo, and who begs for his help.

The moment he enters the castle, non-diegetic music guides the story; for most of the scene it recedes quietly into the background, especially during dialogues, but at other moments it is interspersed with menacing chords to underline the impending threat. It also clearly punctuates the action: when the female vampire flees the dining room, her light steps are underlined by jumpy string chords. It is obviously at the modal level that music intervenes. Through patterns of variation in rhythm, notes, instruments and volume, it fulfils different functions such as guiding the viewers’ attention to certain events or hinting at hidden perils. Its use is none too subtle as becomes obvious in the next shot. As the strange woman makes her exit, Jonathan’s perplexed face is shown in close up before his eyes turn up and widen in surprise. Just then, the music blares out booming brass percussions as, from Jonathan’s point-of-view, we discover the count at the top of the staircase. This is what Sipos calls an audio threat cue (238): ominous non-diegetic music which cues a present or

39 Hammer productions were also famed for saving money by shooting their films on location in lavish country houses rather than renting out expensive professional studios.
impending threat. The background music then disappears completely. The effect is immediate and double. On the one hand, the portentous threat of the count behind his polished nature is revealed; although the revelation is not explicit, it would take poor interpretive skills indeed to misread such a strong and straightforward aural signal. On the other, any normally constituted viewer will have been startled by the conjunction of the sudden arrival and the unexpected volume and booming timbre of the music. And there is probably nothing more representative of a horror narrative than members of the audience jumping in their seats. For instance, Skal quotes the Times’ dismissive review (one of many) of Hamilton Deane’s stage version, which considered its startling sound effects as its only strength: “In that respect at least, this piece displays a sure sense of the theatre. There is very little of Bram Stoker in it. But most of us jumped in our seats at least once in every act.” (Hollywood, 74)

Dracula is then first shown through a low camera angle (Harker’s point of view), right at the top of a wide frame, standing and engulfed in his trademark black cloak. He starts to make his way down; the camera dollies back, following his descent and keeping him central in the frame, until he reaches the bottom of the stairs. It then halts and it is Dracula who moves towards his close up, as he welcomes his guest. As they engage in dialogue, there is some crosscutting between the close ups of both characters, enabling the viewer to gauge their reactions before the shot widens, showing them interacting in profile. The camera will then pan to follow Harker as he gathers his belongings and a crane shot frames both characters in profile as they ascend together.

But it is especially the dialogue which the characters exchange (and its manner of delivery) which is interesting in this scene and particularly its utter contrast with the dramatic introductory shot of Dracula and the sound effect underlining it. As mentioned above, the non-diegetic music was used at the level of the modal metafunction, addressing the audience.
At the level of the logical/representational metafunction, nothing portentous has yet happened to Harker and he thus engages cordially with his host.

In this manner, the scene is similar to Stoker and his polite dialogues; but whereas through the first-person narration the novel gave us access to Jonathan's—as yet unjustified—wariness and feelings of apprehension, that is not the case in this scene. The exchanges between the count and Harker are striking in their formality and politeness, verging on rigidity. To a contemporary audience, the characters' demeanour might indeed appear stilted, albeit in an attractively quaint manner. The charm of course is in the contrast between the elegant, well-behaved gentlemen, their understated conversation and their true intentions. Each of them in fact aims to destroy the other, either by sucking them dry or staking them. Their behaviour is consistent with the unemotional detachment of Victorians or Edwardians. But it is also close to the dominant stereotype of the Englishman, especially in the late 1950s when the film was made. There is something quintessentially British about these two gentlemen masking their hidden agendas behind a veneer of civility. And, even though the film is supposed to be set in the Germanic provinces, there is no mistaking the characters' Englishness: their use of language is precise and elegant and their accent, the purest RP English. Unlike the rest of this corpus, there is nothing foreign about Christopher Lee's Dracula, certainly not linguistically.

After this first instalment in the Dracula series Lee would reprise his role on many occasions for Hammer. Interestingly however, the count grows increasingly (and on occasion even completely) silent. Rumour had it that, due to the poor quality of the writing or a meagre pay check, a dissatisfied Lee simply refused to speak a word. But it seems far more likely that a non-speaking, imposing, hissing vampire was deemed more terrifying than a poised gentleman, no matter how effective the subsequent contrast was.
A glance at the dialogue the characters first engage in should demonstrate the polite
and dispassionate formality of the exchanges:

D: Mr. Harker, I'm glad that you have arrived safely.
H: Count Dracula?

D: I am Dracula. And I welcome you to my house. I must apologize for not being
here to greet you personally, but I trust that you have found everything you needed?
H: Thank you, sir. It was most thoughtful.

D: It was the least I could do after such a journey.
H: Yes, it is a long journey.

D: And tiring for you, no doubt. Permit me to show you to your room.
H: Thank you, sir.

D: Please, allow me. Unfortunately, my housekeeper is away at the moment. A
family bereavement, you understand.

Like elsewhere, there are overtones of Stoker in some lines: “I am Dracula. And I
welcome you to my house.”, “Please, allow me. Unfortunately, my housekeeper is away at the
moment.” However, the delivery is strikingly different from what other versions had made of
the text, particularly Browning’s, which was chronologically directly anterior. Lugosi’s slow-
paced, accented and momentous “I...am...Dracula”, becomes a matter-of-fact statement of
acknowledgement in Lee’s mouth, a single tone unit with a neutral, assertive but by no means
dramatic falling tone.

As repeatedly mentioned above, the import of Lugosi’s appearance and visual
presentation of the count’s character would be indelible and far-reaching. So much so, in fact,
that it would spawn a series of convoluted law-suits between Universal and Lugosi’s
descendants as to who owned the rights to Lugosi/ Dracula’s image. Skal poetically explains:
Lugosi v. Universal Pictures can be read as a kind of postmodernist Gothic text as much as a legal document. The horror themes are implicit ... but not illusory. We have an actor, his career itself a Faustian parable, his fame dependent on perpetuating a certain contemporary image of the devil. The image drains the actor in a Dracula/ Dorian Gray / doppelganger fashion, he dies and is resurrected, his ghost employed to attract and fascinate children for purposes of economic exploitation. Vampirism and consumerism blur; one begets the other. (Hollywood, 195)

Lee was then the first actor since the famous Hungarian to give Dracula a new face. Some predictable features remain; the vampire is tall and slender, clad in black and wears a cape. He is middle-aged, handsome enough, but in a dark and brooding rather than obvious manner. However, unlike Lugosi, this count has two sides to him: the gentleman and the vampire and his appearance shifts accordingly. In vampire mode, he acquires monstrous features which are easier to perceive: mainly a neat pair of fangs and heavily bloodshot or even red eyes. The gentlemanly appearance in later instalments would recede in favour of the more horrific and “bloody” vampire.

Lee’s portrayal, especially through his dominating silent stature, would prove as striking and long-lasting as Lugosi’s, particularly since he would reprise the role on more than ten occasions. He would become one of Hammer’s cornerstone figures and for long be associated with villains in general and Dracula in particular. Lee would have a prolific, if not always qualitatively selective, career and some directors would use the Dracula aura and its connotations to transfer it onto other characters, especially for films steeped in popular culture.

Two telling examples are the casting of Lee as Count (?) Dooku, the antagonist Jedi knight who has yielded to the dark side of the force in the Star Wars series and the equally ambiguous sorcerer Saruman in the Lord of the
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The next excerpts to be examined are different from those developed above insofar as they do not correspond to a similar scene in the novel. Due to diverging choices in dramatic presentation from a syuzhet perspective, Dracula is introduced at a different moment, with a different background or to different characters with ensuing differences in the interactions. Nevertheless, the title character’s introduction was deemed such an important turning point that it seemed relevant to investigate the modalities of his presentation throughout the corpus. Other “first encounter” scenes have then been retrieved elsewhere and, though they do not stand in contrast to the novel, offer interesting insights in their own right.

2.7.6 Badham

This film claims in its credits that it is adapted from the Deane/Balderston play, first, and Stoker’s novel, second. In this case, the credits’ hierarchy is consistent with the movie’s dramatic structure: exit the Transylvania section, action begins directly in England.

Both Browning’s version in 1931 and this one in 1979 were produced by Universal. As for its predecessor, the studio’s decision to shoot a “new” Dracula for a new audience followed on the considerable success that an updated version of the play had just reaped on Broadway. And given their previous success with casting the stage Dracula, Lugosi, as the title role, Universal took no risks and signed up Langella, star of the Broadway production, for their film. This casting however, unlike Lugosi’s, was foundational to the film: the producers had seen Langella’s vibrant, romantic and tremendously effective re-interpretation of the villain on stage and wanted to transfer it to film. Langella, and the manner in which his

Rings series. Tim Burton would also provide an amusing twist on Lee’s mythology by casting him as a sinister dentist, Dr Wonka, in Charlie and the Chocolate Factory.
portrayal re-creates the character and re-shapes the story, are at the very core of the film, making them at once its strongest selling point and its Achilles’ heel. Basically, Dracula is an ages-weary and forlorn vampire driven by romance (lust?) rather than bloodlust. He seduces a strong-willed, independent and somewhat lascivious Mina who falls in love with him of her own accord. Dracula as a Romantic hero may have seemed like a novel and enticing idea but there was a twist: when the villain becomes the hero, there is no villain left and a horror movie without a villain is no longer horrific.

Dracula is introduced to the audience as he is introduced to the other characters: as a newly arrived neighbour, he is invited to a dinner party at Dr Seward’s house. Before this scene however, the audience’s appetite for a glimpse of him has been whetted by taunting partial shots. The opening minutes centre on a horrific storm where sailors aboard the Demeter are battling the weather but also a mysterious enemy locked in a box which they are attempting to throw overboard. They fail as a human hand breaks through the box and rips a mate’s throat out. Later, once the ship has wrecked and its crew has been decimated, a wolf jumps ashore then shelters from the storm in a cave. Lucy follows it there and discovers a pile of fur out of which a hand emerges to grasp hers.

The film makes implicit that these hands are one and the same and there is a clear parallel between the two shots (P236.1 / P236.2), making their major difference all the more striking: the first is violent and brings death, the second cajoling and seductive, although it will also ultimately bring death to Lucy who holds it. But, beyond their representational and symbolic charge, these extreme close-ups also play an important modal role: they build up anticipation on the viewers’ part.

But Badham is also toying with the public’s expectations. By 1979, vampires—Dracula in particular—were important figures of both popular and general culture, exhaustively represented through all kinds of media (and notably visually). A viewing audience would
therefore have had a preconceived idea of what to expect. The handsome, manly count, devoid of pallor, bloodshot eyes, fangs and even a foreign lilt, probably fell short of every single expectation. The previous partial shots pave the way for this contrast: creating anticipation, then disappointing it but generating surprise instead.

Dracula’s introductory scene opens in Dr Seward’s parlour. All the other dinner party guests are present and expecting the count, they have already been introduced in previous scenes. At the beginning of the scene the camera is very mobile; it dollies around the parlour following Swales, the manservant, as he presents drinks to the guests. Settling first on Harker and Mina, it then shifts to Seward and Lucy⁶¹ as they discus the mysterious shipwreck. There is then a cut to a carriage arriving in the courtyard, making its way into the shot, then stopping. It is followed by a very close shot of the opening carriage door: foldaway alighting steps unfurl and a foot steps out. This is the last of these taunting glimpses of Dracula mentioned above before we discover him in his full glory. The parlour scene resumes with the camera still dollying around, following Swales. There is then a cut to a wide shot of the parlour doors opening and a manservant announcing “Count Dracula” before stepping aside. Two rapid shots show close-ups of the characters turning towards the door to discover the guest of honour; the door is then framed as before as Dracula makes his appearance.

His step is light and quick, his stance alert and dashing and he pauses for a moment in the doorframe as he bids the company good evening. He is wrapped in a long black cape which is the only feature, physical and/or of demeanour, that one might associate with vampire staples. The trademark vampire cape can in fact be traced back to Deane’s stage version where a large cape with an upturned collar would hide the vampire from behind thus

⁶¹ As in the stage play, the names of Lucy and Mina have been shifted around in this film. As was previously done for the scenes in Murnau’s or Browning’s versions, the names corresponding to the equivalent characters in the novel have been reinstated here, in an attempt to unify the corpus and ease transversal readings.
allowing him to “disappear” through trapdoors. No longer a necessity, the imagery stuck. In an otherwise fairly realistic background, Dracula’s introduction reeks of a stage entrance. There are probably two forces at play here: first, Badham’s intention to “present” his protagonist’s entrance and outline the novelty of his depiction; second, the staging is so purposeful that it cannot but be intentional and therefore referential. The intertextual reference seems manifest: not only to the original play from which it is adapted but also as a nod to the Broadway revival which launched Langella in the role and maybe even to the movie’s more “stagy” film predecessors.

As Dracula speaks, there is a close-up of Mina, turning to his voice. She is thus set apart from the rest of the company, who had reacted to the announcement of his name, not his person. A subtle link between them is already being etched. The camera then returns to Dracula, whom it frames in medium close up and accompanies him, dollying backwards, as he drops his cloak and goes around the room to dispense his greetings.

At this stage there is a marked compositional shift as the camera dynamics in the rest of the scene change quite dramatically. Whereas the camera was previously mobile and shots generally presented “episodes” (groups), now the dialogue unfolds through crosscutting fixed shots and countershots (presenting the classical framing of one character who faces the camera and the hearer facing him at a somewhat unnaturalistic ¾ angle as he speaks, with the balance reversed in the next shot). Almost all of these are close-ups (face and sometimes shoulders) of the different speakers. The attention is thus focused more closely on the dialogue and the characters’ reactions as displayed through their facial features. The content of the dialogue is not particularly striking: courtesies are exchanged and Dracula’s new purchase, Carfax Abbey is discussed.

More interesting then are the characters’ interactions, particularly Dracula and Mina. She seems intrigued and drawn to him on the one hand yet defensive on the other,
agonizing him on matters such as the choice of his dwelling. The count is portrayed as poised, hardly unsettled by conversational turns, intense and very seductive, gratifying the women especially with his attentions. Compared to other versions, this count is also singularly physical: he is alert and responsive and does not shy away from physical contact, rather the opposite in the case of women as he freely clutches their hands. The end of the scene, when he extends his hand to Lucy to escort her to the dinner table also refers back to their hands joining when she "rescued" him from the cave.

But Dracula is not the only character who undergoes a major motivational "makeover". Mina’s portrayal in this scene is consistent with the revisionist stand which the film wished to implement: if Dracula is no longer a villain but a Romantic hero, his preys must needs change their status accordingly. Rather than victims, Mina, but also to a certain extent Lucy, become willing partners in the relationship. Lucy is depicted as a rather meek, subdued and impressionable figure, probably an easy, and lustreless, conquest for Dracula. Mina, on the other hand, is a completely different case: she is strong-willed but resilient, a "new woman" in her actions, words and ambitions yet extremely seductive and overtly sexual, as her public displays of affection towards Jonathan demonstrate. This portrayal is unlike the novelistic Mina who was vivid, intelligent and caring but somewhat plain and eventually subdued to men’s will.

Her first appearance in the film is a scene in which she reads to Lucy a letter from a law firm, accepting to hire her. The dialogue is fairly explicit as to their different natures:

L: You know, Mina, you're so much braver than I am...taking on all those men like that.

M: But don't you think we ought to have some influence, some say on things? After all...we are not chattels!
She is also unlike the film “vamps”, the stereotypical women seduced by vampires: bright-eyed temptresses, driven by animal passions beyond their will. And she is miles away from Victorian, or even Edwardian (the story is set in 1913), conceptions of women. She is neither submissive nor defensive, just a brilliant, sensual woman attuned to her wishes and needs, yet in apparent harmony with her peers and environment. In other words; she is completely anachronistic.

But her character is consistent with, and was clearly crafted according to, second-wave feminist views typical of the film’s release date. Only seven years before its release in 1979, the Equal Rights Amendment had been passed by the US Congress and ratified by the States. Alongside illegalelies in the workplace, education, legal system, etc., this brand of feminism also strove to establish women’s rights to their bodies and sexuality. Badham’s Mina is the perfect embodiment of the accomplished 1970’s feminist: she chooses her career, her life, her lovers, even in defiance of what contemporary men (mainly her father and fiancé) desire or order. If anything, the transformation of her character is almost more striking than Dracula’s.

2.7.7 Maddin

Despite their common source, no film in this corpus can be said to truly resemble another; but if one were to choose amongst them a single film most dissimilar to all the others, Maddin’s would probably spring to mind. Even though it was originally shot as a made-to-order film for Canadian television, it is unexpectedly crafty and ambitious artistically. One of its most striking features is the manner in which it manages to create a completely novel visual presentation of the Dracula story while simultaneously being extremely referential not only to the source novel but also to other film versions and to the dynamics of popular culture itself.
As critic Roger Ebert pointed out: "So many films are more or less alike that it's jolting to see a film that deals with a familiar story, but looks like no other."

Maddin's film is deeply postmodern in its themes. It returns to Stoker's now canon text, deconstructs many of the themes laid bare by decades of criticism and explicitly, and sometimes forcefully, re-integrates them into the visual weave of the picture itself. Issues of gender, class, ethnicity, race and sex are no longer hinted at or seen as underlying the narrative but overtly displayed. But Maddin is also strikingly postmodern in his treatment of these themes, notably in his fondness for pastiche. But where this is most apparent is in his extremely fragmented structure, both visually and narratively.

One of the main aspects of the visual fragmentation is the film's editing pace: the average shot length is 2.6 seconds (The MSL is 1.9 and Standard deviation 3.1), making the editing twice or even three times as fast as that of the other movies in this corpus. This pace is hectic by any standards but Maddin manages to make it almost seamless, aided by the absence of spoken text but also by resorting to techniques which "smooth" the abruptness of the transitions such as the markedly frequent use of dissolves rather than cuts between shots.

The deconstructed structure, on the other hand, can be attributed as much to Maddin as to the original ballet's choreographer, Mark Godden, whose presentational arrangement the director emulates; his influence on the movie obviously reached beyond the structural to the thematic and some of his concerns were echoed by Maddin, as will be illustrated below.

Godden created Dracula for the Royal Winnipeg Ballet in 1998, amongst extreme awareness and popularity of Stoker's text brought on by the novel's centennial. He used Mahler's symphonies 1 2 and 9 as musical score and opted for a full-length production, structured in three acts. His configuration was influenced not only by the story and his personal

---

42 The software tool Cinemetrics has been used to measure these results. The complete grid, comparing all the films in the corpus, is presented in appendix five.
interpretation of it but also by stage production constraints and the demands of a classically structured ballet (alternation between solos, pas-de-deux and ensemble pieces).

Godden chose to open the ballet in England, as warranted by stage tradition "à la Hamilton/Deane". He thus dispensed with the Transylvania section, which would later be re-integrated in an original form. But where Godden and Maddin's version takes a markedly different stance from the preceding dramatizations is in its characterization; not only quantitatively by including all of the novel's characters (with the exception of Renfield for the ballet, but whom Maddin re-introduces) but qualitatively by making Mina and Lucy the heroines to the relative detriment of the male contingent. The ballet opens directly with Lucy being attacked by Dracula and struggling with conflicting feelings in the wake of the attack.

Thus, Dracula's first encounter is not mediated by Jonathan here but by Lucy. More importantly, it is unusually anti-climactic. Dracula is neither displayed nor hidden, he is furtively shown on three different occasions before he takes centre stage after close to thirty minutes. This is quite close to Stoker's text in chapters 5 to 13, where Dracula is an ominous, but impalpable, threat to the characters. The vampiric menace is efficient for the reader who has become familiar with the villain through Jonathan's account in the initial chapters.

Although they chose not to open with this section, Godden and Maddin rely on a different momentum to ease the vampire's introduction: Dracula's iconic status. As Pribisic notes: "Gone are Harker's travels to Transylvania and the building of suspense about the count's identity, since contemporary audiences perceive Dracula as a modern myth in no need of introduction and explication." (161) Vampire expert Elizabeth Miller applauded the ballet's choice:

"Dracula comes from behind out of the darkness and takes Lucy with his dark kiss.

One Winnipeg critic noted that this happens too early, that there should be more of a preamble. I disagree. Unlike the initial readers of Stoker's novel, we know what a
vampire does to his victim, so the suspense is not as essential an element. The focus in this production is on the aftermath.”

Whereas the ballet used surtitles to set the scene, Maddin could rely not only on title cards but also on dynamic editing and multiple perspectives. Thus he intercuts explanatory cards (“East coast of England, 1897”, “Lucy Westenra’s manor & neighbouring Whitby lunatic asylum”) with images of the sea (a lighthouse, waves crashing on the beach, a ship) and more dreamlike shots (a woman, later to be identified as Lucy, lying with abandon upside down over the sea and whose eyes suddenly fly open).

It is immediately clear that although this film is non-speaking, it is not, strictly speaking, silent. This is reflected in the abundant use not only of perpetual music (which would be expected of filmed ballet) but also of sound effects: in those introductory shots the musical soundtrack vies with the sounds of crashing waves, swarming insects, the swaying of the ship and creaking wood. Although he pays homage to the silent film era and its aesthetics, Maddin also makes abundant use of more recent techniques to structure and revitalize his story; this is also apparent in his use of intertitles where images of the characters are sometimes superimposed on the lines of their dialogue. Maddin’s use of sound is atmospheric, mainly underscoring visual elements, thus clarifying or highlighting elements at the representational level but also guiding the viewer’s engagement at the modal level. In Maddin’s own words: “It’s selective sound – just the way when you’re painting you choose your brushstrokes wisely, when you’re writing you choose your words wisely, you choose your sounds wisely.” (“Conversations”, 246)

Dracula is then first introduced in the next series of shots. The first of these displays an old-fashioned map of Europe across which blood is flowing. Given the film’s black and white photography, it is not explicit that the liquid is blood although its particular viscous texture, not to mention the thematic and symbolic importance of blood, makes this
interpretation inescapable. At this early stage of the story, Maddin has not opted for a technique that he will use on several later occasions: introducing dashes of colour (especially red for blood) in the otherwise bi-chromic background. The blood flows from right to left, or rather as will quickly be made apparent, from East to West. A caption is superimposed on the image and growing larger, it reads: “IMMIGRANTS!” The next shot cuts to the ship and presents a crate in close up, through which a face with closed eyes, Dracula’s, is discernible between two planks. This is followed by an image of a restless Lucy tossing in her bed; again a caption appears over the image: “OTHERS!” This dissolves back to the map shot, with the blood drawing closer to Great Britain. A new caption appears: “FROM OTHER LANDS”. The next shots alternate between a waking Lucy, who unlocks her bedroom door, hypnotically drawn to the outside and the map with the fast-progressing pool of blood and alarming captions (“from the East!”, “From the sea!”). As the blood finally engulfs England, there is a rapid cut to Lucy sitting up in bed as she recoils from blood seemingly spilling over the frame of the image.

This is a striking shot, unique in the movie, in which usually irreconcilable dimensions come together. Whereas the shots of Lucy belong to the representational level and show the diegetic story unfolding, the map and blood are modal insofar as they address the viewer directly, but the issue is further complicated by the fact that they are used symbolically rather than “literally”. The map doesn’t show anything geographically relevant to the story, unlike Coppola’s who uses maps to succinctly but evocatively illustrate Jonathan’s progression across the Carpathians, or Dracula’s “occupation” of London through his estate purchases. Here the map is used to call attention to the Eastern/Western divide and the (bloody) threat which the former poses to the latter as the captions none too subtly underscore. Cinematically, this shot presents another interesting feature insofar as it calls attention to the distinction between on and off-screen space By having the symbolic modal blood spill into the
experiential story world, Maddin could be hinting at many different meanings (highlighting the fictional or even supernatural aspects of the film, asserting the director’s godlike control over his film and characters, questioning the separability of levels of reality, etc.) or indeed, as seems to be his postmodern fashion, to all at once.

Dracula is only furtively and partially glimpsed in his crate as the next scene, Lucy choosing a fiancé amongst her suitors, unfolds. The editing is fast-paced as ever with multiple cuts/dissolves between Lucy and the men, a raving Renfield calling his master behind bars, shots of the sea and of the creaking crate. As Lucy pricks her finger on a bouquet, a drop of blood, which for stronger effect has been colorized in red, spurts. She draws a (red) line on the doorframe as an extreme close up displays the crate whose planks suddenly go flying, finally revealing Dracula’s face as his eyes spring open. This shot, like others that will show him biting Lucy, on three later occasions, follow the film’s frenetic rhythm and do not dwell on the vampire’s appearance. It is only half an hour into the film that the count makes his first fully-fledged appearance to dance a pas-de-deux with the undead Lucy.

It thus seems quite deliberate on the director’s part to neither hide nor flaunt his Dracula. Untypically in this corpus, Dracula is not properly displayed or introduced here, he is rather taken for granted. From where he stood, over a century and countless popular adaptations since the novel’s publication, Maddin probably felt no need to drive through the point that Dracula was the protagonist (or at least the centre of attention), evil and a vampire. His presentation of the count is based on the assumption that he needn’t be redundant since his audience will more than likely have sufficient intertextual knowledge and background to fill in the gaps he willingly overlooked. This strategy seems to have paid off since no critic picked up on this strangely elusive and initially absent Dracula.

But Maddin does bring his individual touch to bear on the representation of the almost mythological figure, although he is once again tributary of Godden’s original casting for the
ballet. His Count is more Eastern than any predecessor since he is not just from Eastern
Europe or the Middle East but actually Asian. Zhang Wei-Qiang's features are left relatively
untouched and although he has fangs, these are slight and the only “horrific” element he
bears. Although he did not get to choose his Dracula, Zhang’s role was created on him by
Godden, Maddin discreetly but unambiguously used his ethnicity to nourish the East/West
dichotomy mentioned above and which has fed many critical readings of the novel. Roger
Ebert picks up on this theme and also remarks that Lucy’s name has been changed from
Westenra in the novel to Westernra in the film, thus accentuating the contrast between her and
the exotic vampire. Holden, as to them, notes that:

“The director has accentuated the ballet's racial and erotic subtexts with a fun house
audacity ... As Mr. Zhang's suave, swashbuckling count seduces and poisons his
victims, you think of Attila the Hun as a Valentino-like voluptuary luring them to
surrender to the intoxicating rhythm of the tango in his hard, unsmiling eyes.
Radiating an avid sexual intensity that carries a whiff of sadism, Mr. Zhang is as
charismatic a Dracula as has ever been shown on the screen.”

Maddin has thus crafted a new Dracula for the new millennium. Paradoxically, he has
looked to the past on two counts to produce this. First, by resorting to old technical means and
old-fashioned aesthetics, even though these have been considerably re-vamped (pun
intended). Second, by digesting the wealth of intertextual material (novel, films but also
paratextual criticism) which the myth generated and creatively regurgitating it into a new
shape.
2.8 Scene 4: The “Brides” scene

2.8.1 Stoker

The next segment to be analysed has proved to be one of the novel’s most memorable excerpts, leaving vivid impressions on its readership at large. It also has a particular history and played an important role in the novel’s genesis, one that may account for its long-lasting impact. The passage in the book was inspired by a dream which upset Stoker and was actually the starting point and inspiration for the whole novel. It is purportedly in the wake of this dream, and under its spell, that the writer began to work on the story. The importance of this passage is further borne out by the fact that it is the only incident which remains a constant in all Stoker’s revisions of the manuscript. Describing his dream, Stoker recounted: “Young man goes out, sees girls one tries to kiss him not on lips but throat. Old count interferes —rage and fury diabolical— this man belongs to me I want him” (Frayling, x).

The scene takes place a little later in the narrative. Still in Transylvania, Jonathan Harker now realizes that he is a prisoner in castle Dracula. One night he is attacked by three vampire women, Dracula’s ‘brides’ who attempt to drink his blood and to whom he more or less willingly and voluptuously succumbs before the count intervenes. The term “brides” to describe these vampire women is a convention used by Dracula scholars, it is nowhere is Stoker’s text where they are referred to as “sisters” instead.

Jonathan then gives, in diary form, an ‘a posteriori’ relation of the traumatic scene he has experienced. The story, as before, progresses through the character’s restricted view and knowledge. Imbued with his subjectivity, the narration generates suspense but also empathy for its protagonist, since its readership is living the story as Harker experiences it. As before, Stoker’s lexicogrammatical choices serve to shape the text in this manner; concurrently advancing the narration (experiential and logical metafunction), involving the readers with the
story and its characters (interpersonal), and organizing these choices into a coherent, deliberate whole (textual).

The excerpt could be divided into two parts: Jonathan’s encounter with the brides and their “seduction” of him and Dracula’s “rescue”. Both parts stand out in the body of Stoker’s text for different reasons.

As has been mentioned above, sex has enduringly been considered as one of the prevailing themes in *Dracula*. Psychoanalytical criticism (originating with Richardson, who was incidentally the first to use Stoker’s novel critically) has dwelt abundantly on the sexual passions that the characters are supposedly repressing and which are ultimately given free rein through vampirism. Although this bias is now being called into question by some authors (Hughes), sexuality is still the single feature which one most readily associates with Dracula. This may well be a valid case to make for most vampires: more libidinous predecessors would of course include Polidori’s Lord Ruthven and Le Fanu’s Carmilla, and later incarnations such as Rice’s Lestat and Quinn Yarbro’s Saint-Germain, to name but the most representative. But Stoker’s text, if subjected to close inspection, displays very little eroticism indeed. The title character generates much more repulsion than attraction; and if the lust for blood is a metaphor for plain lust, it is by no means straightforwardly so.

Incredible as it may seem, Dracula’s (over)sexual nature, as conveyed by decades of criticism and countless later representations, particularly on screen, is not part and parcel of the character’s initial portrayal in the novel. Generally speaking, the book is in fact rather priggish; one might indeed wonder how such an innocuous text could produce such passionate, sexually-charged readings if it were not for the inclusion of a few notable exceptions to the primness of the whole. It could even be argued that these scenes have a stronger impact through the contrast with the restraint shown elsewhere, therefore conjuring
images of repression. The brides scene is undeniably the most straightforwardly erotic episode in the novel; it is therefore untypical of the rest of the narration although its impact seems (for that reason?) to have stretched beyond the scene’s boundaries and tinted the whole text.

The passage’s eroticism, as is often the case with vampires, results from the combination of desire and the knowledge that this desire is unnatural, or even downright wrong. In the presence of the brides, Jonathan is not only aroused but fairly submissive, quite readily succumbing to his attraction, or at least opposing very little resistance to it. It is easy to fathom how certain critics saw this passage as emblematic of male Victorian sexuality: men whose sexual/emotional morals appeared impeccable at the societal level but who surrendered to darker impulses behind closed doors. Some of Stoker’s biographers, Farson chief amongst them, contended that Stoker was no stranger to these practices and that he died of syphilis, contracted while visiting prostitutes.

Lexically, the feelings of attraction/repulsion which Jonathan experiences are unambiguously expressed and repeated, with one element always counterbalanced by another: “There was something about them that made me uneasy, some longing and at the same time some deadly fear. I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire”, “intolerable, tingling sweetness”, “an agony of delightful anticipation”, “Sweet it was in one sense, honey-sweet, and sent the same tingling through the nerves as her voice, but with a bitter underlying the sweet, a bitter offensiveness, as one smells in blood.”, “a deliberate voluptuousness which was both thrilling and repulsive”, “the soft, shivering touch of the lips”.

The erotic charge which appears interpersonally is atmospherically supplemented at the experiential level. The brides are given flesh through descriptive and evocative relational processes but especially through the material processes they undertake as actors (Jonathan is typically the goal of these processes in some form.)
The girl went on her knees, and bent over me, simply gloating. [...] she arched her neck 
she actually licked her lips like an animal, till I could see in the moonlight the moisture 
shining on the scarlet lips and on the red tongue as it lapped the white sharp teeth. Lower 
and lower went her head as the lips went below the range of my mouth and chin and 
seemed to fasten on my throat. Then she paused, and I could hear the churning sound of 
her tongue as it licked her teeth and lips, and I could feel the hot breath on my neck."

It can be noted that these actions (arched, licked, lapped) also confer a primal animalistic 
quality to the vampire women.

Once Dracula appears however, the atmosphere changes or rather is violently 
shattered: the “horrotic” mood becomes plainly horrific. This second part of the excerpt also 
stands in contrast to the rest of the narrative. The novel as a whole is quintessentially Gothic 
insofar as it relies primarily on atmosphere, rather than action, to instil fear into its readership. 
This is no longer the case here: something – a truly terrifying something- is happening. 
Vampirism is no longer a half-perceived background menace but a frontal attack. This is 
borne out at the experiential level by the many instances of material processes, which 
dynamically advance the plot. It can be noted that Jonathan is once again not the actor of 
these, which thus establishes him in the position of inert bystander, unable to react to the 
horror he experiences or witnesses. This status is further borne out by the instances of 
behavioural processes in which he is frequently the behaver (especially with the verb to see). 
Relational attributive processes are predictably used for descriptions but whereas they are 
emotional in Jonathan’s case “I was aghast with horror”, they tend to be physical for 
Dracula: “his eyes were positively blazing”.

Also remarkable in this passage are the relatively numerous instances (three in the first 
part, six in the second) of verbal processes, of which most project direct speech as a separate 
clause. Though not uncommon in a novel, this device may seem slightly out of place in a
narration which is supposedly a diary; more in keeping with this medium would be the instances of mental processes, such as “Never did I imagine such wrath and fury”. It can be surmised that Stoker’s design at this pivotal moment was to energize his story and flesh out his characters. Complementing this premise with their lively descriptive potential are the many uses of circumstances of manner, saliently used to indicate sound or voice quality “in a voice which, though low and almost in a whisper”, “with a laugh of ribald coquetry”, “in a soft whisper”, “with a low laugh” especially when manner appears at the adverbial rank, rather than at the clausal level where it is also common.

As to interpersonal meanings, the prominent features in this passage regard person selection in the mood block. In the first part of the excerpt, Jonathan’s subjectivity dominates and we accordingly view things through his 1st person narration, with repeated uses of pronouns I or my. That is, until Dracula appears and his formidable presence shifts the attention to him. Even though the outlook is still Jonathan’s, pronouns shift to he and him: “His eyes were positively blazing”, “his face was deathly pale”, “he hurled”, “he said”. The passage also presents some dialogue, in which pronoun you typically appears, sometimes needing further qualification since it is used by the count and also by his brides: “You yourself never loved”, “you yourselves can tell it from the past”. Once the dialogue ends, we return to Jonathan’s perspective and the change is once again indicated by person. “If my ears did not deceive me”, “I was aghast with horror”, “I could see”. This shift in use of persons from first to third and then back to first again serves to engage the reader’s attention with the story as it unfolds, hence the use of the third person for descriptive or dynamic purposes, but also with the characters’ predicament, in the use of the first person.

The perspective of the last metafunction, the textual, substantiates some of the claims made above, particularly as to the importance of circumstances, prominently of manner, to enliven the narration. From the point of view of textual organisation, we can observe some notable
(marked) uses of adverbials or clauses of manner in thematic rather than rhematic position:
"lower and lower went her head", "with giant's power draw it back", "with a fierce sweep of his arm", "in a voice which". The effect, especially when collocating with material processes that have Dracula as the actor, seems to aim at boosting the storytelling.

Two meanings thus stand out in this passage: first, Jonathan as a passive victim figure vs. the brides and the count as figures of action, but also of power and ultimately of terror in Dracula's case; and second, the reader's engagement with the story which remains empathically oriented towards Jonathan's quandary while demonstrating unusually vibrant narrative impetus.

2.8.2 Coppola

The pace of Coppola's film is generally fast: it has an average shot length of 5.2 seconds, the second fastest film in the corpus. This is also markedly faster than most of the director's other films (especially the earlier ones) as examination of the cinemetrics database shows. The film alternates between a more leisurely pace with longer takes and heavily edited sequences (such as the final chase described below). The present sequence is particularly fast: the average shot length is 3.2 seconds. The rhythm within the scene also varies, starting out with longer languorous shots, getting more hectic (more cuts, shorter shots) as the sexual intensity increases and with Dracula's arrival and interaction with the brides, then slowing down at the end as it focuses on the two male protagonists' reactions, with longer close-ups. The last epic shot of Dracula giggling away at Harker's horror is a six second close-up, giving the audience all their time to take in the count's hysterical glee, whether they cringe or marvel at it.
The scene begins in the room as Jonathan lies down on a bed. The theme of seduction is initiated through sound here: he is drawn to the room and instructed by a ghost-like voice calling his name and instructing him to “lay back, lay down into my arms”. The voice, although it has an ethereal disincarnated quality to it, is still recognizable as Mina’s, only with untypical lascivious sighs and overtones. The atmosphere is sensual and almost inviting. The scenery is full of rich shimmering materials (the bedcovers, floating drapes, the bed’s canopy), which stand in contrast with the cold starkness of the rest of the castle as shown in previous scenes. The light is dim in intensity and golden in hue, bathing the characters from all angles and enveloping them in a warm, almost fuzzy haze. At the level of figure, the brides continue this warm colour theme as the light is reflected on their naked gleaming bodies and golden adornments. Even the blood that flows in this scene is not gushing red but a thicker maroon colour.

Coppola has commented on seeing Browning’s version as a teenager, after reading the book, and reacting to this particular scene: “I remember being disappointed by the three Brides – they were just standing there in their robes, looking dead, and that wasn’t what a fourteen-year-old boy wants to see.” (2) So the director decided to fulfil his teenage fantasies with a very vivid and explicit combination of eroticism and horror. This generated a memorable scene to which audiences and critics responded in kind, generally torn between fascination and cringing. Howe speaks of the film’s “ALARMING EROTICISM” especially in this “eye-popping” scene. Hinson describes it as: “sexy and bloody... but in a stylized, grand Kabuki manner that lifts the action (including the sex and violence) from our normal sphere of reality to the realm of timeless, primal tales.”

Ironically, the film would receive an R-rating from the American Motion Picture Association, which deemed the sexual content and violence inappropriate to under 17s.
The sexual content is anything but subtle. The brides wear nothing on top, and hardly anything below. They mysteriously emerge between the sheets and immediately engage sexually with Jonathan: caressing, kissing and licking him. Alongside the musical theme, the soundtrack is saturated with grunts and sighs. As the "seduction" unfolds, the pace of editing increases as close-ups of various body parts are displayed in rapid succession. The impression conveyed here is that of an orgiastic fantasy, an entanglement of naked bodies where flesh communes with flesh and where boundaries no longer exist.

In Stoker's novel, as seen above, the scene's eroticism lay mainly in the lure of the forbidden and its anticipation, with Jonathan subjected to a kind of tantric/vampiric foreplay. Coppola is much less coy and Jonathan’s encounter with the Brides is truly incarnated, i.e. given flesh, in the process.

But the traditional equation between vampirism and sex is taken to the next level here. In the midst of its eroticism the scene starts to include horrific elements: the women's fangs are now menacingly apparent, the close-ups on flesh show it increasingly maculated with blood, one of the brides wears a snake coiled-up in her curls medusa-like (P254.1), etc. Medusa was a subject favoured by symbolist painters, an influence which has been acknowledged by Coppola and his team, and this shot is immediately reminiscent of some of their work. (P254.2 / P254.3 / P254.4 / P254.5).

The sequence can truly be labelled "horrotic", intermingling sex and horror; it may leave viewers half-titillated and half-recoiling as a Bride kisses a nipple which is squirting blood or bends over her victim to perform some kind of vampiric fellatio to the accompaniment of his (lustful? painful?) screams.

This sequence also displays a slightly distracting image: in the midst of all the erotic activity, a shot shows Jonathan reflected in a mirror above him, probably somewhere in the bed's canopy. He is writhing alone on the sheets in ecstasy. This is of course an allusion to the
fact that vampires cast no reflection. This motif has been developed in an earlier scene, very similar to Stoker’s text, in which Dracula creeps up on Jonathan shaving without the latter noticing his arrival in his mirror. In this context however, making the connection is not uncomplicated and probably demands some paratextual or intertextual knowledge about vampire features. Without this bit of hindsight, it could indeed seem as though Jonathan is in the throes of some wet nightmare!

The atmosphere in this first part is thus sensual, even in its violence, and accordingly relies on warm colours particularly in its set, costumes and props. When Dracula appears in the next frame, thus initiating the transition to the second part, it is in a flash of lightning which leaves in its trail a harsh blue light which frames him from behind, violently shattering the intimacy of the previous moment. Even when the camera is on Jonathan and the brides on the bed, the glaring blue light backlighting the count throws a cold sheen over the group.

Colour contrast functions representationally here to indicate a rupture between both segments, and an inkling of worse horrors to come.

Direction of lighting in this part is more strongly marked than in the preceding one. Dracula, in those shots where he appears alone, is still backlit by the glaring blue light. This backlight is key light in these shots; it is only faintly counteracted by a fill light, in a warmer shade, coming from below. The resulting effect, at the member rank, is that Dracula’s features are left in relative darkness, especially in the medium shots, from the waist up. In close up, the overall effect remains, only muted. In these shots Dracula is spatially positioned right in the middle of the frame. Modally, he is the centre and focus of the viewer’s attention but paradoxically he remains in the shade. Dracula is represented as a figure of mystery, at once fascinating and all-encompassing, but ultimately unfathomable. This can be contrasted with Jonathan’s representation. Out of the 23 mise-en-scènes that this segment can be divided into,
Jonathan appears in 8: 5 of them exclusively and 3 as a figure within a group (episode). The Brides have 9 shots, whereas Dracula’s tally is 12 shots, 8 of which are exclusive.

But more remarkable than this disproportion is the type of shot Jonathan appears in; excepting the episode shots, the mise-en-scènes, although not strictly identical, are uncannily similar. Jonathan always appears in medium close-up or close-up, sitting on the floor as the camera gradually tilts (although we hardly see its movements) to a slightly dominating (high-camera) angle. His gaze pattern is similarly consistent as he powerlessly witnesses the events taking place before and above him. The relatively static framing matches the kinesic patterns as his only movements are to sway his head in disbelief and ultimately keel over when overcome by horror. This is further substantiated by the soundtrack as Jonathan remains silent before expressing his helplessness by grunting and screaming in frustration.

Thus meanings expressed through modal and representational metafunctions in this scene match those found in the novel. The highlighted semiotic choices concur to depict Jonathan as a weak, inert bystander. The novel interpersonally engaged us with Jonathan’s character and plight, notably through appraisal motifs that could be gleaned from his 1st person narration: “The red light in them [his eyes] was lurid, as if the flames of hell-fire blazed behind them”, “I was aghast with horror.” This is no longer the case here. The fact that Jonathan is rendered both inactive but especially speechless has neutralized much of the empathy Stoker had induced in his text, as we cannot engage with his thoughts and are left with his actions or precisely lack thereof. Paradoxically, but probably deliberately, the central, active, fascinating, ubiquitous figure of the count is put forward. And although his actions are despicable, he generates feelings of attraction-repulsion. This particular reading is of course influenced by knowledge of the two texts, novel and film, as complete textual objects of which the scenes depicted are only sub-texts. Stoker’s Dracula is throughout the embodiment of pure evil, with no redeeming features whatsoever. Coppola’s count, by contrast, is a
romantic, charismatic hero, driven to unspeakable horror by despair, revenge and ultimately hope and love. This premise is introduced by the director right from the prologue, and therefore affects the whole film in its continuity.

In the scene under scrutiny, an instance of this portrayal can be glimpsed in the mise-en-scène where Dracula is confronted by one of his brides who taunts him: ‘You yourself never loved’. The high camera angle frames him from above providing us with a very tilted viewpoint, the effect of which seems to be to portray him as an inferior, slightly pathetic and vulnerable figure. One could counter-argue that this choice of angle is just a necessary reverse shot, since he has tossed his bride onto the ceiling. But by examining patterns of gaze at the event rank, we can observe that establishing an eyeline match between the dialoguing characters is difficult, due to the awkward position of the figures. To any extent, the fact that a mise-en-scène functions within one metafunction (logical / compositional) does not preclude its functioning within another (modal).

Mismatched gazes and bizarre stances are just some of the features that contribute to a strong impression of eeriness in the scene. As mentioned above, Coppola was adamant in his resolve to emphasize the fantastic element in the film, preferring unpredictable and sometimes awkward shots to more ‘readable’ images. The mise-en-scènes featuring the brides gathering round the baby exemplify this, with three very different frames alternating to depict this event: one of them from Jonathan’s viewpoint, another closing in on the action, and a more ‘aesthetic’ longer shot where the episode is (sub-)framed by red curtains in a manner strongly reminiscent of the stage. Thus compositionally there is a deliberate feeling of discontinuity at the rank of the mise-en-scène complex, not from a narrative perspective but rather visually. The aim does not seem to be disruption per se but to inject a dimension of eeriness, consistent with the subject, into the scene. Special effects, such as the count’s gliding entrance, sound effects, or in-camera effects, such as the penultimate shot of Dracula where the camera zooms
in on him while widening the lens, thus giving the impression that he is advancing threateningly towards Jonathan, substantiate this.

Despite this superficial discontinuity, the scene manages to cohere. This is partly due to the logical cause-effect relations within the narration, as was the case in the novel. But another semiotic resource used to hold the scene together is music. As O’Halloran points out: “The mise-en-scène complex is therefore construed by the nature of the setting and other structural elements which include the soundtrack” (118)

The soundtrack music, composed by Wojciech Kilar, has as its main title “a dark, spooky theme in A minor, in 4/4 time at a moderate tempo.” (Joslin, 114) This musical motif is associated with Dracula (and other vampires) and is heard twice before this particular scene; once in the prologue when Vlad goes to battle and then again in an early scene when Jonathan has just arrived at the castle and inadvertently provokes the count, who shows his menacing side for the first time. The theme is initiated with softer melodic variations when the vampire women appear at the beginning. Thus it cohesively carries into the next mise-en-scène complex articulating the sequence as a whole. When Dracula enters, however, the strings-only instrumentation switches from low to menacing high strings, while both rhythm and volume increase, delineating the transition towards the second part of the scene. The musical motif remains present throughout the scene, receding ominously into the background and into lower strings as the characters talk, then erupting forward in the same fashion as in the opening shots, taking over the scene completely as it ends.

Music is then used to simultaneously encompass the three metafunctions: compositionally, to link together the different shots in the scene but also the different scenes at the higher rank of sequence; representationally through the ‘Dracula’ musical motif, and modally to engage the viewer and mark a change in phase.
As to speech in the soundtrack, it appears to be a simplified but relatively faithful emulation of the novel, notwithstanding the fact that the characters, supposedly for the sake of verisimilitude, speak Romanian rather than English. As mentioned above, the issue of which language the historical figure of Vlad Tepes actually spoke is complex. Welsh took issue with Coppola’s simplification: “[Coppola’s] notion of authenticity was to have the characters set in his mythical “Romania” and speak in Romanian”. (168)

There are two notable changes in the dialogue. The first is Dracula’s first line ‘What is this, charlatans’. As the novel is constricted by its linear form, it is only natural that material and verbal processes cannot intermingle seamlessly, so the former are developed at the outset and onset while the latter coalesce with behavioural processes towards the centre of the passage. There are no such obstacles in multimodal texts, which allows Dracula to speak even as he motions the brides away, though what he says is not essential, as the absence of subtitles demonstrates.

The second change is more conspicuous. The dialogue in Stoker’s text is intriguing in this respect as Dracula says “Yes, I too can love; you yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so?” It is one of the rare instances in the novel, if not the only one, where vampirism is straightforwardly associated with love. Coppola hijacks this sentence to tie it in with his original premise that the Count is a creature born out of passionate love, not evil. In the novel the line is directed at the brides or, if arguing for a homoerotic reading of the passage (Schaffer), at Jonathan, since the count utters it after “looking at my [Jonathan’s] face attentively”. The line added in the movie is “And I shall love again”. This quite obviously refers to the reincarnation romance theme guiding Coppola’s movie. Intonation is used significantly to highlight the end-focus position of again, or in this case the Romanian ‘din nou’. It is preceded by a short pause which would seem to indicate a tone boundary and it carries both a heavily falling tone and a slight increase in volume, which concur to convey an
impression of finality. The threat that these words carry semantically and from the point of view of intonation is reinforced visually by a close-up on Dracula, which allows us to scrutinize his facial expression. His gaze pattern which at first seems lost in space refocuses on something below him to his right, which, as the reverse shot then shows us, is actually Jonathan. Thus the staring / speaking order is overturned between novel and film, prompting two very different cause-effect interpretations: Jonathan as the possible object of the count’s ‘appetite’ in the first, but simply as a vehicle for it in the latter.

In the novel, this excerpt stands as a cornerstone: suspicion and background terror suddenly transform into unbridled eroticism and full-fledged horror. Although it has its detractors, the scene in Coppola’s film can be said to successfully re-create the novel’s impact; it is consistently and emblematically cited by critics and scholars and generally vividly, if not necessarily fondly, remembered by its viewers. Holte sums it up thus: “The confrontation between Jonathan Harker and Dracula’s three ladies is perhaps the most effective ever filmed, combining terror and eroticism nearly unmatched in vampire film history.” (86)

2.8.3 Browning

Browning’s subdued version of the Brides scene stands starkly in contrast with Coppola’s but also with the novel, although it does reprise some of its motifs. As it begins, Harker has been left to himself by the count, who has just bid him goodnight. As he is seated he begins to feel faint, maybe as the result of something Dracula has spiked his wine with. There is a cut to a door opening and the brides coming forward at a leisurely pace in a foggy cloud. The

---

64 Again, the film has Renfield rather than Harker in this scene. For the sake of comparison and transferability the latter’s name is used here as before.
figures which they cut are strange and anachronistic as they wear long flowing robes with trains and move in an almost mechanical unified manner, but there is no hint either of sexuality or particular menace in their appearance. No wonder they were a disappointment to the hormonal teenage Coppola. Jonathan fails to notice them altogether as he rises to open a French window but is prevented from exiting by a bat flying before his face. This is intercut by a medium shot of the brides standing very still. Harker then collapses to the floor and the brides enter the frame, advancing upon him. The long take continues but as they reach him, Dracula appears behind the French door and makes his way in. With a single gesture of dismissal, he sends away the brides, who exit walking backwards. The wide shot is then narrowed by the camera zooming in on Dracula, effectively relegating the brides off-screen, as the vampire bends down on his prey. The scene fades to black just as Dracula approaches his neck.

There are two striking features to Browning’s scene. First, the fact that it is shot very widely and consists mainly of a fairly long take with few interrupting shots. Second, the fact that the soundtrack is devoid of any sound whatsoever: speech, music or sound effects. The combination of these two features is what makes the scene eerie and almost dreamlike in the first place. How deliberate this was on Browning’s part is difficult to fathom. Sound films were still taking their first steps when Dracula was made and the latter is widely known as the first talking horror film. Technological limitations can then go some way to explain the absence of sound here. Not to mention the economical argument that Universal may have wanted to keep the soundtrack simple to ease dubbing towards other languages and benefit from the lucrative foreign market.

However, taking the film as a whole into consideration, the scarcity of sound effects, especially those meant to startle the audience, is generally noticeable. Interestingly, many reviewers had commented on the heavy-handed (but effective) use of such techniques in the
Dracula stage production. Their absence or paucity in this version thus begs several questions. Was this a deliberate choice? To what degree? And if so which effect was the director striving for?

Spadoni has an interesting take on the question. He argues that these relatively silent passages served a unique aesthetic purpose: they created a singularly spooky atmosphere precisely because they re-introduced a certain degree of incorporeality into a medium that had become anchored into reality by the advent of sound. To him, the ghostly impact of film with its mimetic but not palpable two-dimensional moving images was dented by the use of sound, which dispelled their other-worldliness. Dispensing with sound was then a way to instil “tangible and delicious weirdness” (1) back into film, especially in this genre which warranted it.

But beyond this particular use (or rather non-use) of sound, there is another interesting facet to this scene. It has been established above that the corresponding passage in the novel is highly sexualised in an overt way which was unusual in the text at large. By comparison, this scene is remarkably chaste: whereas the brides are neither unattractive nor “monstrous” in any guise, they are almost a-sexual with no sense of the erotic or sensual in their demeanour. Their appearance is brief and what is glimpsed of them leaves no lasting impression, even their female forms are hidden within the folds of their flowing gowns.

Downplaying the scene’s sexual tension might well have been the result of production constraints. The film was released in 1931, just one year after the Hays code was officially introduced to Hollywood. A major studio such as Universal and an important producer such as Laemmle could not help but abide by the morality code’s restrictions, especially in terms of sexual content. This may account for the brides’ virginal and subdued depiction.

More unusual is Dracula’s attack on Harker. A seen above, Dracula was atypical by Gothic standards for introducing a male victim. The play, being set entirely in the West, did
not reprise this theme: the only victims were female. In the novel, Harker is certainly prey to the vampire’s terror as he is manipulated and held prisoner, but whether the latter actually feeds on him is not explicitly stated and has therefore remained a matter of –sometimes heated– debate. Many of the arguments have revolved around Dracula’s possessive claim “This man belongs to me”, which, if Stoker’s notes are to be believed, are exactly the words he heard in his dream.

Browning seems to have chosen which side he stands on: as Dracula bends down over Jonathan’s unconscious figure, there is no doubt as to what his purpose is. However, this is not shown explicitly here either, as the image fades to black. This omission and its purposes can be interpreted in many ways which may then be combined at will: fostering mystery, abiding by censorship and not including violent or perturbing content, preserving believability, limiting the cost of special effects, etc…. Hiding the attack can also be traced back to the dramatic tradition where stage effects had the vampire hide behind his cape to attack his victims. It would become a staple (cliché?) of vampire films to come as well: the Hammer productions, for instance, weren’t particularly shy about displaying gory attacks yet often relied on this device.

But this attack also serves an important purpose at the representational level in Browning’s version which it does not in the novel. In the film, it is Renfield, not Harker, who travels to Transylvania and who is thus bitten by the vampire. The mysterious telepathic connection which links the madman Renfield to the count is never quite explained in the novel. Here it is unequivocally accounted for as early as the next scene: aboard the Vesta which is taking them to England, a now-demented Renfield is in his “Master”’s thrall. The vampire’s attack has thus driven him mad and it is clear that he now “belongs” to the Count. Skal (“Audio”) however notes that the approved film script had Renfield being attacked by the brides rather than by Dracula. Whether the posterior change was a last-minute shooting
impulse or a deliberate omission in the initial script due to homoerotic overtones, it fits better within this version due to Renfield’s substitution of Harker.

Browning’s film, like Stoker’s novel for that matter, is split into two parts: the initial Transylvania section and the “parlour drama” which ensues and is much closer to the Deane / Balderston version. By having him travel abroad and succumb to the count, Renfield’s madness and connection are cleverly accounted for in an innovative way. But his inclusion into the second part of the film is less satisfactory as he never quite finds his place or function in the second part’s stage-like London microcosm.

2.8.4 Fisher

It is worth noting again that the Hammer productions being considered in this corpus do not follow the novel’s plot and themes straightforwardly although they include elements which can be traced back to them. The “brides” scene in the 1958 Horror of Dracula unusually carries distinct echoes of Stoker’s text.

Harker is not a young clerk but a vampire hunter (posing as a librarian), Van Helsing’s accomplice, travelling to castle Dracula to “forever end this man’s reign of terror”. Yet, if he is not naïve in taking the measure of the count, he is easily manipulated by the vampire woman supposedly held captive in the castle and who begs for his help to escape. In the scene under scrutiny she seeks refuge in his arms before biting him. The menace which she presents is once more introduced through the musical score and its use of high strings and heavy brass (clashing cymbals as he is bitten). The close-up on her face and “fanged” mouth changes abruptly to a wide shot of the whole room just as she bites and as Harker pushes her away. Dracula’s central figure is revealed in the door frame behind them to the accompaniment of an animal-like screech. Another cut shows him in close-up and the pretence at gentlemanly
normality which had characterized his introduction is violently shattered. The poised aristocrat has been replaced by a foul creature with goggling bloodshot eyes, fangs and blood dripping from his mouth. The transformation is radical and, if not unexpected, sudden enough. What could be another hiss as his mouth is seen widening is drowned out by the music and particularly the booming use of brass. Thus the modal level completes the representational level or is even given precedence over it here as the effect of non-diegetic music is preferred to instil fear rather than diegetic sound.

The next shot is wide as before and shows a surprisingly vivacious Dracula springing over the table to interrupt the "seduction": he heads for the bride and violently tosses her aside, as the formerly fixed camera pans to the left to accompany the movement. There is an alternation of medium shots: on Jonathan grabbing his neck, on the bride whose fiery gaze shows she hasn't submitted to the count and on Dracula expecting her attack. The shot then widens again, with a new perspective to include the expected action: first the bride bounces onto her master, then Jonathan comes to her rescue. Closer shots and countershots show their struggle and Dracula's eventual subjugation of both, although the bride's defeat is not shown but heard as an off-screen shriek (the mise-en-scène shows a supine and helpless Jonathan instead). The camera pans to show Dracula exiting with the unconscious bride in his arms, alternating with the powerless medium shots of Harker, who eventually passes out.

Despite the adjustments (notably the restriction of the three sisters to one), there are some evident connections to Stoker here; mainly in Dracula's interruption of the attack, thus asserting his territoriality over Harker or in the novelist's words "this man belongs to me". This however generates a few hitches from the point of view of logical cause-effect relationships with the rest of the story. How is Harker, who is supposedly experienced in vampires, taken in so easily by the bride? Why does he come to her aid against Dracula even after he has been bitten? Why does Dracula protect Harker from her and what exactly are his
intentions towards the “librarian”? This scene, closer to the original text than most of the film, does not fit quite seamlessly within the revisited script.

Echoes of Stoker can also be found in the semiotic choices displayed here. Most striking is the total absence of dialogue supplemented instead by the overwhelming use of music. The score is in fact used to two distinct effects: to underscore the dynamicity of the action and to startle or provoke fear and/or disgust (terror and/or horror). Thus music takes over from what Stoker had expressed through language at the experiential level by the use of material processes and at the interpersonal level through person selection and appraisal motifs.

Like Coppola, although in a less extreme fashion (no high angles, no close-ups), Fisher also uses framing through three medium shots of Jonathan lying on the ground to depict his helplessness and relative passivity in the scene, especially towards the end. But if certain aspects of Stoker have been reprised in this scene, others are less apparent notably the erotic dimension. There is of course an element of the seductive in this scene through the portrayal of the “damsel in distress”; there is nothing like a seemingly needy woman to stimulate a man’s virility and his need to protect and, thereby, possess. Her low-cut and curve-emphasizing dress certainly also seems to fit the typical “vamp” bill. But she shows little of the bleary-eyed sensuality that the characters of Mina and Lucy will display after Dracula’s attacks later in the movie.

2.8.5 Maddin

There are brides but no “brides scene” per se in Maddin’s version since the word scene would probably not cover the glimpses we get of the vampire women; but the context in which they appear is worth developing since it offers insight into what became of the novel’s
Transylvania section in the film. As explained above, Maddin chose a very different structural path from the novel’s narration, mostly due to choreographer Mark Godden’s organisation of the story into three ballet acts. In acts one and three, Dracula’s menace is mediated through the figures of Lucy and Mina and these two women are given precedence, both from a quantitative and qualitative perspective, over the male characters. Themes of seduction and sexual possession which are dear to Maddin are also expanded through these characters’ interaction with the vampire and the vampire hunters.

Act two of the ballet has a different structure altogether, consisting of two distinct parts. The first is a slapstick précis summarizing the action thus far, focusing especially on Jonathan’s travels to Transylvania and relying not only on dancing but also on acting and miming. Part two returns to traditional ballet but with a more expressionistic, less narrative-driven turn; it displays different atmospherical scenes of vampire life at castle Dracula.

Maddin’s version distances itself from the ballet here: whereas he interferes little with acts one and three, he deletes act two almost entirely, reducing it to one minute and twelve seconds of film. One of his arguments for doing so was that he wanted to reassert narrative clarity, especially since the film was initially shot for television and therefore not only had to grasp the spectators’ attention, but also retain it and prevent them from changing channels. ("Conversations")

It is however singularly difficult to make out Maddin’s intentions based on his own comments and statements, especially in the case of Dracula. This movie stands out in his filmography as it was made-to-order rather than an entirely personal project. Critical reception of the work was generally full of praise, even or especially amongst specialists of Maddin’s work (e.g. Beard), but the director himself is fairly ambiguous about the film. Depending on his addressee he praises or pans Stoker, the ballet, vampire movies in general or the film itself. Furthermore this dynamic does not necessarily parallel official promotion of the movie.
versus critical or academic comment. Maddin has said: “Once I read the Bram Stoker original, I found out how cleverly and well and brilliantly written it is and how many things in the book have actually never been treated properly in any of the movie versions” (“CBC”).

But also: “I really didn’t like the style [of Stoker’s novel]. It’s boring and I only ever read the first half of it, but it was enough for me to get what the book was really about.” (“Conversations, 255”)

Or on ballet: “Dance probably gave me some necessary distance because I would never have been talked into it if it was just another adaptation.” (“Pleasures”, 20)

But also: “It’s Dracula as a ballet. Don’t worry, I don’t think it’s a very good idea either, but it paid me a good salary.” (White)

Another such example would be the fact that he claims not to be a fan of vampire movies, yet makes almost explicit references to them in this film (for instance the glass coffin in which Lucy’s mother lies to rest which has been directly hijacked from Coppola P268.1 / P268.2). One might be tempted to retort that his allusions to other vampire films were just part of his background research on the movie but a glance at his video collection in 2000 (three years before the film’s release) shows that it already included both Browning’s and Fisher’s versions (Holm). Maddin, ever the post-modernist, frequently (deliberately?) contradicts himself, and steers clear from any immutable view on his work, leaving the field of interpretation and discussion wide open.

The condensation of the second act into the “précis” sees the already fast pace accelerate even further. In under two minutes of film, 64 different shots are exposed, pieced together by cuts and dissolves. The average shot length drops to 1.1 seconds per shot, even though the sequence includes quite a few (ten) title cards.

Scholars (Church, Pribisic) have contended that editor and co-director of this movie Deco Dawson was a big influence on Maddin, especially in the editing style. Dawson, a
former student of Maddin's, was fascinated by the frenetic montage of Soviet filmmakers, Eisenstein in particular, and used both older cinematic techniques (such as super-8 film) and recent digital techniques (micro-montage for sound, computerized enhancement of images) to achieve similar effects. Nathan Lee, in the New York Sun takes this connection and its implications one step further as he states that Dracula resembles something “edited by Eisenstein on a cocaine binge”, a line which features prominently in the film’s promotional material.

In this particular sequence, Soviet montage, with its clashes and symbolic portent and more conventional time- and action-condensing Hollywood montage come together. The chronology of the précis, compared to the action it condenses in the novel, is a bit strange. It seems as though at times Maddin and Dawson, and sometimes even Godden, were more interested in the rhythm of the film as a whole than in being completely consistent with its particulars.

In this sequence, Harker is seen taking his leave from Mina, travelling to his destination, and arriving at the castle where he is simultaneously introduced to Dracula and the brides. They attempt to attack him and are repelled by Dracula, as per Stoker minus the erotic anticipation. The wide shot cuts to Dracula in medium close-up, holding up a bag through which the silhouette of a baby can clearly be made out. A caption is superimposed onto the image and reads “Infants for supper?” He then tosses the bag and its contents to the brides who dash for it. The counter shot of Jonathan’s reaction is too fast to be revealing, and is followed by Dracula dramatically spreading his cape as if to provide the transition to the rest of the scene.

It is at this stage that the chronology becomes a bit muddled and the narrative cause-effect relations’ verisimilitude is put under pressure. After the brides’ attack, an amazingly unfazed Harker sits down at Dracula’s table and business resumes, as if nothing out of the
usual had just taken place. Later the brides will reappear in the sequence, attacking Harker once again. The scene is at its most hectic then with shots of such short duration that they verge on the imperceptible or subliminal, blurry visual effects such as quick dissolves, play on lights and shadows, etc... Jonathan is not rescued this time and makes his own escape. This second appearance of the brides is framed ironically by two intertitles: “Vampyr harem!” as they target their prey, and in the midst of the hysterical attack which looks anything but pleasurable for Jonathan, in capitals and large bold font “FLESHPOTS!” The almost flippant tone of these intertitles deliberately contrasts with the conservative Victorian background of the story and the deceptively traditional-looking footage.

Montage sequences are generally used in conjunction with continuity editing to advance a film’s plot by compressing it. This may be part of Maddin’s aim but he draws equally on the Soviet view of montage as dialectal conflict. Some of the shots that he uses here are referential rather than representational, both visually and linguistically. In fact, allusions may at times seem to obscure the story’s logical progression. It can be surmised that a viewer who is unfamiliar with the particulars of Stoker’s text and/or previous versions would have problems following the narrative drift here.

Sanders’ comments on the pleasurable dimension of intertextuality spring to mind once more here as Maddin produces pure tongue-in-cheek allusions, to Stoker of course but also to criticism of the text and other film versions. Maddin’s ambiguity towards his knowledge / understanding of the subject and its ramifications has been noted above. The “infants for supper?” caption is a prime example of this intertextual play. In the novel, the contents of the bag are simply alluded to and/or guessed; in typically Gothic fashion, the implication of horror is sufficient or even superior to its mention:

She pointed to the bag which he had thrown upon the floor, and which moved as though there were some living thing within it. For answer he nodded his head. One of
the women jumped forward and opened it. If my ears did not deceive me there was a
gasp and a low wail, as of a half smothered child. The women closed round, whilst I
was aghast with horror. But as I looked, they disappeared, and with them the dreadful
bag.

The text remains cautious with its use of comparatives and conditionals. This has
allowed revisionist versions of the novel to cancel the horrific taboo which Stoker alludes to.
Saberhagen, who consistently comes back to the original text but from Dracula’s perspective,
simply states that the bag contained “the relatively poor results of my foraging expedition – a
rather lean pig offered up to me by a peasant woman in hopes of my doing, in return, some
damnable evil upon one of her rivals in love.” (34) Harker then mistakes the pig’s squeals for
human cries.

Few versions have included this child sacrifice as the societal taboo on harming
children seems to have prevailed even fictionally. The BBC’s 1977 television adaptation,
starring Louis Jourdan as Dracula, was the first to explicitly feature it. In this corpus,
excepting Maddin, only Badham’s (P271) and Coppola’s versions include it; the former in
passing (and not linked to the brides but to Lucy’s vampire attacks on children, the “bloofer
lady” episode) and the latter much more blatantly. It therefore stands to reason that Maddin
was alluding to his most direct predecessor, Coppola, as much as to Stoker. The offhand
manner whereby Maddin structures the caption contrasts starkly with its semantic dimension,
the consumption of human (children’s) flesh is reduced to a menu suggestion, giving it
grotesque rather than horrific implications.

Similarly, when he intercuts scenes of Dracula peering over Harker’s shoulders and
drawn towards his neck with the title card “A manly temptation?”, he is steering away from
the novel (in which it is Harker’s blood which attracts Dracula) towards the metatextual
critical readings which saw homoerotic overtones in the text.
Maddin’s treatment of the novel’s first part and the ballet’s second act (brides scene included) is another telling example of the postmodern: through the use of allusions and pastiche it combines the referential and the irreverent.

2.9 Fragmentation (form and content)

Now that many of the book’s and films’ themes and motifs have been introduced through analysis of scenes corresponding to the novel’s first section, i.e. the now familiar Transylvania chapters, it remains to be seen how the multimodal texts deal with the more deconstructed second part. Before looking closely at three more pivotal scenes which the novel presents and how (if) they have been dealt with in the filmic corpus, a detour will then be taken to examine the “fragmented” novelistic structure and its equivalents. This interlude will be presented in strictly chronological order: Coppola’s film will then not be fronted here but re-introduced at its sequential fifth place. The contextual environment, especially in terms of the movies’ date of production / release was deemed an important feature in the global perspective considered here. To gauge the evolution of the representation of fragmentation on screen, a progressive approach was therefore preferred in this section. As the more punctual analyses resume later, Bram Stoker’s Dracula will reoccupy its opening position.

In the novel’s second part, Jonathan’s first-person perspective is abandoned and different writers/speakers provide the reader with sufficient threads to weave the narrative together. By gaining access to all the different subjectivities and the selective information at their disposal, the reader is in fact in a privileged position, one which the characters themselves are trying to reproduce as it is their common knowledge which will ultimately enable them to destroy the enemy.
As has been mentioned above, voices in this second part of the novel vary not only according to the shifts in characters but also in the modes of telling. Structuring his writing thus, Stoker brought together tradition and ambition: tradition through the use of framing devices which were a typically Gothic strategy and ambition through the scope and variety of these devices which were unseen in the genre and more typical of mystery writers (such as Stoker’s contemporary Wilkie Collins). Dracula’s structure is part and parcel of its story and, although it may appear excessively crafty, confusing or heavy-handed at times, it certainly contributed greatly to the novel’s success and permanence.

Interestingly, the novel’s structure with its properties and their manoeuvring is strictly monomodal: all these effects are the result of the manipulation of language only. Since it appears in written form, it does of course include such features as visual layout and organisation (into diary entries, letters, telegrams, newspaper cuttings, etc.); but the emphasis remains primarily linguistic. Has it then been a concern of multimodal films to attempt to reflect this structure in their adaptation(s) and if so, what semiotic material did they choose to achieve similar effects?

2.9.1 Murnau

Nosferatu being a silent film, one obviously does not expect its primary focus to be linguistic. But paradoxically, the fact that silent films have to rely on written text in their intertitles to express elements of the story or dialogue creates an instant connection to the written form of the novel. And it is certainly something which Murnau and scriptwriter Galeen used to their advantage, or maybe disadvantage since the connection to the novel was felt to be obvious.

---

65 On a more personal note, as was mentioned in the introduction, it was also a decisive factor in the selection of the corpus to be examined in the scope of this thesis.
and Florence Stoker would inexorably (and eventually successfully) pursue the film with her wrath for copyright infringement.

Even as it steers away from Stoker, and precisely by attempting to do so, Nosferatu roots itself firmly in the Gothic framing tradition by changing (disguising) the setting and making it more palpable to its audience. Murnau opens with a shot of a manuscript with beautiful calligraphy titled “A Chronicle of the Great Death of Wisborg in the year 1838 A.D.” (P274), whose pages are actually turned (by an invisible hand) to introduce the threat of Nosferatu. The manuscript is written in the first person and although the author’s identity remains unrevealed it nevertheless serves its purpose well: to anchor the story in a concrete time (mid-nineteenth century) and place (fictional but obviously Germanic Wisborg) and give it credence through the use of a subjective narration. This pseudo-historical grounding is a device which can be traced right back to Walpole. Through its use, Murnau also introduces the theme of the plague, an innovative and effective thematic take on the original.

The Wisborg chronicle is the most pervasive written document in the film, thus creating an interesting contrast with the novel: whereas Stoker relied on the text’s fragmentation to craft his story, Murnau uses his book as a unifying instrument, bridging together segments of the story, providing additional information or supplementing the Gothic atmosphere etc.

But Murnau also borrowed other elements from the novel’s structure and integrated them into his film. As previously stated, it is difficult to separate the novel’s plot from its structure as the latter shapes the former; it seems as though Murnau was equally incapable of taking his distances completely although his use of varied written materials is often more ornamental than instrumental to the plot.

The first such instance is the letter which Harker’s employer receives from Dracula. In this version, Knock is the vampire’s accomplice and can therefore be construed as an
equivalent of the madman Renfield, especially given his erratic behaviour. The letter is clearly displayed and is seen to include all kinds of undecipherable cabalistic signs rather than regular handwriting (P275.1). This document immediately conveys different meanings both representationally and modally. Knock/Renfield is different and in the know of some mysterious manner of communicating, implicitly with different, mysterious others. The cabalistic signs themselves add a sort of eerie symbolic dimension; although there is hardly time to take them in distinctly, one may glimpse such awe-inspiring mystical symbols as witch-like circles, triangles, wheels, grids or an ominous skull. Compositionally, it will also serve as an overarching linking device in the later scene in which Dracula reads Knock/Renfield’s response, written in the same style.

Then there is the little book of vampires or “Vampires, Frightening Phantoms, Magic and the Seven Capital Sins” which Harker finds in his room at the inn on his way to the castle. When it is introduced it is first presented in Harker’s hands before a close-up in the form of an intertitle displays it as a manuscript (P275.2), much like the Wisborg document. So the book may be said to stand askance the diegetic and non-diegetic worlds since it belongs to the first yet is depicted using the conventions of the second.

This is a strategy which Murnau will use throughout the film, systematically including ‘real’ documents which he then extracts from the mise-en-scenes themselves and frames as intertitles, using them to advance the narration and convey important (or at times less relevant) elements of information. Other examples will be the shipping documents which allow Dracula’s transport to Wisborg (a real close-up, with Iris effect, taken from the film as the hand holding the document demonstrates) (P275.3), the newspaper article on the plague’s advance which Knock reads (P275.4), the Ship’s log book (P275.5) and the official plague announcement (P275.6).
The little book’s old-fashioned style reinforces the impression of authenticity, even though it passes on only obscure meanings and no truly informative content when it is first shown. Like the letter it will re-surface on several later occasions to provide more helpful information, information which will eventually lead to the Count’s demise. Its recurrence will also help unify the film compositionally.

The epistolary dimension of the novel is also alluded to through Jonathan’s writing to Mina, the letter’s content is once again presented through title cards (P276), although what it mentions is of little portent other than ascribing the bites on his neck to mosquitoes. The cards are interspersed with images of the letter’s production: Jonathan in medium shot impractically writing it atop a castle tower. Once again, the letter will re-emerge later on (identical shots) and complete the writing dynamic by showing its reception: Mina discovering it.

It then appears that, although unacknowledged, Dracula was certainly an inspiration not only for Nosferatu’s content but definitely for its form as well; or in Mc Farlane’s terms, on the enunciated and enunciation. The fragmented structure of the novel has been re-integrated into the filmic text and found particularly suitable to the constraints of the silent movie. Thus Murnau’s multimodal text has reclaimed the possibilities, especially in terms of flexibility, which the written medium offered and used them as one track within his composition to much the same effect.

What makes this use of integrated written documents as intertitles doubly effective is the fact that it falls perfectly in line with the Gothic “framing” tradition. Thus a link of genre, beyond the format, is created between literary and filmic texts. This is all the more relevant in the case of Nosferatu; the film having been made in the early days of cinema in general, when there were no generic conventions to the rare horror films produced.
Browning's film was one of the first talkies to try its hand at the horror genre. It was shot in the aftermath of the success encountered by the Deane-Balderston stage version but rights to the novel had also been secured; how pervasive its influence was in terms of structure should therefore also be examined here.

The film opens with a young lady reading a guide book out loud in the carriage which is taking Harker to his destination. This is actually a sign of what is to be expected in this production. Producer Laemmle's aim was to use sound to a new and different aim: making a scary movie. He thereby hoped to turn around Universal's dwindling fortunes and to make a popular, high-grossing production on the model of the play's success. This was a talking film, a commercially but not artistically ambitious production which did not aim to be "faithful" to any original in any way.

One shouldn't forget that at the time, 1931, *Dracula* was not a classic or even a particularly respected piece of writing. It was just a popular and surprisingly successful story, whose rights were ferociously protected by the widow who owned them. Neither was the notion of "fidelity" in adaptation a particular concern in those days. Links to the book, to its structure, to writing in general were therefore mostly severed and an oral style, with spoken language used to explain and develop plot elements, was favoured instead.

As pointed out above, more surprising is the paucity of sound effects (or even music) particularly to startle the audience or create tension. This could be ascribed to the novelty of the sound format and unawareness of the possibilities of aural tracks beyond the spoken word or of how to manage their interaction. It could be countered that the stage had already demonstrated the richness of these possibilities: the play was full of booming sound effects, just waiting to be transferred onto film. Others have therefore argued that Browning's reliance
on speech in an otherwise fairly quiet aural background was deliberate and in itself an effect
generating its own meanings and interpretations. (Spadoni)

Whatever the reason, the dominance of speech seems to have been at the expense of
written documents, which, unlike in Nosferatu, are hardly displayed at all. There are a few
uses of intertitles, (P278.1) most of which could be considered redundant: Dracula has already
stated “I have chartered a ship to take us to England. We will be leaving tomorrow evening”
when the viewers are presented with a ship caught in a storm and a superimposed caption
which reads “Aboard the Vesta... bound for England”. There is one clear reminder of the
novel’s fragmented structure which is also reminiscent of (inspired by?) Nosferatu. Once the
Vesta has arrived in London, the decimation of the ship’s crew and the discovery of mad
stowaway Renfield are explained through intertitles which take the shape of newspaper
articles (P278.2).

At the compositional level, the purpose of these title cards is clearly connective,
serving to link the initial section and the character of Renfield especially, to the action in
London. It is probable that they were not part of the initial script but inserted during the
editing phase to clarify matters that had already been stated, less plainly, elsewhere.

There is another use of press cuttings later in the film, but this time its meanings carry
more weight at the representational level as they introduce a subplot, which will be dropped
almost as quickly thus prompting qualms as to its general relevance. It is noteworthy that the
information presented in the film by the two articles is presented in exactly the same form in
the novel: Stoker uses newspaper cuttings only three times (two of which are reprised here) in
the whole novel, alongside twelve other “narrative voices”.

But the difference in scope and intention between the two texts is also palpable. In
Browning’s film, Martin, the asylum watchman, is shown reading an excerpt to the rest of the
help (P278.3) which develops the “bloofer lady” story, i.e. vampire Lucy attacking young
children. As for the young girl reading out loud in the initial carriage scene, the allusion to the novel’s fragmentation and its gothic overtones are adapted, and to a certain extent downplayed in the process, to the new medium of sound film.

Stoker’s fake article from the Westminster Gazette cleverly emulated the somewhat satirical journalistic tone of its time and initially made light of the event. It is only in a follow-up article that “A Hampstead Mystery” is upgraded to “The Hampstead Horror”, in which lexical variation, along with the shift of articles, marks the progression of fear. The author was of course extremely knowledgeable about this particular style, having abundantly practised it himself in his reviews for the Dublin Mail. Stoker even indulges in a little private joke here as he writes:

A correspondent writes us that to see some of the tiny tots pretending to be the "bloofer lady" is supremely funny . . . [he] naively says that even Ellen Terry could not be so winningly attractive as some of these grubby-faced little children pretend, and even imagine themselves, to be.

Ellen Terry, one of the main actresses of her day, was also Henry Irving’s leading lady and long-time mistress and thus a close acquaintance of Stoker’s.

Browning’s article is of course much more succinct and pragmatic:

Several attacks on small children committed after dark by the mysterious woman in white took place last night. Narratives of two small girls, each child describing a "bootiful lady in white" who promised her chocolates, enticed her to a secluded spot, and there bit her slightly in the throat.

Although Browning’s film went back to the novel as to plot, especially in the opening scenes, it can be said to have relied on its own devices, or maybe sought more straightforward inspiration from the dramatic version, as to shaping of the story. The use of speech to explain and develop the story is preponderant, consistently with its status of early talkie. Nor does the
film rely on more visual cues to relay a filmic equivalent to the novel’s monomodal type of fragmentation, as will be seen below, most notably in the cases of Coppola and Maddin.

2.9.3 Fisher

When Hammer Horror productions decided to tackle the Dracula myth, the vampire was already a popular iconic figure within his genre; what was now required was for him to step out of Lugosi’s overbearing shadow. As has already been pointed out above, scriptwriter Jimmy Sangster had no qualms about exploiting and reshaping the novel’s content to suit this purpose, mostly by re-defining the characters, their relationships and motives. Neither would he hesitate to seek inspiration from the book’s form to give his new narrative a matching shape.

Right from the outset, this agenda can be read in the credits sequence. There is no mistaking the film’s lineage: images of a gothic castle, overlaid with red Gothic script and set to dramatic, faintly Wagnerian, musical chords are presented before moving into the crypt which prominently displays a stone coffin engraved with the name Dracula. As the camera zooms in on the name, blurring away the surroundings and making it modally central, vivid red blood begins to splatter it (P280). As Auerbach mentioned, the blood’s (off-screen) source is indeterminate, and it is unsure whether it should be linked to the representational or the symbolic level or indeed both: “Is Christopher Lee splashing his own coffin as he comes home from a kill? Or does his presence inside the coffin magically attract any blood around? Logic is nonexistent. It doesn’t finally matter whose blood we are watching, since it looks so good (“Vampires”, 390)66.

66 Another author who has commented on the metafilmic implications of the credits scene is Ménégaldo.
What is made apparent in this sequence is where the movie comes from and where it intends to go. The fact that Dracula’s name is sufficient to “conjure up” blood demonstrates the iconic status which the vampire now holds, and the unmistakable associations which are to be expected at the bare mention/display of his name. At the same time, Hammer Horror puts its distinctive stamp on the story by splattering the name with its trademark bright-red blood. Hammer’s main innovation and distinctive feature from its predecessors, and particularly from Browning’s already cult version, was its use of colour. Whereas Browning’s fresh take on the myth was the bringing of sound, Fisher had colour and, in this case, colour might as well stand for blood red. The pivotal role of blood in the story, not only instrumentally but symbolically, was finally to be given its deserved scope.

Obviously, critical interest in the novel at the date of the movie’s release was not yet developed, and the centrality of blood and its associations was still to take centre stage. One might even wonder to what extent “bloody” visual representations such as this one contributed to these subsequent readings and the preponderance of the theme. By splashing it onto the screen before the story warranted it (or had even properly begun), Fisher was also making the Hammer agenda explicit: coyness and indirect allusions were no longer the order of the day. The movie would present full-blown uncut horror, no holds barred and blood-splatters included.

Within the corpus chosen here, visual representations of blood are in fact relatively (surprisingly?) scarce: virtually absent from Murnau and Browning’s films, fashionably re-appropriated by the Hammer productions, only to recede again with Badham. The two more recent productions in the corpus are more notable and will warrant further development. Maddin’s references to blood will be mainly symbolic and underlined by his use of red colorization within the black and white photography. Coppola, as with everything else, will
take it to the extreme, abundantly using blood not only referentially and symbolically but also aesthetically: exit the splatters, enter the sea of blood.

As the story proper begins after the credits, the inspiration of Stoker’s structure is immediately present. The first shot displays a diary and introduces the audience to its owner both visually as the name appears handwritten on its frontispiece (P282.1) and aurally as a male voice, Jonathan’s, takes over the narration. This framing technique allows the shift from written language to spoken language, more appropriate to film. Thus, like Mumau and Browning before him but as will be seen below rather more systematically, Fisher alludes to the novel but also to the wider Gothic tradition of the framing narrative. But whereas Browning either let the cards do the talking or had his characters read out the documents within the diegesis, Fisher relied on voice-overs to bridge the possible gap between the written and spoken mediums, or the transition towards the multimodal mode of film. The diary’s red leather binding is very distinctive, making it easy to identify (P282.2) and the prop will accordingly be used as a linking, and at times even instrumental, device throughout the rest of the film: it will provide Van Helsing with information about Harker’s fate and will help convince the Holmwoods of Dracula’s existence and menace.

Fisher also uses the format of the diary and the voice-over narration to introduce an early twist plot, especially interesting intertextually if the viewer is familiar with the novel and its characters. In this version, Harker willingly travels to castle Dracula, not as an estate clerk, but as a librarian. The film’s opening scenes, including the text of the voice-over, support this version and it is not until Harker is locked up in his room and bringing his diary up to date that his true mission is revealed: he is a vampire hunter, very much aware of his host’s true nature, and come to Transylvania to destroy the count. It is then via the diary, and the audience’s access to it through Jonathan’s voice-over, that light is shed on Harker and especially on the Count, invalidating the gentlemanly image conveyed in the introductory
scene but correlating instead with the blood-spattered warning of the credits and the menace implicit in the previous scene's musical score.

Despite the narrative cause-effect importance of the diary-writing scene, or maybe precisely because of it, the scene is awkward and somewhat unnatural in an action-driven story, with Harker pausing and purposefully pondering each sentence (P283.1) before writing it down for the viewers to see/hear. A similar sequence will recur later in the film, with Harker writing/explaining the implications of the vampire's bite on him but its ungainliness, in this case, is more rapidly lifted, as the voice-over carries over to the next shot in which he sets off to destroy his host.

Harker's diary is the most striking example of Fisher's appropriations of the novel's fragmentation but by no means the only one. In fact the director is particularly fond of introducing all kinds of documents: books, official documents and letters. Some are instrumental to the plot: a note is used to justify Dracula's initial absence from the castle (P283.2), to find where Dracula is hiding the reduced band of heroes (Van Helsing and Holmwood) use the records of transport authorities (P283.3). Still at the representational level, others focus more on the logical cause-effect relations holding the story together: Van Helsing traces Harker back to the castle thanks to a letter he receives (P283.4) then peruses the diary to fill the gaps in his knowledge; the montage-like editing makes this implicit. Van Helsing is seen flipping through the pages then the shot dissolves into the next one (P283.5) showing him galloping rapidly to the castle, with the rhythm of the action underlined by fast-paced music.

Fisher's reliance on these devices to piece together his story therefore also plays an important compositional role: these recurring documents unify the story and serve as a kind of red thread to guide the viewers through the meanders of the narrative, all the while vouchsafing its credibility.
Although it is peripheral to the novel's fragmentation, there is another thematic aspect of the book which Fisher has noticeably responded to and attempted to emulate on the screen, namely Stoker's concern for modernity and technology. As has been noted above, Stoker's contemporary setting for the action of his novel was unusual within the Gothic tradition, as was the polarity which he created between the dark mystical forces of the ancient world and the guiding lights of the technologically advanced crusaders fighting them. Stoker was therefore intent on introducing all kinds of technological gimmicks into his novel, most of which also had an important functional role to play in the story: the blood transfusions, the secret diary keeping in shorthand, the type-written manuscripts which would facilitate the spread of information, etc.

Fisher also chose to integrate some of these into his film, although to a markedly different effect. One of the "charms" of the Hammer productions was in the contrast between the old-fashioned upper-class rigidity of their protagonists and the gory unrefined fate they were often subjected to. Set in Victorian/Edwardian times and abiding by some of its codes but with the perspective and awareness of its release date, the film uses these allusions to technology effectively when they are seamlessly integrated into the setting/props/story (as is the case of the blood transfusions and their intricate apparatus) but loses some of its impact and credibility when it dwells unnecessarily on the novelty of the devices. A telling instance of this kind is when Van Helsing is listening to a recording of himself on the phonograph and is interrupted by a bemused manservant walking in and surprised to find no other person there, the point is further driven through as Van Helsing is then shown recording himself.

One may, for instance, consider the more negative dimension given to technology, as interfering with the natural course of life and generating unmitigated disaster, in Dracula's illustrious Gothic predecessor Frankenstein.
In the novel, it was of course Seward, not Van Helsing, who used the phonograph to record a spoken diary. The overly structured “written” and sometimes emotional/confessional tone of his speech has been commented on above. Here, by contrast, Van Helsing’s language is dry and pragmatic, matching the instrumental nature of the recorder. He uses ellipses or even pieced together phrases, structured enumerations and repetitions. Paradoxically, the end product resembles note-taking (the ultimate result) rather than speech:


The general effect is rather obsolete: the “quaintness” of the film, its setting and protagonists is thus reinforced rather than, or even contrary to, the novel’s plot-driven reliance on cutting-edge technology. This goes to demonstrate that the context of situation is inseparable from a comparative analysis and that attempts at “faithfulness” through reproduction are misplaced and illusory.

2.9.4 Badham

Like the play that it is based on, and like Browning’s film before it, Badham’s version holds very few allusions to the structure and fragmentation of Stoker’s text. Instead, as would be expected from a dramatic derivation, it offers a consistent unity of place (apart from the initial and final sea scenes, everything takes place in Carfax Asylum, Carfax Abbey and/or the grounds between them), unity of time (the chronological action is set over a short period of
time, no analepses or flash forwards and hardly any ellipses), and unity of action (mostly logical cause-effect links between the scenes, few alternations and parallel developments).

Some particulars of Stoker’s novel, beyond what was apparent in the Deane/Balderston version, and pertaining to the initial Transylvania chapters have been re-introduced here. Visually, the most striking example is the extremely Gothic aspect of Carfax Abbey which has been lifted from castle Dracula, from Transylvania to Whitby, from East to West. Two other additions from the book concern Dracula’s powers: his lizard-like capacity to scale down vertical walls (P286.1) and to take the shape of mist instead of human corporeality. However, these integrations rarely allude to the text’s fragmentation.

It seems clear that Badham had no wish either to pay homage to or to utilize the novel’s structure to any referential end, quite the contrary. Whenever a document comes to play an instrumental role in the plot (the ship’s log, for instance) it is briefly glimpsed, or alluded to rather than displayed. Another example would be the telegram which Seward sends to warn Van Helsing of Lucy’s death, which is not shown but heard dictated over the phone. A rare counterexample is to be found in a scene in which Van Helsing consults a book which, other than its aesthetic impression, has virtually no impact on the plot (P286.2).

Badham’s primary aim seems to have been to re-invent Dracula’s character, and to a certain extent his story and some of the characters around him. To that aim, no debts were felt to be due to the original novel; if anything the film’s allegiance lay instead with the dramatic version. On the whole, the impression which the film conveys is of a unified front, devoid of fragmentation or textual allusions but not necessarily made more effective by the process. The manner in which Badham has retained but diverted such memorable quotes of the Dracula tradition as “I never drink ... wine” or “children of the night” has been developed above and is part of the same individualistic momentum.
As with many adaptations from stage to screen, it is very likely that Badham was wary that his film would feel too enclosed, a flaw which many have argued the Browning version’s parlour drama second section suffered from. Badham uses two noticeable strategies to counter this effect. The first, more traditional, approach is simply to harness the beauty of the natural locations in which he shoots, staging many exterior scenes along the awe-inspiring windswept English coast. The second, more artificial, approach is to recreate the illusion of dynamic movement by including a surprisingly high number of shots with extremely diverse modes of transportation: horses, carriages, coaches, cars, trains ... there are even two “chases”. Most of these are not directly required by the plot but likely aim to instil a vigour typical of dynamic film as opposed to confined stage versions.

2.9.5 Coppola

As has been pointed out above, the fact that Coppola’s film was marketed under the title Bram Stoker’s Dracula and the pretence that it would abide by the novel sparked the wrath of some critics and particularly scholars who were familiar with the book. Coppola and scriptwriter Hart undeniably took liberties with the text both as to characterization and to plot; even though there was only one notable change, the inclusion of a consensual love story between the vampire and Mina, it was such a major shift that it subverted the story completely. But if that criticism may justifiably be targeted at the film, it falls very much within the “fidelity” tradition in adaptation theory and centres on the transformation of content or the enunciated over the changes in form or enunciation.

In accordance with more recent adaptation trends and the deconstructive possibilities offered by multimodal analysis, the analytical model which was chosen as a framework to the exploration of this corpus was deemed particularly relevant because it allowed the balance
between content/ enunciated and form/ enunciation to finally be redressed and for the latter to warrant equal consideration. From this perspective, it could be argued that Coppola’s title was aptly chosen indeed: if Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* is the epitome of the fragmented Gothic novel, then *Bram Stoker’s Dracula* has been crafted as the epitome of the fragmented Gothic film.

What Coppola has done here, with considerable help from his editing team (the three credited editors are Anna Goursand, Glen Scantlebury and Nicholas C. Smith), is not only to integrate a wealth of (fake) period documents in reference to the book but also to transform the fragmented echoes present in the novel into a filmic equivalent through the manipulation and multiplication of different tracks and cinematic techniques: voice-overs, parallel editing, superimpositions, dissolves, visual and aural motives, etc. Their abundance makes it difficult to be exhaustive but a few chosen illustrations and mentions should suffice to demonstrate their deliberate pervasiveness throughout the film.

The film opens with the much-debated historical prologue, which of course is not part of the novel and serves to link the novelistic Dracula to his alleged historical source of inspiration Vlad Tepes. Although it was new to the screen, this was not necessarily an original take: a popular trend had been sparked by the research conducted by McNally and Florescu and spread not only through their books (first published in 1972) but also through documentaries, such as the 1975 *In Search of Dracula* which cleverly starred Christopher Lee as its narrator. In Coppola and Hart’s case, it was also the perfect pretext to introduce their love story and particularly the theme of eternal love as exemplified by the reincarnation romance. The film’s promotional catchphrase, featuring prominently in trailers, posters etc. was “Love never dies”, sufficient in itself to justifiably irk all the Stoker purists.

But here again, this was not a completely novel approach: it had been in the offering for a while and distilled, to different degrees, into various productions. The Hammer Dracula can generally be considered as the last unequivocally “bad” Dracula, the subsequent
representations would always give the figure, if sometimes only slightly, a sympathetic dimension.

The 1973 television adaptation starring Jack Palance was directed by Dan Curtis, famous for creating the ABC vampire series *Dark Shadows*; the show served as inspiration for his first introducing a reincarnation romance theme between Dracula and Lucy. Curtis was also the first director to explicitly link Dracula to Vlad the Impaler. In 1975, Saberhagen published his revisionist *The Dracula Tape* in which the count gets to explain his side of the story and notably the consensual nature of his love affair with Mina. And in 1979, the romantic theme culminated with Langella’s stage and screen forlorn, romantic count.

Coppola’s cardinal sin was then probably not to exploit the historical connection, nor to include a romantic motif, but to do all this at once without renouncing, but rather enhancing, the horrific dimension of the tale and ascribing the whole thing to Stoker to boost! The “love it or loathe it” reactions which it generated, especially amongst Dracula scholars, attest to the undeniably overblown but startling nature of the end product.

Similar criticism has more rarely been directed at the film’s style; Joslin however stated:

Everything about *Bram Stoker’s Dracula* is overwrought and overblown. Wretched excess is the only aesthetic. It is filmed in a frenzied, would-be-fever-dream style replete with gimmicky dissolves and rapid-fire editing. This visual style is wildly inappropriate for an adaptation of a 19th-century novel. (109)

Whereas issue might well be taken with their abundance (possibly resulting in a feeling of “overkill”), what Joslin fails to notice is how appropriate these techniques are to this particular 19th century novel. Hopefully, this will be made apparent in the section below.

To return to the prologue, even though it does not belong to Stoker’s text, the framing device which contextualizes the rest of the story is in itself reminiscent of the Gothic tradition.
It is also a foretaste of the filmic fragmentation which is to come. The prologue already relies, as the rest of the film abundantly will, on several documents: a map, situating the action geographically (while the voice over situates it temporally) and two letters: the one which the Turks send to wrongfully announce Vlad’s death and Elisabeta’s suicide note. When Vlad retrieves the latter, the mise-en-scene presents a complex composition which is emblematic of Coppola’s attempts to echo the novel’s fragmentation. As Vlad reads the letter, Elisabeta’s voice is heard not once but twice as she begins in hushed Romanian and then her voice in English is superimposed more loudly onto it. Visually, another superimposition is taking place: over the letter, an image of the falling Elisabeta appears (P290.1). This embedding of visual and aural tracks and elements is typical of the filmic “fragmentation” which characterizes Coppola’s style in this production and whereas it does not necessarily refer straightforwardly to the original novel, it does to some extent compositionally reflect the effects of the pieced-together narrative.

Another example of this layered structure within the mise-en-scène, or in this case mise-en-scène complex is when Jonathan is travelling to Transylvania. In the novel, the trip is described in his diary; here the viewers see Jonathan travelling and writing, pages of his diary and the scenery, the voyage progressing (through maps); they hear Harker’s voiceover completing, or at times duplicating the picture(s). At one point Harker reads a letter sent by the count, the scene alternates between glimpses of the text, wider shots of the scenery, (extreme) close-ups on Jonathan or on the text of the letter. These shots match the soundtrack of Oldman’s voice over reading his letter, and therefore the reader’s –Jonathan’s- point of view. But beyond the representational, other devices are used to add symbolic layers to the scene: Dracula’s eyes are superimposed onto the scenery flashing outside (P290.2), ice-cold blue against the red setting sun, if not quite a menace yet at least an ominous presence.

Aurally, apart from Dracula’s voice two more tracks can be isolated: background music but
also faintly menacing, and apparently non-diegetic, sound effects resembling howling (wolves? wind?). These varied sensorial appeals carry out different meanings at the representational and modal level and also provide a compositional cohesion which carries across the film as a whole, but also beyond it to the original source novel.

These are but a few succinct illustrations of a consistent trend within the film, which arguably most scenes could convincingly exemplify. Rather than decompose other mise-en-scènes, some of the recurrent visual themes, props, motifs and techniques which Coppola uses will be grouped to be examined.

Like previous versions, Coppola relies on rather old-fashioned (by 1992) situational panels and subtitles (P291.1 / P291.2). In this case, however, the representational function which they serve to clarify plot progression is probably more useful than similar more traditional uses by Browning for instance. Since one of Coppola’s main techniques to reproduce the novel’s fragmentation is to continually shift the perspective and rely on multiple and parallel points of view or editing, some guidance as to where and when the action is taking place may no longer appear as redundant but rather useful or indeed necessary. But the director also uses other intra-diegetic means, such as signs visible within the frame, to perform an analogous function (P291.3). Beyond its utility, the referential nature of this device is also pointed to at moments in which it is superimposed with others: one scene for instance combines subtitles, a prop and voice-over, all to convey similar information (P291.4).

One of Coppola’s most obvious nods to Stoker’s novel and its structure is his systematic inclusion of the different modes of telling which the novel comprises: personal writing, correspondence and general documents. Whereas Fisher had used Harker’s diary as an explanatory red thread, Coppola takes matters one step further by referring to the book’s three main narrators and diary writers: not only does Jonathan write, so do Mina and Seward.
Whereas the novel’s proportional distribution is not reflected on screen, it is however undoubtedly a step towards its polyphonic echoes. Another way in which Coppola plays into Stoker’s configuration is by respecting, and giving viewers to see, the form which these journals took in the original. In initial scenes, Jonathan is seen writing on several occasions as his voice over then divulges the diary’s content (P292.1), later the voice over will take precedence and pages of the diary will be glimpsed as superimpositions (P292.2), then eventually the voice over will need no justification.

The same goes for Mina who is seen typing her journal; this again links up to the use of voice-over to illustrate her perspective (P292.3). The fact that, as in the novel, she uses a typewriter demonstrates that Coppola was keen on retaining other Stoker features such as the importance of technology, as will be further alluded to below. The director also uses the typewritten material to another end, which is interesting compositionally within the story, but also at a wider intertextual level. When Mina goes to join Jonathan in the Carpathians, thus relinquishing her prince, parallel editing shows him reading her goodbye letter which is stained by his tears (P292.4). The next shot is of the typewritten pages from Mina’s diary retracing their love story (P292.5) similarly stained by water as she gets rid of them by throwing them overboard. Compositionally, the two perspectives echo each other, not only because of their reversed standpoints but also through their common symbolic use of water to “erase” the documents or their contents. But the scene can also be construed as an intertextual justification that the love story between them is absent from Stoker’s novel since the documents relating it were destroyed. Given the degree of referentiality which Coppola

---

Section 2.2.2.2 had already mentioned that the novel’s main voice is in fact Seward’s, and that his status as a secondary character is due partly to the minor role he plays but also to the fact that he “speaks” for Van Helsing and Renfield more than he does for himself.
demonstrates throughout the film, this interpretation which might appear far-fetched really seems to make sense in view of the whole.

Seward's diary, spoken into a phonograph, is like the others close to its representation in the novel; incidentally allowing Coppola to dispense for once with his heavy reliance on voice-overs since Seward can speak, and be heard, directly from within the story. That will only be the case initially, as a kind of establishing device; later scenes will have Seward talking with images of what he is talking about (rather than his talking) shown instead. Another voice over in effect, although the status of the recordings may still be alluded to indirectly. (P 293)

Voice overs are also used at moments in the film which are not linked to any character's diary. Sometimes they are justified through another written document, such as Sister Agatha's letter to Mina, but mostly they belong to Van Helsing and do not relate to any clear source or document.

In the prologue already, a narrator chronicles the tragic fates of Vlad and Elisabeta; his voice is unmistakably Hopkins' in Van Helsing mode as it features the character's Germanic inflexions and accent if not his idiosyncrasies. Van Helsing's character will of course not be introduced until much later in the story: almost an hour into the film the Dutchman actually introduces himself in voice over stating: "For the record, I do attest that at this point I Abraham Van Helsing became personally involved with these strange events."

The voice in the prologue therefore plays an ambiguous role in retrospect: on the one hand viewers cannot necessarily ascribe it to the yet absent vampire expert Van Helsing, but on the other, if they could and did, it would give credence to the additional non-Stoker material presented here. Van Helsing's later interventions in voice-over are consistent with the unfolding of the plot and the story's chronology. With one exception: when a younger Dracula emerges from a crate in Carfax Abbey, Van Helsing's voice is again heard before his
official introduction to justify that a vampire can move around in daylight. The line doesn’t quite match here and seems as though it was tagged on later, probably as a concession to the general (non-Stoker) assumption that daylight is fatal to vampires.

At the level of correspondence, as seen above, Coppola relies heavily on letters but also includes telegrams on a few occasions. Due to their shortness, he can dispense with speech and present these solely as written language (P294.1).

Other visual documents are also used pervasively: the Demeter’s log, documents of purchase (P294.2), books etc. One scene showing Van Helsing perusing a book on vampires (P294.3) takes an intertextual step further as the portrait it displays of Vlad Tepes is an engraving which is the only known representation of the real-life voivod (P294.4).

Newspaper cuttings are used once here but unlike with Browning for instance they are not used to indirectly convey new information but rather to substantiate aesthetically what has already been mentioned/shown: different newspapers are leafed through in close up, and only their headlines can be glimpsed (P294.5 / P294.6 / P294.7). The inclusion of the newspapers thus has a more atmospheric than informational role to play, as the scene which follows, but especially the manner in which it is filmed, will show.

The mise-en-scène in which the newspapers appear immediately contrasts with the previous sequence, visually and aurally. The compositional effect of discontinuity results from a shift in the type of the film and speed of projection. Heavy-grained film is used to age the images’ appearance and the speed of projection has been adjusted from the 24 frames per second standard to sound film, to overcranking reminiscent of early silent films projected at a higher speed (about 40 frames per second) and thus conveying an unnaturally fast effect to the whole. The soundtrack also includes the clatter and grinding consistent with the use of an older projector. The effect is obviously meant to refer back to the early days of cinema, which are in fact contemporary to the novel’s publication. Coppola embraced the theme of
technological awareness that was present in the novel. To mention just a few of these technological inclusions: the typewriter and phonograph, as seen above, but also medical devices such as the blood transfusing equipment (whose experimental nature Van Helsing comments on) or a microscope (P295) which shows blood cells in close up and thus gives additional visual anchoring to another theme dear to Coppola, i.e. (polluted) blood.

Coppola even included his individual touch through references to another technology, one close to his heart. Hopkins has mentioned that Stoker’s interest in technology was language-oriented and visually biased:

It has often been remarked that Dracula is a novel that is very interested in technology, but the technological innovations on which it focuses are primarily auditory or text-based . . . Stoker’s novel has little interest in the visual, and when it does focus on the visual, it does so primarily in order to concentrate on its failures and unreliability as a guide. (111)

Coppola might then have sought to redress this bias by introducing the historical connection to Cinema. Following the images of the newspapers, a crowd scene is shot in similar style before the contemporary feel returns to show the first encounter between Mina and Dracula. They decide to go and visit the Cinematograph. If consistent with the novel, the date of the action depicted and the invention of the cinematograph do not perfectly align but are close enough to understand why a filmmaker such as Coppola might have wanted to throw in the extra intertextual reference to the history of his art. The action depicted in the novel is generally deemed to have taken place somewhere between 1888 and 1893 at the latest; the first Cinematograph theatres did not open in London until 1896. Dracula however was first published in 1897. The dialogue which Mina and her Prince engage in shows the tongue-in-cheek nature of this allusion:

D: Astounding! There are no limits to science.
M: How can you call this science? Do you think Madame Curie would invite such comparisons?

Another insider’s joke is used in the same scene, although it would take more extensive than average knowledge of Stoker to spot it. In the crowd a human billboard walks by advertising for Hamlet starring Henry Irving at the Lyceum theatre (P296.1). Stoker’s connection to Irving and the Lyceum, and the actor’s supposedly “vampirising” influence on the writer and his creation have been mentioned above.

Not content with these innuendoes, Coppola adds a last cyclical allusion in the same scene. Inside the theatre, a shadow play is taking place in the background and shows Vlad’s battle against the Turks (P296.2), most likely the same stage effect that was used in the Prologue (P296.3). The issue is further complicated by the fact that the battle scenes in the prologue appear to have another intertextual reference. In their use of shadows and red background hues, they resemble Kurosawa’s Kagemusha (which translates as shadow warrior). Coppola obviously uses this reference quite deliberately, since he was an executive producer of the film. (P296.4 / P296.5). Thus the story of lovesick Vlad who lost his wife symbolically comes full circle as he meets Mina.

These examples with their different layers of meaning demonstrate Coppola’s determination to be referential in the extreme, not only to Stoker’s text but also to previous Dracula adaptations and even other artistic pieces or forms which have nothing to do with the vampire. Some scholars have argued that this is what makes the film quintessentially ‘end-of-century’ and postmodern. Bak, for instance lists some of the basic principles of postmodern theory such as they apply to Dracula but also to BSD: the ‘disappearance of the real’, intertextuality, ironic distanciation, artistic self-reflexivity, challenging the high/low art distinction, fragmentation and “bricolage” (xxi). This is a valid point to make for Coppola but
I would argue that all these features are even more vividly incarnated in Maddin’s film which represents the quintessential post-modern Dracula. (see below)

Whereas Stoker used only written documents to create his fragmented story, Coppola chose to extend the logic underlying this premise as he transferred it to film by adding more visual or hybrid (multimodal) documents, the most striking example of which is his use of maps. There are maps galore in BSD. (P297.1 to P297.3) and at the same time as they tie in with the fragmented/ pieced together feel of the film, they often serve other functions too (such as mentioned above, to illustrate Harker’s progression through the Carpathians).

In Transylvania, as Jonathan and Dracula close their estate deals, a map of London is apparent on the wall behind them. It turns dark as Dracula’s asynchronic shadow is projected onto it thus hinting at the darkness of his intentions and the threat he will pose to the inhabitants of the city (P297.4). But other than symbolically, maps also have a clear added value at the level of the representational metafunction. In the novel, when the band of heroes are chasing Dracula back to his “lair”, the race between them and their progression along different itineraries is convoluted and difficult to follow, mainly due to ignorance of the region and the impossibility to conjure up a visual representation. In the film, matters are immediately clarified and summarized by a map displaying the two distinct routes (P297.5).

Thus Coppola’s use of multimodal documents within the multimodal filmic text itself pays tribute to the original novel and its fragmented structure while at the same time using their varied expressive possibilities to their full extent.

But, not content with alluding to the novel or mimicking some of its devices, the director took matters further by reflecting on the possibilities of his medium to create a filmic equivalent to the novel’s fragmentation. As developed above, the use of voice overs was one means of creating a multivocality which would echo the novel’s. But Coppola also relied on
several cinematic techniques which would create a type of visual fragmentation consistent with the novel’s form.

Layered images, superimpositions and visual motifs abound. Dracula’s crest (P298.1), for instance, can be glimpsed throughout the film on costumes, settings and props and effectively reinforces the film’s visual cohesion. Yet it is more particularly through the use of editing that the director sought to emulate the type of parallel constructions which pieced together the novel.

Some scenes are linked together through aesthetic devices. As Jonathan departs for Transylvania, a peacock fans its train to hide his goodbye to Mina and the camera zooms onto an eye of the tail. Through a dissolve, the eye becomes the opening of a tunnel through which Jonathan’s train then exits (P298.2 to P298.4). While smoothened by the dissolve which plays on the (formal) similarities between them, the alternation between the two shots brings along a series of contrasts, the most striking of which is colour: the fresh blue-green hues of Hillingham give way to the stifling red tones of the Carpathians. Colour symbolism is a technique which Coppola uses consistently in the film; some characters have an associated colour or colours, whose link is made apparent through effects such as lighting, setting and particularly costumes: Dracula is red (and black), Mina is aqua, Lucy is orange etc. Cold colours are generally associated with the East and bolder warmer shades, more passionate but also more violent, with the West. Lisa Hopkins has commented on the way in which these colour codes gradually break down in the film and has used this as ground to argue that Coppola’s version does not consistently display the polarities which are typical of the Gothic genre and is therefore “only selectively and intermittently Gothic.”(105)

Examples of these aesthetic, thematic and/or symbolic dissolving cuts recur in the film: another has a close-up of Lucy’s wounded throat in which the two gaping pinpricks of the vampire’s teeth dissolve into a menacing wolf’s bright eyes (P298.5 to P298.7).
At other times, the link between shots is not just realised through affinities of shape, colour or overlapping sound but even through the mobility of the camera. Through parallel editing, the storm which brings Dracula to England is shown alongside Mina and Lucy playing in the Hillingham gardens and a wolf escaping from the London zoo. Not only does the soundtrack interweave the scenes, with sounds of crashing waves, howling wind and grunting animals intermingling as the shots alternate, but so do the camera movements. Having just shown the Demeter caught in violent storm, there is a cut to the girls running around the grounds, framed from above by a high-angle camera. The camera is not fixed but rapidly panning from left to right and back, thus effectively swaying, emulating the ship’s movements and continuing the impressions of the previous shot.

In another instance, the parallel editing stretches beyond a few shots to a whole sequence, in which two unfolding scenes echo one another and symbolically answer each other, almost shot per shot. Dracula avenges himself of Mina’s desertion on Lucy, perpetrating an attack which will prove fatal just as Mina weds Jonathan in Romania. The editing alternates between one scene and the other making the connections between them and the meanings to be drawn fairly explicit: Dracula condemns Lucy to lust for blood as Mina and Jonathan drink wine, the blood of Christ, in the orthodox ritual; as he bites her, they kiss etc...

The visual and/or editorial techniques which Coppola uses are not groundbreaking or even unseen and are furthermore consistent with his mostly flamboyant directorial style. But it is undeniable that there is an overabundance of these effects here which is anything but coincidental. Coupled with the extreme referentiality and allusions which are displayed not only towards its source text but also towards the latter’s metatext, the director’s aim to reinvent the novel’s fragmentation for the screen stands clear and arguably proud. Some might take issue with the surfeit of images, sounds, allusions and explicit or implicit meanings...
present in this production, and critics have often done so. But what cannot be denied is that Coppola’s endeavours to adapt not only the enunciated but also the enunciation take the formerly sterile “fidelity debate” into a whole new dimension and singularly illustrate the potentialities of multimodal texts to “make meanings in any and every sign, at any level, and in any mode.” (Kress and Van Leeuwen, Multimodal, 4)

2.9.6 Maddin

Maddin may not have been as intent as Coppola on devising a filmic fragmentation which could be equated with the novel’s, but he certainly set up an ambitious visual and referential agenda of his own.

Maddin’s ambiguity about his source materials, not only Stoker’s text but also Godden’s ballet, has been noted above but beyond the metatextual light which these interviews shed on the matter, it is also perceptible in the end product, i.e. the film. Although it functions as a harmonious whole, mainly due to its aesthetic cohesion, Dracula, Pages from a Virgin’s Diary may give the impression of a patchwork, disorienting through its variety of (sometimes contradictory) themes, allusions or tones. Mostly the pendulum oscillates between tradition and satire: Stoker is quoted faithfully one minute only to be distorted the next, the characters’ emotions are poignantly highlighted then ridiculed, dramatic tension gives way to slapstick comedy etc. Again, Maddin proves quite postmodern in his approach: through satirical de-centring he questions the (chronological, hierarchical and/or canonical) primacy of the source text.

This can already be perceived in his choice of (sub)title: Pages from a Virgin’s Diary. On the audio commentary to the DVD, the director states that he has no particular explanation to provide other than his interest in the word “virgin” which “is always fun.” Whose diary and
whose virginity is alluded to remains unclear; he later comments on the fact that the men in his version are more prudish and virginal than the sensual women he presents. Only two characters are explicitly depicted as diary writers: Jonathan and, more unusually, Lucy. Both are shown writing entries on one or two occasions (P301.1 / P301.2).

But the diary as physical object also features prominently as a prop in a later scene. When Jonathan and Mina are reunited in the Carpathians, she discovers his diary which includes his carnal encounters with the Brides. In the novel, Jonathan's entrusting of his diary to Mina and her initial reluctance to read it were symbolic of the blind trust and faith between husband and wife. Here, upon discovering its contents, Mina seems to experience curiosity and a certain amount of arousal. The pas de deux which they dance together is suggestively sensual on her part, but with the diary literally coming between them. In this scene, Maddin makes use of superimpositions in a manner which is reminiscent of Coppola, albeit in a faster more subliminal way: when Mina reads, the text of the diary is shown with her eyes superimposed onto it and followed by images of what the text mentions. (P301.3). The casting aside of the diary, which in this case seems to result more from Jonathan's fear of Mina's erotic awareness than a gesture of trust on her behalf, is symbolically represented by a scarf being tied around it.

The satiric vein which was already at play in the title continues as the film opens. As in an old-fashioned series, the characters are introduced through a “dramatis personae” presentation before the story proper begins. A series of stills present images of the characters along with their name and an indication of their function or the role they will come to play. These are accompanied by a metatextual reference as blood pours onto the background or an object meant to symbolize them (a diary for Mina P301.4, a doctor's bag for Van Helsing). Like with Fisher's credits sequence, but in a less striking way due to the absence of colour,
this allusion to blood is in direct reference to its thematic importance and unfailing link to the
myth of the vampire.

The satiric drift is already present too in the “titles” which the characters are given: Van Helsing is the overqualified savant (P302.1) whereas Renfield is reduced to the function of “eater of bugs”. This allusion, right from the start is intertextual in the extreme: it can only make sense to (and be funny for) someone already familiar with the story and its secondary characters, all the more so since Renfield is hardly shown in his zoophagous activities at all here. Renfield is actually the only character in the book who was absent from Godden’s ballet, and subsequently reintroduced by Maddin, he is also the only un-dancing character in the film. With his inordinate fondness for the grotesque, it is no wonder that the director felt the need to reinstate the raving madman. Two other examples of the director’s partiality to grotesque excess would be Lucy protected from the vampire by being drowned in garlic (P302.2) or when, as the bloofer lady she is seen snatching a baby (clearly a doll) out of a pram. (P302.3)

Before and after his Dracula, Maddin experimented with the form of (quasi-)silent film. His avowed nostalgia for old movies was paradoxically a way to seek inspiration to create something strikingly new. Although Maddin’s Dracula (deliberately) resembles old silent movies in many ways, it is obvious that the director had a lot more technical leeway to create certain effects and could thus afford to be more versatile in some of his referential uses of older methods. His use of intertitles is quite emblematic of this situation. Since the film is non-spoken, it is logical to make use of title cards as did silent movies. Some of the different shapes and meanings these could take have been mentioned with respect to Nosferatu, but the contemporary Maddin could afford to take matters further and put together hybrid cards with varying degrees of multimodality: traditional situational intertitles (P302.4), traditional dialogue cards (P302.5), dialogue cards with a mobile image of the speaker clarifying the
exchange (P303.1), text superimposed onto images or subtitles (P303.2), etc. Another way in which Maddin stretches the conventions of his references is by playing with the layout of his title cards, especially modifying capitalization and font size to induce the effect of variations in importance or volume (P303.3 / P303.4).

But whereas Maddin is clearly intent on creating a referential link to a certain tradition of filmmaking, he seems less interested in alluding to the novel’s fragmented structure: despite its title there are few diaries and hardly any documents (at one point Van Helsing quickly peruses a book P303.5). There is only one moment when Maddin relies on an “equivalent” to the novel’s variegated form: the bloofee lady episode is alluded to through title cards presented as newspaper cuttings (P303.6 / P303.7) as in the novel and as reprised by other film versions (Browning).

But if Maddin seems only marginally interested in Stoker’s novel as to form, he has other scores to settle with it as to content and themes. The fact that the Canadian has claimed to have both profoundly admired and disliked the novel and to have attempted to pay it homage or tied to transcend it once again shows in the way he uses Stoker’s text, sometimes faithfully enough, other times twisting it around sufficiently to subvert its meaning or even ridicule it in the process.

When Lucy hesitates between her three suitors, the text is pure (condensed) Stoker, integrated into its proper context. Later however, when she has been bitten by Dracula and is trying to come to terms with the men’s judging attitudes, Maddin has her say “Unclean, unclean! I must touch him no more”. Although this line has clear Stoker overtones, the context in which it is uttered in the novel differs quite considerably from its presentation here. In the book, Mina speaks it after she has been attacked by Dracula not in reference to the vampire but to Jonathan, whose shirt she has just sullied with her bloody mouth as she sought refuge in his arms: "Unclean, unclean! I must touch him or kiss him no more. Oh, that it
should be that it is I who am now his worst enemy, and whom he may have most cause to fear." By making the speaker Lucy and the object of the line Dracula, Maddin clearly manipulates the line and makes Lucy a more overtly sexual figure and especially consensual victim, a reading which, as seen above, has commonly been made of her character.

There is another instance of distortion of Stoker's text in the film: not through reassignment but through condensation, this time for contrastive humorous rather than thematic purposes. Upon Lucy's death, Stoker has the following exchange between Van Helsing and Seward:

"We thought her dying whilst she slept, and sleeping when she died". I stood beside Van Helsing, and said, "Ah well, poor girl, there is peace for her at last. It is the end!"

He turned to me, and said with grave solemnity, "Not so, alas! Not so. It is only the beginning!" When I asked him what he meant, he only shook his head and answered,

"We can do nothing as yet. Wait and see."

Which Maddin summarizes into the overtly ironic: "DEATH! It is only the beginning."

Similarly, Maddin is only partial to Stoker's themes or motifs insofar as they match his or can be adapted to them. The only instance in which he explicitly refers to the theme of technology is in a fairly lengthy and explicit blood transfusion scene. But the transfusion itself is not the issue here as much as how it can be interpreted as a type of male imposition on a woman, a substitute for group sex. Maddin has repeatedly alluded to his perception that this is one of the central themes in the novel: "This is one of these Bram Stoker intertitles in which the men are continually blaming the women for their own libidinous thoughts." ("Audio"). The association of blood and sex has long been central to criticism of the novel and this scene has often been read in this manner. Holte for instance notes that: "Lucy's fate is illustrative of
the relationship between male and female in Stoker’s novel... she is acted upon by powerful older men who use her to their own ends” (103).

Stoker himself was not unaware of the possible subtext, although he put it in milder terms when Van Helsing breaks down in laughter at Lucy’s funeral and explains himself to Seward:

“Said he [Arthur] not that the transfusion of his blood to her veins had made her truly his bride?” “Yes, and it was a sweet and comforting idea for him.” “Quite so. But there was a difficulty, friend John. If so that, then what about the others? Ho, ho! Then this so sweet maid is a polyandrist.”

Maddin makes this interpretation inescapable by resorting to visual cues (recurring shots of the men pumping their blood with evocative rhythm P305) and double entendres in the novel’s text: as Holmwood delivers the unusually long line “No man knows, till he experiences it, what it is to feel his own lifeblood drawn away into the veins of the woman he loves”, it is accompanied by a close-up of his inappropriately rapt (libidinous) expression.

Thus, despite Maddin’s sporadic claims at faithfulness, his primary interest lies in conveying and playing around with possible readings of the text beyond its narrative continuity. Neither does he seem to feel any particular allegiance to the format of the novel with its traditionally Gothic overtones. Yet not only does his versatile approach return a freshness to the story which brings it closer to the original text than many other versions, there are evident parallels to be made between the fragmentation at play in Dracula and the fabric of Maddin’s film text.

While retaining his contemporary perspective (particularly thematically), Maddin seeks aesthetic inspiration from the past and interweaves a plethora of visual and editing effects which give his film a paradoxically cohesive and disjointed feel. Or in his own terms:
“I got to work with non-stop music and fluid camera along the way, then cut it all up with little halting hiccup-cuts, jump-cuts, and good ol’ fashioned bad continuity.” (White)

Some techniques such as the hectic pace of editing (the average shot length is 2.6 seconds) and use of sound effects (quasi-silent rather than silent film⁶⁹) have already been mentioned above but his Dracula also includes dissolves, blurred lenses, irises, superimpositions, slow motion, subjective camera framing⁷⁰, colorization and tinting. These last two effects warrant further development.

Choosing black and white rather than colour meant that Maddin could indulge in his preferred work material. According to his producer, it was deemed more appropriate to the time period of the story but the director thought it appropriate to the story’s moral context:

During the course of our marathon, absinthe-soaked lucubrations I discovered that Mark [Godden] choreographs in black and white! How curious! How apt! For Bram Stoker’s story, so limned out in xenophobic and propagandist terms, is a structure comprised exclusively of good and evil, light and shadow, black and white! Black and white and red all over! (“Accompanying”)

However, Maddin did not want to lose out on colour’s expressive possibilities especially, as had been illustrated by Fisher’s first colour adaptation, red for blood. He thus chose to use touches of colour, which stand out all the more and against the bi-chromatic background and underscore their symbolic nature. Although Maddin resorted to digital technology, the use of colourization was in itself consistent with the old-fashioned feel he sought for his film since equivalent effects had been used almost since the invention of film.

⁶⁹ No speech is heard in the film but there is a wide variety of other sounds: the howling of the wind, the crashing of waves, footsteps, ringing bells, opening doors, sirens, etc. Not to mention the squelching noises which accompany more gory scenes, such as Lucy’s decapitation (see below).

⁷⁰ One such instance is when Lucy’s hesitation between her three suitors is depicted by her swaying on a swing: the countershots show each suitor in turn with the camera swaying towards them, thus reflecting her POV.
Maddin quotes Edison and his “Butterfly Dance” (“Audio”) but another influence seems likely to have been the 1925 Laemmle production of the “Phantom of the opera” starring Lon Chaney, wrapped in his colourized red cape.

For most of the film, red is the only additional colour inserted; it is used primarily for blood and first introduced through Lucy as a lure to Dracula (P307.1 / P307.2), then later on the vampire’s pinpricks, during the transfusion scene (even as a soft blush on Lucy’s cheeks as its result), on Lucy’s vampire lips, etc. But it is also more widely associated with the vampire himself, with shots of red inside his cape (P307.3) or eyes (P307.4).

Much later in the film, Maddin introduces another theme through the use of another colour. When the band of heroes run to Transylvania in pursuit of Dracula, they find a money chest in his castle, overflowing with green bills (P307.5). The money becomes an object of contention between the count and the band of heroes, a caption of Van Helsing claims it to be “Money, stolen from England!” and it resurfaces on several occasions as they oppose. Once the vampire is vanquished, the Englishmen are seen walking away with the chest. Money thus participates in the wider East vs. West theme which the director introduced right from the outset, the implication being that Westerners, threatened in their ways, are not adverse to stealing what is not rightfully theirs.

The theme is further underlined when Dracula is stabbed in the arm during a fight and bleeds gold coins rather than blood (P307.6). There is a vague precedent to this money theme in Stoker. Dracula stumbles upon the band of heroes as they are neutralizing his hiding places in London. In the scuffle which ensues, Jonathan lunges at the vampire with a knife: “the trenchant blade had shorn through his coat, making a wide gap whence a bundle of bank notes and a stream of gold fell out”. He hurries to retrieve some of it before disappearing. The money is subsequently mentioned on several occasions but only insofar as it is the instrument, and sole means, of Dracula’s flight.
But it is obvious that Maddin has taken this episode to a completely new thematic and symbolic level. The choice of the colour green to represent money is in itself emblematic of this trend, immediately evoking dollar bills and the imperialistic domination of the currency. Maddin makes a final, tongue-in-cheek, use of colourization right at the end of his film: as the victorious band of heroes walk away, exiting castle Dracula, they head towards a beautiful shaded sunset, evocative of prototypical Hollywood happy endings (P308.1).

But as far as structure is concerned, it is the director’s use of tinting which is especially relevant. In an attempt to stray from the compositional rigidity of the ballet’s division into three acts, Maddin wished to create “chapters” within his narrative and sought to guide the viewer’s engagement through changes in tonal hues using all kinds of different tints: yellow, green, lavender, red, sepia, etc. Some of these changes, and choices, appear fairly hap-hazard, or in Maddin’s own words “irrational and capricious” (“Audio”), while others seem very deliberate. Lucy’s transformation for instance is symbolically marked by the evolution in colours: initially the image is un-tinted but shifts after she is first bitten (P308.2 / P308.3), indicating her changed status, then returns to black and white with the return of her suitors only to change again with Van Helsing’s arrival (P308.4 / P308.5) and when he unveils the bite marks (P308.6 / P308.7). The threat which, in this version, Van Helsing poses for Lucy is conveyed through the reddish hue which he brings to the picture and the accompaniment of the booming chords in the musical score.

Through its formal references to older “original” productions, this film might initially be misjudged as simple in its crafting. The case is obviously quite the contrary with its interweaving of visual, aural, musical, textual, referential and symbolic motifs. Although Maddin probably did not seek to emulate his textual model, he delivers a multi-layered product of great complexity which, in its own way, is evocative of Stoker’s fragmentation and its multiple perspectives.
2.10 Scene 5: Lucy’s “exorcism”

2.10.1 Stoker

The scene to be scrutinized next is one of the story’s turning points in terms of action within the plot: the undead Lucy is exorcised by Van Helsing and her former suitors, who seek to restore her soul to her defiled corpse. As it deals with Lucy and her being subjected to the wills of the men who surround her, it is one of these scenes which has fed critics’ interpretations of Stoker’s misogyny or even of Lucy undergoing (group) rape as punishment for being sexually curious and overt.

In the novel, it is told from Seward’s perspective although, as usual, he is the narrative voice rather than an effective participant in the unfolding action. The glorifying mission which is undertaken by the men is actually very much a group endeavour. A closer glance at the interpersonal metafunction and particularly at person selection within the mood block shows that personal pronoun we is the most frequent subject in this excerpt with a percentile frequency of 1.47. The accent is then put on the communal nature of the mission.

However the picture changes if we look at the subjects’ patterns of collocation from an experiential perspective: more often than not, we collocates with behavioural and mental processes rather than material ones, especially for perception whether voluntary or not (we saw, we looked, we gazed) and cognition (we knew, we felt). Although important, the group is confined to witnessing and supporting rather than doing.

The actors in the segment are Van Helsing as he leads his men and sets up the exorcism (he unlocked, took, lit, stuck, lifted etc.) and Arthur Holmwood who will carry it out (he took, placed, struck). This passage actually focuses primarily (and unusually) on Arthur: his name is the first keyword in this excerpt. This is due to the fact that he is not only the perpetrator of the exorcism but also, as Lucy’s grief-stricken fiancé, the main object of attention, both for his henchmen (We all looked at Arthur) and the readers.
Thus tension shifts between the communal facet of the enterprise and its enabler, Arthur. His is the “hand” which will bring delivery both literally and figuratively:

So that, my friend, it will be a blessed hand for her that shall strike the blow that sets her free. To this I am willing, but is there none amongst us who has a better right?

Will it be no joy to think of hereafter in the silence of the night when sleep is not, ‘It was my hand that sent her to the stars. It was the hand of him that loved her best, the hand that of all she would herself have chosen, had it been to her to choose?’ Tell me if there be such a one amongst us?

Although he is surrounded by his partners (“Only think that we, your true friends, are round you, and that we pray for you all the time”), Holmwood is the true almost God-like hero and unambiguously portrayed as such through lexical selections:

He looked like a figure of Thor as his untrembling arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy-bearing stake, whilst the blood from the pierced heart welled and spurted up around it. His face was set, and high duty seemed to shine through it.

These words with positive built-in connotations stand in stark contrast with those used to describe Lucy, or rather a de-humanized object which is no longer Lucy but has become “the Thing”:

The Thing in the coffin writhed, and a hideous, bloodcurdling screech came from the opened red lips. The body shook and quivered and twisted in wild contortions. The sharp white teeth champed together till the lips were cut, and the mouth was smeared with a crimson foam.

Thanks to the hero’s intervention, the “foul Thing” regains human, albeit dead, form and Lucy is restored her “face of unequalled sweetness and purity”.

Violent though the passage is in its depiction of the staking, the message which it projects is typical of Stoker’s rigidity and relative lack of ambiguity in his opposition between
good and evil. The only marginally astonishing feature it presents is its casting of the secondary figure of Arthur Holmwood in the starring role, correlated by interpersonal, textual and lexical choices. However, as pointed out above, finesse in characterization, especially in secondary characters, was not one of Stoker’s stronger suits: there is a feeling of interchangeability between the characters which eventually shifts the focus to the very memorable act being performed and away from the performer. As will be seen hereafter, this is a sentiment which Maddin has clearly integrated into his version as he has all the suitors stake her in turn.

On a somewhat digressing note, this passage is finally also interesting as it introduces a word/name which, along with Dracula, has found its place in vampire (folk)lore and general knowledge: Nosferatu. Stoker only uses the word twice, and does not dwell on its meaning, seeming to equate it with un-dead. According to Skal, Stoker borrowed the word, which was supposed be the Romanian name for vampire, from Scottish-born folklorist Emily Gerard. But his source, or his use of it, was misguided and there is no clear origin or meaning for the word. (“Audio”)

Discreet as it was in the novel, it took Galeen and Mumau’s fancy and they chose it as the title of their un-authorized version. Given the judicial history which followed, it might in hindsight seem like poor judgment on their part. But Stoker’s use of the term is undeniably scarce: just two mentions in a novel which is 430 pages long. Even though Stoker was intent on conserving mystery to instil terror and only explicitly mentioned the true nature of his creation fairly late in the book, the word vampire is used 25 times. But Stoker’s preferred choice of terminology (and working title for the book) was the “un-dead”, which is used 36 times.

Whether due to Mumau’s success and intertextual interference or to the darkly exotic phonetic connotations of the word, “nosferatu” would take flight and be used in almost all the
film versions that would follow sometimes as much as its (near-)synonyms. Browning, the precursor, had a marked preference for “vampire” (9 mentions) over “Nosferatu” and “un-dead” (3 each). Fisher makes no reference to the Romanian word (4 “vampire”, 2 “un-dead”), but both Badham and Coppola alternate between them quite freely with three mentions of each word.

2.10.2 Coppola

The exorcism scene in Coppola’s film conflates two different episodes in the novel. This section of Stoker’s book, between Lucy’s two deaths, the human one and the vampire one, is particularly, some might say overly, drawn out. Van Helsing feels the need to convince the others rather than divulge his conclusions as to Lucy’s transformation. He starts with Seward, then moves on to the rest of the band of heroes, which means there are actually four different and gradual crypt episodes in the novel.

Coppola uses the last two and conflates the confrontation scene, in which the band of heroes are made to witness Lucy’s un-dead state with her exorcism immediately following it. Lucy, who has lured another child to her, returns to her coffin carrying her prey before the band of heroes spring out to surprise her. Her appearance, posture and her manner of carrying the child (P312.1) are reminiscent of a visual source apparently unacknowledged by Coppola and his team: the artist Satty and the illustrations he provided for Wolf’s annotated edition of the novel (P312.2). This is clearly more than coincidental as other shots offer similar parallels. For instance, the appearance of castle Dracula and especially its high-perched hilltop location (P312.3 / P312.4), or the entangled brides retreating which evoke the headboard of a Satty bed (P312.5 / P312.6). Two more examples will also be given in the next scene to be analysed.
All three suitors are present alongside Van Helsing and face the newborn vampire. Her movement towards them, and particularly Arthur whom she is trying to entice into her arms, is enhanced by the camera movements: it dollys back from her in one shot, and zooms in on her target in the next. As she talks to him, echoing sound effects are used to convey the supernaturally alluring quality of her voice, as described by Stoker: "There was something diabolically sweet in her tones, something of the tinkling of glass when struck, which rang through the brains even of us who heard the words addressed to another".

These effects are also immediately reminiscent of the brides in castle Dracula guiding Jonathan towards them as memorably heard in a previous scene, not to mention the mythical connotations of the sirens’ voices luring sailors to a certain death in the Odyssey. Lucy’s plea to Arthur is an almost exact, only slightly more explicit, version of Stoker, in which “My arms are hungry for you. Come, and we can rest together” becomes “I am so hungry for you. Kiss me and caress me.”

As Van Helsing forces her to reintegrate her coffin by brandishing a cross, the strangeness of her new demeanour is underlined by special effects: Roman Coppola shot her cautiously exiting the coffin forward and then played the film in reverse. Without being invasive, the effect conveys an eerie dimension to the movement. Far less subtle is the next series of shots. Van Helsing is shown in medium shot chanting before Lucy’s coffin when her head pops out and vomits blood all over him. This is Coppola’s own addition to the scene and it certainly fits in with the horror movie staples in terms of unexpected startling effects and unadulterated gore. Deliberate or not, it also cannot help but evoke one of the greatest horror movies of a different tradition and its very memorable projectile vomiting scene: the aptly-named, considering the nature of the action in this scene, The Exorcist.

Stoker had underscored Lucy’s un-human features by reifying her lexically and grammatically and having Seward refer to “it” and “the thing”. Here, the more clearly visible
traits of her supernatural nature are complemented by strange sound effects before she is silenced: animal-like grunting and screeching but also a more eerie clicking sound.

The staking itself is introduced by a series of close-ups: on the instrument as it is passed from hand to hand, symbolically linking the band together as "partners in crime", and on each of the men in turn. As Van Helsing exhorts Arthur, the high-pitched strings of the musical score evoke a ticking clock and hint at the urgency of the procedure. The editing pace also accelerates as shots alternate quickly to the accompaniment of a soundtrack saturated with screams: Lucy's but also Arthur's and even Dracula's. The images shift rapidly from the staking to gushing blood to the beheading. A jump cut then shows Dracula in close-up (formally linked to the previous shot by the head-up framing) awakening to his creature's slaughter. This is followed by Lucy's head flying across the air in slow motion, before a final jump cut provides the transition to the next scene with a close-up on a juicy roast sitting on a dish. The aim of the cut here is clearly to draw a humorous parallel between the vampire's head and the roast, a very unsubtle allusion of doubtful taste. At least this tongue-in-cheek ending serves the purpose of offsetting the gore of the preceding scene; it also refers to a self-deprecating tradition in the horror genre (especially cinematic), although not typical of the Gothic and certainly not of Stoker's novel. To different degrees, all the films in this corpus make use of tongue-in-cheek humour. The least prone to this trend are the Hammer Horror productions (with one or two exceptions such as the scene in which a border guard is dismayed to find his crossing gate broken on two separate occasions by the fleeing vampire and his pursuers in Horror of Dracula). However in their case, their overly serious and cliché approach to their subject gives them a camp quality which makes them quite funny in retrospect.

At the level of the enunciated, Coppola advantageously amends Stoker's novel by condensing two scenes into one. At the level of the enunciation, he follows him only halfway
as far as focus is concerned: he insists on the communal nature of the enterprise, through
group shots and a variety of close ups of each character, rather than fronts Arthur’s role.

2.10.3 Fisher

Neither Nosferatu nor Browning’s Dracula present a staking scene; the first (chronological)
film in the corpus to include one (or rather two) is Fisher’s Horror of Dracula.

The character of Lucy, Jonathan’s fiancée and sister to Arthur Holmwood, has slowly
decayed and died due to Dracula’s repeated attacks. She has become a creature of the night
preying on others as the “bloofer lady” scene preceding her exorcism demonstrates. However,
unlike the novel, this is not the first staking scene: in castle Dracula, vampire hunter Harker
had already dispatched the alluring “bride” during a nerve-wracking episode which would
ultimately lead to his death. The first staking scene conveys horror in an indirect way: there
are close ups of Jonathan performing the deed and a projection of the hammer coming down
in shadow play on the wall behind him but no countershots of the bride, the horror of her grim
fate is suggested primarily through the use of sound and bloodcurdling screeches. The viewer
is then familiar with the particulars of a vampire exorcism and knows what to expect before
the scene with Lucy. It seems only natural therefore that Fisher would take matters up a notch
and make this second scene more gruesomely explicit than the first, not least because the
operation is in the hands of the experienced Van Helsing rather than the more hesitant
blundering Harker.

Through selection and restriction typical of adaptation, many characters have either
disappeared (Renfield, Morris) or been assigned new roles (Harker, Seward) in this version.
Holmwood’s character has unusually been amplified: he represents Van Helsing’s “band of
heroes” all by himself, which is rather well-suited to this particular scene in the novel, the
only moment in which he has a preponderant role to play. In Fisher’s film however, Holmwood is present but only as a helper and witness, not unlike the communal “we” expressed by Seward in Stoker’s excerpt. The actor, the doer, the hero in this one-on-one battle against Dracula, is Van Helsing.

The segment opens with Van Helsing unpacking his tools, the camera tilts up to reveal the two protagonists intensely discussing the necessity of the intervention. Van Helsing develops: “Please try and understand. This is not Lucy, the sister you loved. It’s only her shell, possessed and corrupted by the evil of Dracula. Liberate her soul and give it eternal peace. We must destroy that shell for all time! Believe me, there is no other way.” The camera then pans to show the professor making his way towards the coffin and the next wider shot reveals him above Lucy lying in it. The soundtrack highlights the deceptive peacefulness of the scene with gentle bird chirping. Van Helsing glances sideways and the countershot reveals a defeated-looking Holmwood. Medium shots of the three characters are then shown in succession: Van Helsing preparing, Lucy with the stake over her heart, the striking and its effect. In this case, the vampire is not only heard, although of course there is much screaming, but seen. Shots continue to alternate (at least three of each) between Holmwood squirming at his sister’s pain, Van Helsing striking again (twice) and Lucy’s helpless suffering. These are interrupted by a single close-up of the stake going through Lucy’s heart and bringing up red vibrant blood.

The explicitly gory details, the undisguised violence of the close shots and the accompanying screams, the empathy-inducing reaction of the sibling, all contribute to the Hammer agenda of not holding back but fully embracing the horror genre and its combination of cringing and exhilaration.
The last shot of Lucy shows her screaming dissolving into a sigh before there is a cut to a wider shot of the two men. The birds have resumed their chirping and another track introduces soothing, emotional music as he steps down and wipes his bloody hand. He then walks up to Holmwood (with the camera tracking him) and brings him by the coffin. As they look down, the reverse shot shows an appeased Lucy in close up, a sentiment which is underlined by a bold increase in the volume of the music. There is another alternation of shots between the "heroes" with a now-smiling Arthur and Lucy with the music gently subsiding as the image fades out to close the scene.

Fisher's scene, in a condensed form, displays many elements that can be equated with its novelistic counterpart: the emphasis on the preparation through the lining-up of tools, the necessary violence with its horror and justification. It differs by reversing one particular: Van Helsing is the active hero and focus of attention, rather than Holmwood who nevertheless has a witnessing role to play.

Seward's recounting of the abuse scene in the novel presented overtones of voyeurism, not only for the characters, which buttressed the interpretations mentioned above, but also for the readers. Here, Holmwood's unwillingness to watch shifts the burden of voyeurism even more to the audience, corroborating the feeling of schadenfreude which is often inherent to the horror genre.

71 Coincidentally, Stoker uses the same imagery to indicate the return of the calm and a "new dawn" after the exorcism: "Outside the air was sweet, the sun shone, and the birds sang, and it seemed as if all nature were tuned to a different pitch."
Badham's version is intriguing insofar as it presents not one but two different scenes in which an already dead Lucy is "killed" or purified. Neither of them matches the novel exactly and their accumulation, along with other twists on vampire lore, has often generated puzzled or downright dismissive comments from critics. Maslin for instance has commented that:

The movie hedges its bets shamelessly when it comes to Dracula lore, never explaining the vampire's habits or nutritional requirements. This reaches a bewildering crescendo in the film's final moments, which provide an ambiguous ending that is nothing but a dirty trick at the audience's expense.

Lucy's character, who seems quite bland especially in contrast with the extremely vivacious feminist Mina, presents one major variant in this version: she is Van Helsing's daughter. To make Dracula a plausible and sympathetic romantic hero, Badham seems to have felt the need to deflect the viewers' sympathy from the reduced band of heroes. The male heroes are portrayed as rigid (prototypically Victorian) but also ineffectual and socially awkward. Harker is coldly arrogant and superior and Seward, Mina's father here, is a combination of gauche incompetence and detachment, seeking solace in food at the most inappropriate moments. But the change in Van Helsing, although more subtle, is the most striking.

In the novel, the Dutchman's age sets him apart from the other characters in a positive light: he is older but also wiser and worldlier, not just in vampire matters. He represents a paternal figure leading his surrogate sons and daughters, who are by the way distinctively parentless: neither Mina nor Jonathan have families, their substitute father figure, Mr Hawkins, dies in the course of the novel as do Lucy's mother and Arthur's father. But though he is older, Van Helsing's vivacity, both mental and physical, is never questioned: he is not
only the brains behind the operation but can be its arms as well, as when he single-handedly
dispatches the brides.

The Van Helsing "mythology" has carried into, and been distinctly fed by, his
depiction on the screen. As early as the first stage versions, he was cast as the main "positive"
character, Dracula's only worthy opponent and nemesis. Hamilton Deane, the novel's actor-
adapter, chose for himself the role of Van Helsing over Dracula as it offered better lines (Skal,
_Hollywood_, 70). Edward Van Sloan was the first Van Helsing on the American stage and
reprised his portrayal in Browning's film. The role would make him famous but also typecast
him: "from that time on he played fatherly and scholarly authority figures." (Melton) Like
Lugosi with the vampire, he would represent the emblematic vampire hunter for a whole
generation.

This would last until Hammer productions re-introduced the vampire and his arch-
rival and, much like Lee did for Dracula, Cushing would become the new face of Van
Helsing, reprising his role on four more instances.\(^{72}\)

Badham, however, chose another track for his character: Van Helsing appears as a
feeble old man, made all the more vulnerable by the loss of his daughter. Casting Lawrence
Olivier as the professor might have been an attempt at transferring some of the great actor's
aura and charisma onto the compelling figure of Van Helsing. But Olivier was 72 years old at
the time of shooting and furthermore battling cancer, although he would live on and continue
acting for ten more years. Compared to the dynamic figure cut by 45-year-old Cushing, this
was a drastic change. Whether this was Badham's initial take on the character, or the result of
misplaced casting and bad luck (Olivier's health), the result is a Van Helsing who appears
weak, defeated and overwhelmed, certainly not a plausible opponent for Langella's

---

\(^{72}\) Although he was a memorable Van Helsing, Cushing is not linked solely to that role or franchise. He was also
Hammer's Victor Frankenstein and portrayed Sherlock Holmes on several occasions.
particularly vivacious count. The ambiguous ending, with Dracula supposedly burned to ashes by the sun but Mina smiling as she sees his cape drift away, corroborates this interpretation: Dracula has defeated his unknowing adversaries and lives on.

Although there is equal emphasis on the hunters' inefficiency, this particular scene also adds a certain degree of poignancy to Lucy's exorcism due to the father-daughter tie which unites them. The first encounter between the two doctors and Lucy takes place underground, in a catacomb-like network of mining tunnels. The whole scene is rather fast-paced, with an alternation of cuts between short-timed shots which contrasts with the more leisurely pace and long takes which Badham had previously favoured (as in the parlour scene preceding Dracula's introduction above).

Lucy's appearance is striking but contradicts vampire logic: instead of appearing alive (or rather un-dead), she walks around as a half-decaying corpse. Though the result is horrific in itself, it seems out of place in a vampire tale and evokes zombies out of unrelated horror traditions. Badham might have been influenced by the resurgence in Zombie films brought about by Romero's hugely successful *Dawn of the Dead*, released the previous year in 1978.

Lucy calls out to her father in their native Dutch "Papa, kom met mij. Kom, papa". As in Coppola, this alludes to the confrontational scene between Lucy and the band of heroes which precedes -and indeed justifies- the exorcism in Stoker's text. But instead of the amorous bond between two lovers, the emphasis is on the filial bond between the Van Helsings. Rather than confronting her and controlling the situation, the two older men seem distinctly ineffective. They fend her off in evident self-defence, seemingly improvising their strategy as events develop. Van Helsing holds a stake before him, not in a spirit of attack but rather seeking refuge behind it; when Lucy stumbles upon it as she turns away from the cross Seward brandishes, the staking seems to be accidental. She collapses into her father's arms,
calling out to him one last time and the scene ends on the reverse shot of Van Helsing crying over the body of his dead-again daughter.

One would expect the scene to be sufficiently evocative to wrap Lucy-related matters up, yet Badham included a second exorcism scene later in the movie. The director stands in contrast to vampire lore and traditions (Waller) not only in Lucy’s change of appearance but also in the need to kill her twice and the manner chosen.

This second scene is quite different from the previous one. The first killing was fast, urgent, dark, intimate and emotional; this scene is shot in broad daylight, public (the three “heroes” bend over Lucy while Swales and another servant stand by and Mina witnesses the whole thing from her bedroom window), cold and mechanical. Lucy is no longer horrific here (another strange twist on vampire appearances), but she is presented in a detached manner, almost as if objectified, through close-ups but of her chest and the scalpel running through it rather than of her face. She has become an object of morbid curiosity for the men surrounding her, who are unnecessarily numerous since she is not reactive. She is also an object of empathy and warning for the wary Mina who looks on, and whose point-of-view we are given to share through a subjective shot.

If the scene is of little import and rather redundant representationally, it nevertheless serves a logical and compositional function by transcending the intimacy of the first exorcism and especially by including Mina as a witness. This will prompt her to run to Dracula, and her protectors to seek his total destruction, thus justifying the rest of the plot evolution.

2.10.5 Maddin

Maddin’s take on the exorcism scene is surprisingly faithful to Stoker in many respects. The most blatant change is not so much a deviation as an expansion: instead of fronting Van
Helsing or Holmwood, Maddin focuses on the communal aspect of the operation and makes all of Lucy’s suitors equally participative and responsible in her death. At the level of the experiential metafunction, two characters at least (Morris and Seward) shift from the role of “senser” to that of “actor”.

The scene opens with a close-up of the tools being laid out on the coffin, emphasizing the more pragmatic aspect. Then the coffin is pried open to reveal Lucy in close up, her lips have been tinted red, as has a rivulet of blood which is running from them. This is followed by an alternation of shots (close-ups and intertitles) illustrating the dialogue between Arthur and the professor about the necessity of performing the operation. A mixed shot, uncharacteristically presenting image and text together shows Van Helsing mouthing the words at the same time as they appear in written text as he qualifies Lucy’s state: “UN-DEAD”. At the interpersonal level, this shot obviously draws attention to itself and may evoke different things for the viewers.

Although it is not a revelation (for the audience), the news of Lucy’s transformation is presented in a sensationalist fashion which is reminiscent of the early film tradition which Maddin pays homage to, particularly expressionism and its extremes of stylized acting. There is also an ironic dimension to this presentation: it takes Stoker’s invention and preferred term, which would probably have warranted this kind of emphasis in its day, but since it has now become hackneyed through overuse, the effect is more satirical.

The shots then gradually become wider (including a few episodes or group shots). A wide shot presents the coffin centrally and the soundtrack guides our attention towards a shift in focus as cymbals clash violently and music increases dramatically to show Lucy springing out of the coffin. The camera zooms in on her at the same time as she moves towards us, giving the audience a close-up of her menacing fangs. As her fight against the band of heroes takes place, the shots are generally wider (although interspersed with a few close ups of a
seductive or menacing Lucy and of her suitors, generally retreating behind their crosses) and feature extremely mobile handheld camera work.

These wide shots deservedly allow the expressive choreography to take centre stage. Maddin’s exorcism scene is particularly successful through the combination of the art forms which add up, each with their fortes, to create a harmonious whole. The hectic movements of the dancing accumulated to the vivacious camera movements, modally appeal to the viewers’ sense of the struggle taking place: Tara Birtwhistle is particularly versatile and her recoiling movements have an animal quality which is eminently suitable here. Maddin has commented on the use of the handheld camera and how its aim was to try and preserve the essential dynamicity of ballet, which tends to be “drained of life” on the screen:

[Godden] grabbed me by the scruff of my neck, yanked me right onto the stage itself, and in the capacity of navigator steered me with a straight arm through the swirling blur of dancers while my little super-8 camera purred at my eye, recording the exhilaration I barely had time to acknowledge. I was thrust, like a child on a freeway, right into the middle of heavy human traffic! (“Accompanying”)

Music also has an extremely important role to play here as it spreads over and across the three different metafunctions. Representationally, it underscores both Lucy’s sense of panic and the hunters’ urgency through its variations in pitch and fast-paced rhythm. Modally, its intensity grasps the viewers and also guides their engagement through the swift action. Compositioanally, it delineates the whole scene and also creates cohesive links to the preceding and following sequences. Certain musical motifs, inherent to symphonic pieces, are thematically reprised or adapted, creating an aural red thread which carries through the whole film.
Pribisic has commented on the suitability of Mahler's symphonies to the visual track and even argues that they are particularly apt to convey the referential and intertextual dimension of the work:

[Mahler's] symphonic work is also characterized by a transfiguration of different genre conventions, and a play upon genre that gradually refutes the audience’s horizon of expectations. Perceived from this angle, Mahler’s music is intertextual and hybrid within the classical music tradition itself – thus fitting organically and contributing immensely to the dialogical and dialectical encounter between stage and film. (167)

When Lucy is finally executed, the communal nature of the endeavour is highlighted as she is staked not once but three times, by each suitor in turn. Red-tinted blood soaks through her dress and as she lies down Van Helsing brings the final blow and decapitates her. The shot is framed so as to show only their two bodies, Van Helsing in action and Lucy, arms extended, in the throes of her second death. This seems to imply de-humanization not only of the victim but also of the perpetrator of the gruesome act.

The grisly aspect of the gesture is saliently underscored through sound effects: Maddin's fondness for quasi-silent film has been pointed out above but nowhere is it more noticeable than here, as the blunt instrument (spade?) goes through the neck with a squelching noise. Surprisingly, the decapitation, which one might consider more filmic or even Maddin-like in its lugubrious taste, was already part of Godden's original ballet. The camera then tilts up to reveal Van Helsing but rapidly cuts to a much wider, and extremely beautiful, frame: he is standing centrally over the grave, holding the head as the wind howls, the snow twirls outside and lanterns dangle within the crypt.

Had Maddin wished to emulate Stoker’s dichotomous perception of good and evil, he would probably have ended the scene on this eerily picturesque shot. But the director had his own agenda, on which the victimization of women by overanxious possessive men featured
highly, and the shot thus dissolves to a close-up of an extremely (and inappropriately) smug-looking Van Helsing before it fades to black. The next scene carries through and confirms this interpretation as it opens with a shot of a basin of water tinted red by the hands which the men are plunging in it. The image is fairly straightforward: they are “washing their hands” of her murder. There is a kind of cyclic twist to the metaphor here. It originated with Pontius Pilate washing his hands of Christ’s blood (as recorded in the Gospel of Matthew, 27:24). Biblical connotations are thus also evoked as the dead metaphor is visually brought back to life.

Maddin is at the top of his game in this scene: drawing closely on his source of inspiration, he nevertheless manages to put his own imprint on the material both thematically and aesthetically, through the compilation of variegated means of artistic expression.

2.11 Scene 6: Mina’s attack

2.11.1 Stoker

As in the previous scene depicting Lucy’s exorcism, the novel’s usually rather atmospheric and slow-paced plot takes an action-driven turn. The passage is initially recounted by Seward but he then reports Mina’s version of what happened behind closed doors before the vampire hunters interrupted Dracula. She, in turn, repeats Dracula’s exchanges with her. Three supposedly individual voices thus intermingle here, not to mention more punctual interventions from all the other characters. This polyphonic narration stretches the borders of the credibility of the novel’s format to the limit, which may account for Seward’s validating and cautionary words of introduction before he recounts the events: “3 October.--Let me put down with exactness all that happened, as well as I can remember, since last I made an entry. Not a detail that I can recall must be forgotten. In all calmness I must proceed.”
The passage is also noteworthy for the fact that it features a Dracula whose behaviour stands in stark contrast with the rest of the second part. Whereas in the Transylvania chapters, he is a concrete being (although neither human nor living), once he travels to England, he becomes a more ethereal manifestation, fathomable through the consequences of his acts rather than through his presence. As Mina says in this passage: “I felt the same vague terror which had come to me before and the same sense of some presence”.

There are only a few instances when the count actually takes human shape and interacts with his victims, and equally few instances in which his voice is heard. This scene is one such exception: not only is he present and active but he is also uncharacteristically voluble.

But before he is heard, he is seen by Seward and the others. In the first part of the excerpt, Seward puts down his actions “with exactness”. No wonder then that the experiential and interpersonal metafunctions focus entirely on the figure of the count. Material processes once again chiefly have Dracula as the actor (help, keep, grip, force, turn, throw, spring...). The active figure which emerges as a result is miles away from the insubstantial threat that he formerly posed. This newfound vitality is illustrated by the descriptions which are made of him both grammatically and lexically. Instead of relational processes, Stoker uses material processes to qualify the count, whose subjects furthermore correspond to the count’s features or attributes rather than to his whole person. The effect is to make every single parcel of his being into an active forward-driving danger:

*The Count turned his face, and the hellish look that I had heard described seemed to leap into it. His eyes flamed red with devilish passion. The great nostrils of the white aquiline nose opened wide and quivered at the edge, and the white sharp teeth, behind the full lips of the blood dripping mouth, clamped together like those of a wild beast*
This correlates with the lexical frequency of the possessive pronoun *his* which, with twelve occurrences, is the keyword in this passage. Interpersonally, the reader is thus put on a par with Seward (and the others) and thrust into a similar witness position, given to powerlessly observe the unfolding action. At the end of the first passage, the vampire hunters regain some modicum of control and manage to make him retreat by advancing upon him with a sacred host, before he eludes them by, literally, vanishing into thin air: “when the gaslight sprang up under Quincey's match, we saw nothing but a faint vapour”. Thus the atypically present and active figure of the count recedes back into his ghost-like existence.

But during his brief corporeal stint, he was also unusually talkative as the next segment demonstrates. Although it is Mina who now takes over the narration, the representational balance remains the same. Material processes are still linked to the count as an actor whether in his own threatening words (*take, dash, fight*) or in Mina’s recounting of the events (*place, hold, bare, pull, open, take, hold, seize, press*). The first keywords “*me*” and “*my*” can be ascribed to two different sources. First, Dracula referring to his dominance and to the hunters’ vain attempts to shatter it: “And so you, like the others, would play your brains against mine. You would help these men to hunt me and frustrate me in my design! You know now, and they know in part already, and will know in full before long, what it is to cross my path.”

The second source is of course Mina, who is cast in a subdued stance as goal of the material processes: “he placed one hand upon my shoulder and, holding me tight, bared my throat with the other”, “took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound”. As with Jonathan in the Brides scene, Mina’s helplessness is further asserted by confining her mainly to mental, behavioural or relational processes: “*I was, I did not want, I suppose, I felt, I know*.”
But the count also seizes this opportunity to finally express himself, thereby multiplying verbal processes: three “speak” and two “say”. Mina stands in contrast not only to him but also to her usual narrator position as she is repeatedly restricted to silence: “I would have screamed out, only that I was paralyzed”, “Silence! If you make a sound I shall take him and dash his brains out before your very eyes”, “I was too bewildered to do or say anything”, “You may as well be quiet”.

The turning point in this scene, the moment which is presented from both Seward and Mina’s perspectives, is when Dracula forces Mina to drink his blood. There is in fact a conflict of lexical information in the terms which the three different voices in this passage use to describe this event. Seward first describes the situation in these terms:

With his left hand he held both Mrs. Harker’s hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension. His right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. [...] The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten’s nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink.

The verbs which he chooses point towards a display of strength, depicting Mina as the unwilling victim -a term which he will use later- of the attack. But the image which he relies on as comparison is fairly mild and innocuous in the connotations it evokes (child, kitten, milk), thus countermirning the violent and negative effect of the scene. But whereas Seward’s lexical selections may appear unfortunate, they do not seem to have any underlying purpose or meaning.

When Mina goes over her ordeal, she is unambiguously negative in her lexical choices describing her assailant and her reaction to the attack: “I was appalled”, “With a mocking smile”, “I was bewildered”, “the horrible curse”, “his reeking lips”, “this horrible thing”, “his foul, awful, sneering mouth”, not to mention her three appeals to higher powers “God, pity me”.
Dracula's speech, however, is a lot more ambiguous: although at its base lies pride and menace, there are tender overtones to his words to Mina. The count seems to go from dominating threats to ceremonial promises:

"Whilst they played wits against me, against me who commanded nations, and intrigued for them, and fought for them, hundreds of years before they were born, I was countermining them. And you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood, kin of my kin, my bountiful wine-press for a while, and shall be later on my companion and my helper. You shall be avenged in turn, for not one of them but shall minister to your needs."

The vampire's words thus bring a certain degree of ambiguity to the scene, or at least give his character a new dimension: although he is undeniably and definitely evil, all his actions can be ascribed not solely to spite but also to desire (of possession, to thwart loneliness?).

By contrast, Mina is unambiguously disapproving; an aspect which will be strongly amended in some of the revisionist versions examined below. Despite her resolve "if you only knew what an effort it is to me to tell of this fearful thing at all", ultimately she cannot even bring herself to speak the unspeakable: "When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow some of the... Oh, my God! My God! What have I done?" The missing word is of course "blood", which is the cornerstone of the whole passage, and also the third keyword in it, with a frequency of 0.5 percent.

Although they have been hinted at or imagined, no vampiric attack, especially involving such explicit exchanges of blood, has been overtly presented in the book up to this point. This scene is in fact the culmination of the vampire's bloodlust-driven quest and the beginning of a downward spiral for him as the blood connection will eventually lead to the
hunters tracking him down and killing him. This scene is the story’s apex, the climactic culmination of the middle act and at its core thematically lies blood.

2.11.2 Coppola

So far, it has been possible to analyse individual scenes in Coppola’s film and find them to be relatively close in spirit to the original and untainted by the reincarnation romance theme guiding the story. This is no longer the case here. By making Mina and Dracula’s relation consensual on her part, this scene has undergone a radical transformation from horrific attack to love scene. As will be seen below, Badham had already done something similar and in both versions the changes brought to the initial text are tremendous.

Stoker is nowhere recognizable in the love lines which Dracula and Mina speak to each other. Scriptwriter Hart might have cleverly diverted the count’s line in the novel “you are now to me, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood, kin of my kin” as he had done elsewhere, but chose not to in this case. Instead, he invents a completely new dialogue, replete with declarations of love, explanatory lines on vampire lore (“Mina, to walk with me, you must die to your breathing life and be reborn to mine”), incantatory ceremonial vows (“Then I give you life eternal, everlasting love, the power over the storm and the beasts of the earth. Walk with me to be my loving wife forever”) and cleverly wrought but somewhat confusing catchphrases (“Take me away from all this death!”).

The only similar line which the novel and this version have is when the vampire threateningly faces his enemies: “You think you can destroy me with your idols, I who served the cross, I who commanded nations hundreds of years before you”, which in the book read as follows: “Whilst they played wits against me, against me who commanded nations, and
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intrigued for them, and fought for them, hundreds of years before they were born, I was countermining them”.

Absent from the original text are the religious allusions (idols, cross) which are frequent in the film. Right from the prologue, Coppola has expanded on religious symbolism in the vampire myths and has made his creation a kind of “fallen angel”: once the arm of God, who betrayed him, he now serves the dark forces to whom he is enslaved. In this manner, he partially justifies the influence of religious artefacts on the night creatures.

When this scene in the film begins, it is edited in parallel with images of the band of heroes gone to make sacred the earth in which the vampire rests, thus making it inaccessible to him and forcing him to flee. Quite rapidly, though, the focus is exclusively on the lovers and the vows they exchange.

Section 2.2.2.2 mentioned how Stoker simplified his narrative structure by including only one “voice” at this stage and focusing his readership’s attention on the dramatic action taking place. Something similar seems to take place in this scene (at first, i.e. before the hunters’ interruption). Coppola’s generally “heavy” visual style is simplified here, emphasizing the characters’ emotions: the editing is simple, with a regular alternation of close ups of both protagonists and medium shots, all set to the accompaniment of a romantic music theme. This is undoubtedly a love scene, which soon doubles up as a sex scene.

The connections between the vampiric act and sex and its erotic implications have been examined above in the “Brides” scene. Here the case is different, with an added emotional dimension to the crude act. But once again, the blood-drinking is a substitute for sex, as is made clear by Oldman’s expression, one of rapturous, indeed climactic, joy. This is underlined by the musical score which simultaneously comes to a “climax” in terms of pitch and volume.
The band of heroes do not then walk onto a horrific attack, as in the novel, but step into the middle of a love scene. Their sudden interruption is briefly announced by the look on Dracula’s face which goes from ecstatic to worried, and as they barge in, the music comes to an abrupt finish, bringing the romantic theme to an end. What the next shot reveals is Mina, in a trance-like state kissing the empty air in front of her. Before the viewer has time to process and decode this information (powers of invisibility?), a repulsive screeching monster dangles down into the shot from above. The effect is obviously startling and typical horror movie fare. The next shot frames the men who have walked in, and the camera is set at a slight high-angle position which seems to imply a dominating threat which is facing them.

The mood has changed dramatically as is illustrated by the soundtrack. There is a barely perceptible hostile musical theme, Dracula’s theme, which has been heard on many previous occasions, generally when the count asserts his power in some manner or other (prologue, Brides scene; etc.). But the most salient sound, besides the characters’ voices, is the howling of a sudden wind/draught which has accompanied the monstrous creature’s entrance and against which the hunters seem to struggle.

The shots continue to alternate between Mina, the men and the creature, who is portrayed using a clearly low angle camera shot which accentuates his physical domination over his opponents (especially in the close ups). The creature’s repulsive appearance is unique to Coppola: he worked on the idea that vampires are connected to bats, and transform into bats, and took it further by creating an anthropomorphic bat creature. However, it seems that illustrator Satty might again have been a source of inspiration.

German-born Satty (of his real name Wilfried Podriech) sought artistic stimulation from nineteenth century lithographic prints, which he transformed into collages which often demonstrated a marked predilection for the grotesque. The artist was at the height of his
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73 He also illustrated a selection of the works of another master of the (American) Gothic, Edgar Allan Poe.
craft in 1976 when Wolf’s *Annotated Dracula* was published, but his private life was
turbulent and six years later he would die an untimely, alcohol-fuelled accidental death at the
age of 42. Since then his reputation has been confidential enough and although his influence
on Coppola seems glaring, it has gone unacknowledged and generally unrecognized. The bat
creature indeed seems to have a precedent: the scene in the book is illustrated by a collage in
which a vampire is seen preying on his victim (P333.1). In the background however lurks
another frightening being, a kind of evil incarnation of the vampire’s spirit. Its appearance,
especially its stature, large pointy ears, sharp teeth and folded wings, is surprisingly similar to
Coppola’s bat-man (P333.2 / P333.3).

The balance of power between the two parties is correlated by their framing: through
the use of angled camera shots, as mentioned above, but also through the type of shot used.
Dracula’s solitary but dominating position is displayed through medium close ups or close
ups whereas the band of heroes are shown in wider episode shots which include them all as a
group, thus focusing on their communal stance. In the novel, the count’s domination over his
adversaries had been rendered by verb/process selection at the experiential level (with the
material processes executed by the count while the hunters were confined to behavioural and
mental processes). In this filmic text, it is conveyed modally instead: the band of heroes is
presented as a fairly homogenous entity, which stands its ground under the pressure of its
formidable enemy.

As the scene comes to an end, another Coppola invention closes it off dramatically.
In the novel, Dracula escaped in the shape of vapour, just as he had come. Here, an
outnumbered but by no means defeated Dracula backs away into the shadows but what is
revealed by Holmwood’s gaslight is not mist but a human-shaped assemblage of rats which
collapses and allows the vampire to flee the scene “in parts”.
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The symbolic links between rats and Dracula have been mentioned before, especially, but not exclusively, in conjunction with *Nosferatu* and the plague. Coppola might then very likely have wanted to re-establish this intertextual allusion in a novel form. The human-shaped pile of rats might again have originated with Satya, although less straightforwardly this time. The illustrator indeed included a collage of a human-shaped grouping, only of insects rather than rats. This served to represent Renfield’s zoophagous obsession and is thus not directly linked to the scene analysed here but the similarities in outline (P334.1 / P334.2) seem to point to an influential connection.

As usual, there is a lot going on in Coppola’s re-interpretation of the scene. The revisionist romantic reading of the story has momentarily cast Stoker into the background. But other influences, and their thematic connotations, have sprung forward in its stead to enrich the visual text, even when they are not necessarily recognized or even recognizable as such.

### 2.11.3 Badham

The re-invention by Coppola of Mina’s attack as a love scene obviously had a precedent in Badham, who was the first director to conceive of Dracula as a romantic hero. Unlike Coppola, Badham chose to exploit Stoker as much as he could before, necessarily, drifting away. The vampire also makes his entrance in mist form, then materializes as the window panes open and walks in. His entrance is fairly theatrical and centrally framed, then offers a counter shot of Mina before each of them in turn is shown in emphatic close up, underlined by a slight zoom and widening of the lens. Dracula makes his vampiric declaration/pledge manipulating Stoker’s lines, which as mentioned above offered some degree of ambiguity, to fit the new context: “Now it is you, *my best beloved one. You will be flesh of my flesh,*
blood of my blood. You shall cross land or sea to do my bidding. I need your blood. I need."

Then the love scene continues without text, alternating fairly close shots of the two protagonists undressing. At one point the vampire literally sweeps Mina off her feet, carrying her to the soon-to-be marital bed in a quintessentially romantic but slightly tacky gesture. Baddeley, for one, ascribed the film’s poor public and critical reception to the fact that it was just too cheesy for its subject, using the oxymoronic phrase “disco Dracula” to summarize his point.

As their relationship is consummated, through the vampire’s bite, the lovers’ change of status is modally expressed through a shift in the image’s tonality. The whole background shifts to a warm red hue and the characters appear delineated as shadows. Through the use of filters and laboratory techniques, contrast of extension is created as the colour scheme becomes almost monochromatic, dramatically modifying the viewers’ perception. The aim might be to suggest a primary, more essential mystical connotation to the corporeal/supernatural union. The scene then develops using a series of special effects, supposedly aiming to convey a dreamlike, symbolic quality to the exchange taking place. Extreme de-zooming, disappearance of the background set, smoky mist, lasers, dissolves, superimpositions (notably of flying bats), all concur to instil a spiritual dimension to the communion. The last shot is particularly illustrative of the general mood, with the camera zooming away and using a distorting lens until the two characters’ profiles dissolve into one.

After the allegorical “wedding” ceremony is completed, the scene resumes and the colour scheme returns to normal. The lovers’ new status is alluded to through a series of close-ups, on their intertwined hands first, then on their kiss. Shots alternate from one to the other again as the ritual is confirmed by Dracula gashing his chest (using his sharp nail, as in

---

335
Stoker), and Mina drinking. The scene ends as the camera tilts up to reveal an extreme close up of the vampire’s ecstatic face, with sexual innuendoes obviously present.

How successful this strikingly different psychedelic scene is in an otherwise visually traditional film is a moot point. Langella reportedly disliked it (“Revamping”) and critic Janet Maslin found it similarly misguided:

The scene in which he seduces her, which ought to be the erotic high point of a movie with considerable erotic pretensions, is proceeding along steamily until Mr. Badham interrupts it with an amazingly ill-advised special-effects sequence, full of abstract shapes in a stark red-and-black scheme.

Many would probably agree that the scene is overwrought and that the visual contrast it presents seems out of place. From a systemic functional multimodal perspective however, it offers a good illustration of how a shift from the representational to the modal metafunction can help convey symbolic meanings, whether the end result is ultimately convincing or not.

2.11.4 Maddin

The Canadian director’s film includes a scene portraying the attack on Mina but it is relatively succinct. The nature of the relationship between Mina and the vampire is more ambiguous and difficult to delineate: the loathing expressed by the novelistic heroine does not seem matched but neither does Mina unequivocally surrender to the attack.

Mina’s curiosity as to sexual matters has been evoked in previous scenes, where it centred on Jonathan and especially his newfound awareness after his encounter with the brides. As mentioned above, this was exemplified at the level of prop by the diary which they dance around.
It is this same curiosity rather than full-blown attraction which seems to drive Mina towards the vampire. Their connection is expressed through a pas de deux which is interrupted once by the intervention of the band of heroes but which they later resume. The choreography is sensual but not overtly so, there seems to be a wariness which Lucy, for instance, did not demonstrate.

When they move to the exchange of blood, it is not particularly amorous or consensual, Dracula is clearly seen to be controlling her and forcing her head to his chest. As in the novel, he has drawn blood himself by using his nail and Maddin, as usual, resorts on tinting in close up to make the blood salient. As she drinks, the mystical connotations or at least the sexually allusive climax of the exchange is intimated by the camera movements. Rather than use the handheld camera to follow the dynamic dance movements and re-instil vivacity into them, as he had previously done (in Lucy’s exorcism, for instance), Maddin uses it here to create symbolic movement: the dancers are relatively still as the camera drives hectic circles around them, in a literally head-spinning manner meant to reflect the head-spinning experience. The focus is on Mina (as victim? as sexually aware? as consensual or not?) as is exemplified through the use of close ups but also through irises and dissolves.

In the novel, Dracula unknowingly signed his own death warrant by creating a mental connection with Mina through the exchange of blood which would lead to his being hunted down and killed by the band of heroes. A less causal and condensed version is given here: the end of this scene is the beginning of the next which represents the count’s death; there is no mental connection or exploitation but in the wake of their encounter, Mina, still stained with blood, runs to a cross and uses it to let the sunlight back in (in this version, unlike the novel, sunlight is prejudicial to the vampire). Her laying the first stone towards the vampire’s slaying seems to corroborate the interpretation that Mina, though curious, is not however a willing victim.
In this Maddin returns to earlier versions such as Browning’s, or Fisher’s which depicted heroines of unshakeable morals but under the influence of an irresistible trance, although the nature of the trance might well vary. Maddin’s heroines have sexual impulses rather than romantic illusions – as was the case with Coppola and Badham - and it is precisely these impulses which the men around them fear or paradoxically envy. They will prove fatal to Lucy but not to Mina, who regains control over them and over herself, at the expense of the vampire’s life.

2.12 Scene 7: Dracula’s death

2.12.1 Stoker

There is one telling sequence which remains to be analyzed if examination of the parallels to be drawn between the novel and the filmic corpus is to be, if not exhaustive, at least inclusive. Dracula’s death and the modalities of his demise close off the story and, although it is included in all versions, it is the single scene which has varied most in the corpus.

All the movies examined kill off the vampire, and in all cases this also corresponds to the end of the film itself. But no film resembles the novel or another film, either from the point of view of cause or method. As with Dracula’s introduction, it will therefore be worthwhile to examine all the films in the corpus in this respect even though they might be – or precisely because they are - at variance with the novel.

The scenes in which the vampire dies have in fact stretched beyond the limits of their film to become an object of interest in and of themselves; Waller for instance has taken the slaying of the Un-dead as the subject of his investigation. The modalities of vampire slaying
have also become one of the cornerstones of vampire lore in popular culture, the formidable enemy's vulnerabilities being at the centre of some surprisingly heated debates.

The varied manners of death which Dracula undergoes in this restricted corpus are then just the tip of the iceberg, but they have also abundantly created and contributed to their own mythology, defining it for the works to come.

The best example of this cycle, which will be further examined individually below, is Dracula's vulnerability to daylight. As has been rapidly sketched above, Stoker only makes his vampire weakened by daylight, especially insofar as his shape-shifting powers go, but by no means is it lethal to him. Staking and beheading are the only means used in the novel to dispatch a vampire. Yet Coppola is the only director to align himself with the book. The origin of the deadly effect of the sun on these "creatures of the night" is to be found in the first (unauthorized) adaptation of the novel Nosferatu. Browning does not dwell on the matter, as most of his "parlour" scenes take place indoors anyway, but all the other directors include daylight either as an aid to (Maddin) or as the sole instrument (Murnau, Fisher, Badham) of the vampire's destruction.

The visual impact and systematic use of this technique has made it into a staple of vampire lore in popular culture. Nearly all the fictional vampires to have emerged in novels, films and TV series are affected by exposure to the sun and come out only at night time or have had to find a way around the problem. This has become such a dominant feature that when writing the Dracula "official sequel", authors Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt felt a concession should be made to vampire fans and the original author's position was revised:

"Vampires burning to ash in the sun is such a part of modern vampire lore that many reading

To name but a few examples, Yarbro's and Rice's novelistic vampires avoid daylight, as do vampires in TV series, Buffy the Vampire Slayer and True Blood; in The Vampire Diaries, they wear daylight rings which protect them from exposure. Only Meyer has a different take on matters in her teen saga Twilight in which her vampires hide their distinctive glowing skin from the sun (in cloudy Washington State).
Bram’s novel for the first time claim that he is “wrong” . . . Bram’s vampire lore is no longer cutting edge, and we have tried to address this in our sequel.” (409) This is a prime example of intertextual dialogism and of its relevance to the exploration of adaptation, an issue which will be developed at greater length in the next section.

In the novel, the final chapter recounting Dracula’s death includes a variety of different voices, generally confined to shorter than usual interventions. It features Van Helsing in an uncharacteristically prominent way: so far, his voice had been mainly mediated by Seward but here, the other doctor not being on hand, Van Helsing writes directly in his memorandum. His distinctive manner of speaking and fanciful unawareness of English grammar are at times blatant and even distracting while at other times Stoker seems to inconsistently lay his character’s verbal idiosyncrasies to rest:

At this time and place, she become all on fire with zeal. Some new guiding power be in her manifested, for she point to a road and say, "This is the way." "How know you it?"
I ask. "Of course I know it," she answer, and with a pause, add, "Have not my Jonathan travelled it and wrote of his travel?" (386)

In contrast with:

Had I not been nerved by thoughts of other dead, and of the living over whom hung such a pall of fear, I could not have gone on. . . . Had I not seen the repose in the first place, and the gladness that stole over it just ere the final dissolution came, as realization that the soul had been won, I could not have gone further with my butchery. I could not have endured the horrid screeching as the stake drove home, the plunging of writhing form, and lips of bloody foam. I should have fled in terror and left my work undone.(394-5)
But the bulk of story telling in these final moments falls to Mina. Her blood bond to Dracula restricts her physically but her mind is still very much on the side of the band of heroes. And never before has their name been so apt.

As has consistently been the case throughout the novel, the narrating voice presents an exterior, observing but relatively inactive point of view. At the experiential level, Mina is, as per usual, linked to behavioural processes of perception (four different counts of see, watch) while those she watches, Quincey and especially Jonathan, are the actors of the material processes. And quite dashing actors they are here; in this climactic action scene the material processes chosen are of a singularly dynamic nature: jump (three times), raise, fling, force through, press forward, win a way through, spring, parry, attack (twice), prize off, etc...

This is correlated by the appraisal motifs apparent in the lexical selection: Jonathan, whose ambiguous status as a victim/hero character has been developed above, regains, through his wife’s eyes, a wholly heroic dimension:

*Jonathan’s impetuosity, and the manifest singleness of his purpose, seemed to overawe those in front of him. Instinctively they cowered aside and let him pass. In an instant he had jumped upon the cart, and with a strength which seemed incredible, raised the great box, and flung it over the wheel to the ground.*

His enemies are logically associated with negative connotations of cowardice or, in Dracula’s case, disgust. Given the subsequent intertextual interpretations (which will be returned to below) which link Mina and Dracula romantically, it is interesting to note how, in these closing moments, there is still no ambiguity to her evaluation of the count: “I saw the Count lying within the box upon the earth, some of which the rude falling from the cart had scattered over him. He was deathly pale, just like a waxen image, and the red eyes glared with the horrible vindictive look which I knew so well.”
The only inkling of pity on the count's behalf is in the mention of the contrasted "look of peace" resting on his face in his final moments.

More surprising is the manner in which Dracula's slaying is depicted. The build up towards this final moment has been tremendous, both in terms of the novel as a whole, which has taken pains to consistently and relatively unambiguously depict the count as the prototypical villain, and in terms of the final chapters dwelling on the drawn-out chase. The manner in which good finally triumphs over evil as the enemy is slain is then all the more distinctively anti-climactic. Five short lines and the vampire is done away with:

*But, on the instant, came the sweep and flash of Jonathan's great knife. I shrieked as I saw it shear through the throat. Whilst at the same moment Mr. Morris's bowie knife plunged into the heart. It was like a miracle, but before our very eyes, and almost in the drawing of a breath, the whole body crumbled into dust and passed from our sight.*

Equally intriguing, or even frustrating, is the impersonal way in which his death is presented, focusing neither on the slayer nor the slain. Instead there is a kind of distancing taking place and conveyed by subject selection at the interpersonal level, and thematic presentation at the textual level. Within each clause, the subjects and topical themes are delayed by the introduction of textual themes (conjunctions, adverbial groups).

But more striking is the nature of the subjects: rather than cast the human actors - who have just been dynamically presented - as the vampire slayers, the emphasis is put instead on their weapons, with knives shearing and plunging rather than being wielded by human agents. This leaves a conflicting impression: it could be argued that the agency of Dracula's murder is deflected and thus takes on a more communal feel, as no one carries off the prize of finally killing the evildoer. But there is undoubtedly some disappointment resulting from this impersonal and unexpectedly fast vampiric demise. Dracula himself undergoes some type of reification as, instead of experiencing the agonizing throes of death supposed to accompany
stabbing (as had been the case with Lucy), it is his body rather than his person which crumbles to dust and vanishes.

However one interprets the ending, its anti-climactic nature stands out. The absence of gory detail could be ascribed to a combination of Victorian restraint and misogyny, especially if compared to Lucy’s bloody exorcism: Stoker might have been loath to subject his male anti-hero to humiliating agony in death. But the rapidity and relative impersonality of the count’s death has also sparked a series of more fanciful interpretations, most of them centring on the fact that Dracula has not been killed at all. Leatherdale for instance comments on the ambiguity of the final scene (125); he also has a very personal interpretation to account for Quincey Morris’s death (and indeed the inclusion of such a “bland” unnecessary character) seeing him as Dracula’s accomplice. The advocates of these interpretations put forward all sorts of logical arguments, most of which state that the count has not been properly staked but only stabbed, that his beheading may only have been partial and/or that crumbling away could have been just another of his corporeal transformations.

The fact remains that all these interpretations, and the ensuing implication that Stoker might have wanted to write a sequel, are completely circumstantial. Nothing in the text of the novel or in his biography point unambiguously, if at all, to such a conclusion. What seems less ambiguous is the origin of this wishful thinking. Through its varied visual incarnations and plethora of re-interpretations and sequels, the character of Dracula, even the original character, could not be conceived as a “one-off”. The complex intertextual patterns linking the novel to its later re-inventions, most of them in the form of film-texts, came back to feed perception and criticism of the source text. Dracula, after all, is un-dead in a much wider sense than what Stoker originally meant: he is, and for the foreseeable future will be, forever resurrecting in popular culture (as will be dealt with more extensively in the next section).
2.12.2 Coppola

By contrast with Stoker’s text, almost all the films included in this corpus foreground Dracula’s death in a dramatic and/or detailed way (except for Browning, see below). The story’s construction truly culminates in this final scene and its dramatic possibilities were correctly perceived as visually powerful.

But Coppola’s is the only version to closely adhere to the particulars of Dracula’s death as presented in the book: the chase, the gypsies, the fight, the race against sundown, the double knife attack… all the better to then betray the essence of the novel with an additional “reincarnation romance” scene.

The whole final sequence, especially the chase, is fast-paced and energetic (the ASL for the whole film stands at 5.6 before this scene and drops to 5.2 by the end of the film), much like an action film. The urgency of the struggle is underlined by music (extremely fast rhythm, high pitched string chords and bells, repetitive themes) and sound effects but also by the visual motif of the sun going down, as shown through variation in lighting but also more straightforwardly with shots of the setting sun.

As has been stated above, the sun was not lethal to Dracula in Stoker’s text but did weaken his powers: in this final scene it is what prevents him from shape-shifting and fleeing his pursuers. Coppola is also the only director to return to this original stance. However, with the attack taking place just as the sun sets and the vampire regains control, the day/night dichotomy is powerfully fronted. The direction in which the impact of daylight would evolve in other films is then not surprising. It could be argued that if daylight does not kill the count directly, its restrictions on his powers lead to his death: the sun and its persistence metaphorically take his life.

Although unambiguously present in Stoker’s text, this typically Gothic polar opposition between night and day (which resonates with wider oppositions such as light and
dark, black and white, good and evil) is made more palpable by the visual medium. The film thus returns to the novel while simultaneously integrating symbolic imagery which has become foundational to the vampire on screen.

At the beginning of the scene, the sun is going down as Jonathan stands over the crate, about to open it. As it disappears behind a large cloud, Dracula springs out of the crate and grabs Harker’s throat. Shots alternate rapidly and at times barely perceptibly: a closer shot of the struggling pair with Harker aiming to strike, an extreme close up on the vampire’s throat as the knife shears through it, then wider shots of all the participants engaged in the hectic action. When Quincey in turn prepares to attack the count the camera zooms in with him as he stabs his heart with the great bowie knife. Through the motion, the viewer is made to join in the action, to modally engage with it, to a certain degree.

At this point, excepting Quincey’s death, the parallels between novel and film end as Coppola reactivates his reincarnation romance theme and creates a final intimate scene between the star-crossed lovers. As Mina protects her lover and holds her friends at bay by yielding a firearm, a deeply wounded Dracula is tinting the white snow with his red blood, like the injured Quincey had done just before him. Coppola seems to revel in the visually striking effect of the colour contrast between the white snow and red blood. Beyond this contrast also lie the symbolic associations which both colours conjure up: the purity and clarity of the unblemished snow versus the vital scarlet blood which sullies it, bringing death as it is split.

This contrast of blood and snow is not an uncommon motif visually and/or symbolically. A similar use in film is the final duel scene in Stephen Frears’ *Dangerous Liaisons* where a wounded Valmont bleeds to death in the snow, literally and symbolically expiating through blood his feigned coldness to Madame de Tourtou. Another literary example may be found in Garcia Marquez’s “The trail of your blood in the snow” in the *Strange Pilgrims* short story collection, a magic realism tale in which colour symbolism has a preponderant role to play.
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As Mina confronts the band of heroes, there is another manipulative inversion of Stoker's initial text. In the novel, when Mina feels Dracula's hold over her increasing she makes her accomplices swear that, if need be, they will save her soul:

"Then I shall tell you plainly what I want, for there must be no doubtful matter in this connection between us now. You must promise me, one and all, even you, my beloved husband, that should the time come, you will kill me."

"What is that time?" The voice was Quincey's, but it was low and strained.

"When you shall be convinced that I am so changed that it is better that I die that I may live. When I am thus dead in the flesh, then you will, without a moment's delay, drive a stake through me and cut off my head, or do whatever else may be wanting to give me rest! " (351-2)

Coppola uses similar lines twice but alters the context, making them resonate in a completely different – indeed contrary – fashion. A frenzied Mina first accuses Van Helsing of revelling in the prospect of her death: "Will you cut off my head and drive a stake through my heart as you did poor Lucy, you murdering bastard?" Then later, it is her husband she addresses as she looks upon her maimed lover's body: "When my time comes, will you do the same to me? Will you?" The rising intonation pattern in the question tag indicates that this is a real, accusing, enquiry and not just a phatic tag.

Mina and Dracula retreat into the castle as Quincey dies surrounded by his friends. The words which Van Helsing speaks have again been exported from Stoker and re-contextualized. When Van Helsing first arrives on the scene to tend to Lucy he says to his friend Seward, the asylum director: "All men are mad in some way or the other, and inasmuch as you deal discreetly with your madmen, so deal with God's madmen too, the rest of the

---

(the extremely young and innocent newlywed heroine dies of a finger wound caused by a thorny rose, spreading her blood in the snow as the young couple seek a hospital).
world.” (129) On screen a disbelieving Hopkins states: “We’ve all become God’s madmen, all of us”.

The religious reference is actually very much in keeping with the rest of the scene and not dissimilar to the atmosphere reigning at the end of the book. As has been mentioned above, religion is an important theme in the novel but one which often rings with ambiguous or at best unclear overtones which have led to multiple interpretations. As a Gothic tale, Dracula foregrounds the eternal Christian struggle between good and evil, but its use of Christian themes and motifs is rarely straightforward. As Victorians, the band of heroes are a prototypical bunch of good-doing, god-fearing believers. But more specific definition of their religious stances remains imprecise: who is a Catholic, who is a Protestant, what exactly is Dracula’s link to religion, how do rituals fit it, why is Catholic symbolism used (host), etc…? As Quincey dies, the novel ends on an untypical mystical religious note: as the Texan points to Mina’s forehead from which the scar caused by the burning host has disappeared, all the men “sank on their knees and a deep and earnest ‘Amen’ broke from all”. The slaying of the vampire and saving of Mina then take on a “miraculous” dimension, in the sense of an act of God.

Coppola’s thematic use of religion is heavy-handed throughout the film: in the prologue, he actually ascribes Dracula’s vampirism to an act of Godly renouncement. His interpretation in this final scene, like the novel’s, is imbued with the shadow of religious salvation. In this case, however, it centres almost wholly on Dracula and has an added cyclical dimension: through the power of love, the vampire is redeemed and reconciled to his god. The prologue’s cruel God has become the God of love. And, as is implied by Mina’s words in voiceover, if God is love, then all-powerful love conquers all: “There, in the presence of God, I understood at last how my love could release us all from the powers of darkness. Our love is stronger than death.”
The religious factor which is already quite overtly stated is reinforced, almost to overkill, by other visual/aural dimensions. First the set, as the goodbye scene takes place in the prologue chapel, complete with giant crucifix. Then different lighting effects are used: candles magically light up and suffuse the chapel with soft, warm light and as peace comes to the vampire before death a similar golden “godly” light bathes his face which transforms from bestial back to princely. The moment when Dracula actually dies shows him with an illuminated look (of godly revelation?) on his face, which is still literally illuminated by the “supernatural” light. So the balance between light and darkness is inverted once more; although the sun has set, the chapel is lit by God’s otherworldly light, a light which Dracula, no longer a creature of darkness, is now able to stand. Finally music drives through the religious theme: choir singing, whose primary associations are with the Church, can be heard in the background.

The cumulated effect of these different semiotic resources and their religious connotations is definitely heavy-handed if not unsubtle; but in its intent it is not dissimilar to the awkward suddenness of the band of heroes’ religious epiphany in the novel.

To “bring him peace”; it is Mina who finishes off Dracula by driving the knife completely through his heart. The merciful execution is shot with a stylized attention to detail: five different shots alternate so rapidly that some of them are barely perceptible, functioning almost at the subliminal level to confirm the vampire’s death. Mina is first shown in close up, the knife’s handle is present in the foreground of the shot but blurry since the focus, both literal and figurative, is on her instead. Then the following shots alternate in extremely rapid succession: a close-up on the blade, a wider shot with Mina determinedly driving it through, a shot showing the body from below as the blade comes through and finally a close up in profile of the knife’s blade exiting through the body and stabbing the ground below it. Whether these detailed shots are noticeable or not, the general effect is crafty and complete.
After Mina kisses the body of her beloved a final goodbye, she completes the process by decapitation. This second intervention is similarly fast-paced and detailed, with close ups on the weapon and severed head. After the deed, Mina looks up and is framed with the body by a completely vertical high angle camera directly above her. It moves down and closes up on her, displaying the emotional smile which now lingers on her lips. Her personal (mystical) epiphany is completed and underlined by the choir singing pouring forth. The countershot then reveals, with a corresponding vertical low angle shot, the mosaic decorating the ceiling and which represents Vlad and Elizabeta floating as if flying in heaven. The camera moves away gently spinning on its axis before there is a final cut to black.

Thus Coppola ends his movie by carrying forth the romantic theme of eternal love across the boundaries of death, conquering all, even the forces of darkness. The mystical resonances which his foregrounded semiotic choices carry are remindful of Stoker’s final miraculous purification. But the director takes a different track by making Mina the exclusive instrument of Dracula’s salvation, who has not only cleansed his soul from darkness through the power of her love but also released him by conducting the final execution. The focus on Mina, as well as the active part she takes in the final scene, is very different from the exterior witnessing position she is confined to in the novel.

In its conclusion, *Bram Stoker’s Dracula* once again combines plot elements but also themes and motifs (meanings) of Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* with idiosyncratic approaches which could be considered as conflicting with or even antonymic to the novel. This is what caused the film to incur the wrath of Dracula aficionados upon its release. As seen above, it was not the only or first version to bring about drastic changes and re-visitations but maybe it was the first to do so on such a scale. Or maybe it was the combination of these novelties and an unflinching, if at times puzzling, “faithfulness” to other aspects of Stoker’s text which generated confusion. At this point, may be worth mentioning again that if some (most)
Dracula purists reacted negatively to the adaptation, it was nevertheless a resounding box office success and, if not universally lauded, praised by a majority of critics.

The impact that this version has had on subsequent readings of the Dracula myth will be explored in the next section, but suffice it to say for now that Coppola’s film was a turning point and that some of its interpretations would redefine popular perception of the story forever.

### 2.12.3 Murnau

Even though it was very nearly destroyed and took a while to be re-discovered and establish the classic status it now holds, *Nosferatu* set the standard for how Dracula would die on screen. As has been mentioned above, Murnau’s work introduced the notion of the vampires’ vulnerability to sunlight, which, notwithstanding its many other aesthetic qualities, was probably its most important contribution to the genre.

Murnau’s expressionistic interest in contrastive shadow play has been alluded to and obviously ties into this theme: the nocturnal creature, lurking so deep in the shadows it is no more than a shadow itself, is destroyed by the break of dawn. The modalities of the vampire’s termination, and the link to its shadowy nature, are explicitly stated in an earlier scene in which a curious Mina cannot resist the lure of the little vampire book. An intertitle divulges the vampire’s Achilles’ heel: “Beware of his shadow. Do not let it haunt your dreams. There is no salvation other than a faultless woman who lets the vampire forget the first crow of the rooster by giving her blood.” It is then knowingly that Mina sacrifices herself to free Bremen of the Black Death which plagues it.

The scene opens with Mina, who has just sent Jonathan away and opened her window, symbolically inviting the vampire in from across the street (he will however enter through the
door). She walks to the open widow as the camera pans to follow her and a countershot once
again reveals the buildings opposite and the menace which lurks within. As she peers out,
there is a cut to the staircase in which a very distinctive and by now recognizable shadow is
seen creeping up the stairs. The next shot shows an aware and frightened Mina turning round
to face the door. The other side of the door is revealed next in a frame featuring an oversized
shadow (much bigger than the doorframe) whose extremely long claw-like fingers are making
their way towards the knob. The image then returns to Mina, in medium close up as before,
clutching her heart with a horrified expression as she makes her way back towards the bed as
shown in a wider shot. Then a closer shot frames her turning away as the shadow of a hand
makes its way up her body grasping at the location of her heart and causing her to wince.

These shots, in which only the count's shadow is apparent are the culmination of this
visual motif presented earlier on in the film. Whereas the vampire's shadow had previously
been introduced as a kind of impending threat, in this scene the shadow itself seems to lead
the horrific way, climbing up stairs, opening doors and clutching at hearts, as of its own
volition. The effect is startling and memorable, both visually and symbolically: how can one
fight the shadow of evil other than by bringing the pure light of goodness to bear upon it?

The scene and its hypnotic force then suffer a series of interruptions for the sake of
narrative clarity at the logical level, but probably at the expense of intensity at the
compositional level: Harker goes to wake the doctor, and allusions are made to the recapture
of Renfield. When the shot finally reveals the vampire and his prey, the attack has already
taken place off screen, or rather, quite aptly, in the shadows. The shot is wide, depicting Mina
lying on the bed with Dracula crouching by her head (her neck), and longer than average,
giving some inkling of the way the vampire loses himself in time. There is a cut to the image
of a cock crowing outside. The next shot closes up on Dracula slowly lifting his head off his
prey and turning towards the window, then the cock is shown again. Again the scene cuts
away to shots of Renfield in his cell, reacting to the bird’s crowing and dawn breaking and trying to climb out and warn his master. Another shot also shows Harker and the doctor arriving through the garden.

When the action returns to the room, the shot displays the window centrally, thus modally engaging the viewers’ attention towards it as it will be the scene, and instrument, of the vampire’s death. A cut then returns to the wider previous shot with Schreck rising as if in a trance and making his way to the window, almost as an insect drawn to the consuming light of a flame. There is a kind of mirror effect to Mina’s situation as he is now the one clutching his heart. The window mise-en-scene then resumes with Dracula walking past it in profile; he stops as if halted by a force beyond his control, shelters his face in an awkward gesture with his right hand, pivots around at a three-quarter angle to face the sun, extends his right hand towards it and vanishes. This was quite a remarkable use of superimposition as a special “disappearing” effect - especially at such an early date - contributing to its long-term cult status. The wider shot of the room then resumes with a few flames subsiding where the vampire used to stand. The scene ends with a distraught Renfield lamenting, and by the same token confirming, his master’s death.

The essential role of light and shadows in _Nosferatu_ can thus be observed, and interpreted, at different levels: thematically and symbolically but also as a reflection on the nature of film itself. Abbott, for instance, examines the Dracula myth with respect to modernity and explores how each time period has dealt with the issue. She argues that _Nosferatu_ was not as quintessentially expressionistic as is generally stated (notably through its preference for natural settings over stylized sets) and that the figure of the vampire, through the use of new technologies such as dissolves and superimpositions, embodies a new type of modernity, namely the photographic. Her contention is that the vampire, through his ghostly presence resulting from these effects, brings out the spectral quality inherent to film.
technology itself. In a cyclical movement, later references to this 'forefather' of Dracula films are allusive to this now out-dated technology and refer to other types of modernity, while consciously exploiting the past:

In these films, however, the vampire no longer represents the uncanniness of modern technology but rather old technology, as well as conveying a nostalgia for cinema of the past. [This] reaffirms the notion that modernity operates as a cycle, replacing what was once modern with a more up-to-date incarnation. (60)

This is particularly interesting for the later versions included in this corpus, Coppola's and Maddin's, who have both sought inspiration and paid obvious homage to the German classic in their respective ways. The interest of both movies in photographic and spectral effects has hopefully emerged from the preceding analyses. Another direct instance of Coppola's allusions which has been mentioned above is his take on the vampire's shadow. As to Maddin, a more enduring homage is built into the format of his movie itself (silent, black and white photography, expressionistic acting, stylized sets etc.).

2.12.4 Browning

Of all the films included in this corpus, Browning's is the only one to not overtly show Dracula's death on screen, let alone dwell on it. In this respect, it is quite similar to the novel in being anti-climactic. Two reasons can explain this directorial choice. First, the influence of the stage dramatization, the model for this version, in which the vampire did not die on stage but was heard expiring in the wings. Second, as seen above, Universal was targeting as wide an audience as possible with this production and therefore sought to abide by the Hays code and not include anything reprehensible in terms of sexual content (the chaste Brides scene) or violence.
However, it cannot be denied that the ending to the standoff between the count and the rest of the characters falls flat: it seems rushed and a bit muddled. Harker and Van Helsing pursue Dracula and an entranced Mina to the crypt of Carfax Abbey. There is an improvised feel to the chase as the characters run about aimlessly before they come upon the coffins. Despite the threat to Mina, the scene is not particularly suspenseful as the viewer is not modally engaged in the action: no music, effects and/or contrastive editing which might generate anticipation or sympathy for her plight.

Browning does include a moment of delayed suspense when Van Helsing opens the first coffin, fails to respond to Harker's stammering questions (Is she...? How is she...?) and cautiously closes it again before stating "She is not here!" A contemporary audience more attuned to dramatic visual effects might have expected him to throw the lid open and reveal its empty content (in close up), probably with a few striking chords to underline the revelation. The disorganized, rather than urgent, feel of the scene can also be perceived in the absence of tools to fight the enemy. Van Helsing improvises a stake from a splinter of wood while Harker looks around for a blunt object to drive it through. Luckily for them, the count does not put up a fight and compliently lies, waiting for them to stake him.

As they chase their nemesis to his coffin, most shots are (very) wide displaying the atmospheric crypt rather than the characters' anguish. There are a few closer shots towards the end, on Van Helsing preparing for the slaying or on Mina, hypnotized into a stupor. Van Helsing is thus shown raising his "hammer" before there is a cut to Jonathan looking for Mina. Pounding noises are heard along with an agonizing wail, but these sounds are quite low-key again, conveying neither volume nor intensity. And thus is the fiend rapidly and efficiently dispatched, off-screen and with minimal effect.

The scene focuses on the young couple next. Mina is portrayed in medium close up with a glassy stare upon her face which suddenly shifts as if she were emerging from a
waking nightmare. There is a cut to Jonathan still looking for her, she screams and he runs in the direction of her voice. There is a rapid cut to Van Helsing, as before, hearing their reunion. The lovers are then framed together as Mina explains her trials, Van Helsing joins them but urges them to leave while he remains behind. The reason is unclear, or at any rate unmentioned; a vampire aficionado might surmise that he wishes to complete the execution and decapitate the body, although, given the lack of proper tools, that might prove quite a challenge. Browning’s concern, to focus only on the couple, seems to have been more symbolic than logical. The shot dissolves to the final frame of Mina and Jonathan walking up the steps to exit the Abbey. As they walk up side by side, church bells are heard in the distance, the camera pans up with them before the shot fades to black.

A conjunction of different symbols seems to be at play here. The ascension of the stairs is like exiting an inferno (much like the souls climbing up or down the stairs in Dante’s Inferno) while the couple’s posture, the bells and even the train of Mina’s nightdress seem to allude to a wedding. The prototypical Hollywood happy ending, especially in those early days, would have a happy couple (re)united, preferably in morally sanctioned matrimony. Despite Dracula belonging to a very different genre. Browning seems to have felt the need to hint towards that tradition and end his film on a similar note.

At any rate, Browning’s ending was definitely not the most memorable or influential moment of the film. Certainly none of his followers would align with his decision to deprive their audience of the cathartic vampire slaying by setting it off-screen.

2.12.5 Fisher

As mentioned above, Browning’s version would long remain the benchmark of how the general public would perceive of Dracula. The Hammer productions would not only introduce
a new iconic face for the count but would also set new standards as to the expectations of the
horror genre and how they should be fulfilled.

Fisher’s final scene is then everything that Browning’s wasn’t: climactic, energetic,
suspenseful, cathartic and fairly gruesome. To this effect, it relies heavily on dynamic editing
techniques and a definitely unsubtle but tremendously effective musical soundtrack.
As in Browning’s film, Dracula is fleeing back to safety in his home, taking Mina with him
and is chased by Holmwood\(^7\) and Van Helsing. As Arthur tends to his wife, the final pursuit
is between the count and his arch-rival the professor.

Initially the chase is depicted through wide shots of different rooms in the castle as
the characters dash through them. The camera perspectives are diverse and infuse vitality into
the scene: occasionally mobile and panning to follow a character’s progression, in other cases
it is fixed the characters fill the screen by running towards it. Other camera angles guide the
viewer: an overhead shot shows Dracula escaping through a room, in the next series of shots
Van Helsing is seen hesitating before a entering a room and being similarly framed, a modal
indication to the audience that he is on the right track and about to close in on his prey. But
the image’s dynamicity is nothing compared to the intensity of the music which accompanies
the scene: rhythmic, fleeting strings sustain the impression of urgency of the chase.

Once Dracula is cornered and the two enemies reach a stand off, the initial wide
shots make way for an alternation of focuses: a few wide shots portray the action-packed
moments (as when the count throws a candlestick at his pursuer throws himself on him) but
also many closer shots (medium close-ups and close-ups) illustrating the intensity of the
struggle and the characters’ emotional responses to it, as for instance when a triumphant
Dracula believes he has defeated his enemy and grins toothily before attempting to bite him.

\(^7\) A quick reminder of the character interactions in this film: before falling prey to Dracula, Jonathan is engaged
to Lucy while her brother, Arthur, is married to Mina.
These shots also help to modally guide the viewers’ attention through the ongoing, and coming, action. At one point, for instance, Van Helsing in close-up looks at something from the corner of his eye. The next shot (his point of view) shows a large window with daylight breaking behind the curtains. So when the initial close-up resumes and he exits the frame suddenly, it can be inferred that he is heading in that direction, as is instantly confirmed by the wider shot which follows.

This is in fact the scene’s apex in terms of action as Van Helsing runs across the table, flinging himself at the curtains to bring them down and let the light of day flood in. Dracula’s fate is left to no doubt as his instant loud and painful screech announces. Different close ups show the suffering on his face but also the physical result of the intervention: his foot dissolving to ashy dust. Van Helsing is also closely framed as he takes matters to the next level, constructing a makeshift crucifix out of two candlesticks. In this respect, the scene is reminiscent of Browning’s as the heroes improvise weapons or strategies of destruction. This was already the case with Stoker where knives were used in lieu of stakes, and it seems to have become the norm of Dracula films that the final showdown has an unprepared feel to it, with the good guys driven by the urgency of the moment to use whatever falls at hand to kill the bad guy. Present in all the films in the corpus, the best example of this trend would be Badham and his use of unconventional tools such as hooks, traps and pulleys (see below).

A wider shot, in which the ray of sunlight is clearly visible, shows the professor advancing on his maimed enemy. A low angle shot, corresponding to Dracula’s point of view, then frames the professor, underlining his dominance over the vampire, as does a later shot with the camera placed behind Van Helsing with a corresponding high-angle depicting the supine vampire. As he recoils his hand enters the ray of light and is again shown dissolving in close up. Close ups of the screaming count, his confident attacker and his different limbs.
succumbing alternate until the villain falls completely into the light, his face charring and his cries finally dying down.

Throughout the gruesome scene, there is no dialogue between the protagonists but sound nevertheless has a predominant role to play. First, it is through Dracula’s blood-curdling screams that the extremity of his situation is made palpable to the audience, which might either rejoice or cringe in response. Second, as has been the case throughout the movie, music takes on an important role as it guides the viewers through the action (modally) while simultaneously underlining the visual dimension (representationally).

James Bernard, the composer, worked on different Hammer productions but Dracula stands out as one his most accomplished pieces. He was renowned for certain features which are at their peak here: a frenzied pace, clashing harmonies and the clever use of recurring motifs in different tones. In this final scene, he uses hectic rhythm and high-pitched string instruments to underscore the frantic pace of the action. Wind instruments (especially brass) are brought in at a lower pitch to introduce menace into the melody and percussions (especially drums and cymbals) accentuate the pivotal moments. When Dracula finally crumbles to ashes, for instance, booming drums give the melody a more serene, triumphant note. As the scene shifts outside to Mina and Arthur, the music becomes softer, more slow-paced and romantic and will remain so until crashing percussions (and an increase in volume) signal the end and the credits start rolling to the Gothic tone of Dracula’s theme.

Dracula’s death is presented quite unambiguously in the final shots: the mark of the cross fades away from Mina’s tainted hand, and the pile of ashes which the vampire’s body left on the floor is swept away by a windy draft from the open window, leaving only his ring behind. Yet Fisher and his producers would have no qualms about resurrecting the apparently “non-salvageable” vampire eight years later, and then killing him off and resurrecting him again and again in multiple sequels. Finding innovative ways of killing off and bringing back
the count would in fact become one of the franchise’s foundational traits; but this explicit ending, as the first of its kind, would stand as landmark not only of its own “family” (the Hammer vampire films) but also of later adaptations of the novel.

2.12.6 Badham

Most of the films in this corpus (with the exception of Murnau’s and Maddin’s versions) follow Stoker’s narrative construction: Dracula flees his enemies who pursue and eventually destroy him. Earlier on in the film, Badham had already demonstrated his fondness for chases and varying modes of transportation but it culminates in this final scene. A reduced band of heroes, consisting only of Jonathan and Van Helsing track down Dracula and Mina to a boat about to set sail, the “Czarina Katerina”.

It is an unusual setting for the vampire’s death but there are some striking precedents of navigation associated not only with the novel but also its adaptations. It is obviously natural that travelling from Eastern Europe to the United Kingdom involves the crossing of water, but beyond this geographical necessity, the maritime episodes have generally proved enduringly vivid. Stoker’s use of the Demeter’s log and the captain’s evolution from mystification to waking nightmare set the model. Although a whole crew was decimated, terror in this passage stems from mystery as to its disappearance rather than from the presentation of horrific facts.

The case is different with the most famous and striking example of a filmic adaptation of this scene in Nosferatu. When Murnau’s count crosses the sea, the ship’s crew doesn’t suddenly disappear but is taken by a strange illness instead; the link between vampirism and the plague and notably the intermediary role played by rats are all put forward in this version. But this sequence is particularly memorable in what it overtly shows rather
than in what it insinuates. Delirious though the sailors well may be, the “hallucinations” which plague them are presented realistically and leave a vivid impression on the viewers especially at two distinct moments. First, when a feverish sailor glimpses a transparent vampire by his side in the hold who then fades back into thin air; and second when a determined mate raids the hold to find the source of the plague and is confronted by the vampire supernaturally emerging out of his coffin in one go, rigid as a plank of wood. Beyond his strange appearance and almost autonomous shadow, these are the first more explicit signs of the creature’s otherworldly, and fearsome, nature.

It is then not unusual to connect Dracula with boats, but Badham was the only director to make him die on one and to actually use the boat and its structure to kill him off. A few unobtrusive techniques remind the audience of the scene’s setting: in certain shots the camera is gently swaying from left to right as if following the sea’s heave and the purring of engines is also perceptible on the soundtrack.

But the crux of the scene is of course not on the setting but on the confrontation between the vampire and his pursuers: it is then no wonder that the sequence unfolds mainly through (medium) close ups of the different characters, but also of key moments or objects in the scene (for instance the stake, first aimed at Dracula but which will eventually kill Van Helsing and which is framed in close up in both cases). Modally, the viewers are thus thrown into the centre of the unfolding action. The audience is also engaged through another sense by the use of the musical soundtrack featuring John Williams’ emotionally charged score. Changes in volume and rhythm are different ways of guiding its focus but the emphasis here seems to be particularly on variations of pitch (especially with string instruments): the higher the pitch, the more extreme the degree of urgency.

In the initial part of the scene, for instance, Dracula seems quite in control and even overly cocky: he remains impassive, not even batting an eyelid when being shot at. But later,
when Van Helsing impales him with a hook and Harker exposes him to sunlight by operating the pulley, the horror of his fate is underlined by the soundtrack as his cries intermingle with Mina's and the music reaches its highest pitch.

As the action accelerates, the camera's angles vary to depict it dynamically: a low angle camera shows the vampire's ascension into the lethal daylight while a high-angled shot frames the humans left below in the hold. The whole scene is in fact imbued with a motif of verticality and ascension, both aurally and visually, from the cargo hold to the top of the ship's mast. This final scene draws attention to the story's "culmination" in more ways than one.

As the pulley unfurls completely and Dracula reaches the top of the mast, his ordeal is presented more "frontally": the camera faces him and shows his decay in close up: his skin is gradually covered in boils and his hair whitens. These images are intercut by shots of the sun, some of which are almost abstract and/or symbolic: the surface of the sun is shown with unrealistic detail (magma erupting) which is meant to convey the intensity of the burn. As the vampire finally surrenders and hangs limp, a series of close-ups focus on the different characters (and their fates) including a dead Van Helsing and a numb and expressionless Mina. Her attention is however caught by a flapping sound which makes her look up in its direction. The next shot depicts the ship's sails, against whose white background the black shape of a cape is seen floating away. Although it is recognizable as a cape, the cloth seems to take on a bat-like shape as it is carried by the wind in a preternatural way which makes it seem as if it were flying rather than blown away.

Once again, the shot is given an added meaning by the use of music: the melody changes from the slow-paced romantic tune which had accompanied the "hero's" death to simple string chords which carry connotations of mystery and suspense. The camera then zooms in on Mina in extreme close up, only cutting to show the barely discernible speck of
the receding cape in the sky; her eyes light up while the hint of a smile appears on her lips. A last glimpse of the cape is shown before the credits start rolling.

By making the traditional villain the hero of the tale and figure of the audience’s empathy Badham has therefore stretched the genre’s conventions to (beyond?) their utter limits: although he is killed -and in a traditionally gruesome way- the possibility of his death being only an illusion is very forcibly hinted at. The whole preceding scene is then invalidated to a certain degree.

As a vampire, Dracula is un-dead but also un-dying: doubt can easily be cast on his true demise as has been the case with all his incarnations right from Stoker onwards, with multiple resuscitations along the way. But Badham is the only director in this corpus to powerfully underline and even orient this doubt, or even to not kill him off properly in the first place. This may be justified by the fact that the cathartic effect of his death would seem out of place since he is not the “bad” guy; however, to Dracula purists, this twist was often considered as the ultimate betrayal (Maslin).

2.12.7 Maddin

Maddin’s slaying of the vampire bears his visual stamp and also brings together most of the themes disseminated in the film, particularly the East/West divide as the British band of heroes literally “gang up” to defeat the foreign enemy. An unusual feature of this scene is the almost complete absence of choreography; although the scene is as meticulously composed as others, it offers fewer danced elements. For instance, the contrast with the other slaying scene, i.e. Lucy’s, is quite striking. In this previous scene, many interactions and emotions were depicted through expressive dancing, which is no longer the case here. This likely means that Maddin put his own distinctive imprint on the ending, distancing himself from Godden.
This scene follows the attack on Mina directly. As mentioned above, the blood bond between the vampire and his victim is not one of allegiance in this case: on the contrary, Mina immediately turns on Dracula and aids the men.

As usual, the scene is extremely rapid in its editing pace, extremely short shots alternate and dissolve into each other, barely giving the viewer time to take them in and creating a more subliminal general impression. This sensation of relative "speed" furthermore contrasts with the previous scene, which had used slow motion to depict (and insist on) the exchange of blood.

The first few shots focus on the altercation between Mina, who counterattacks by holding out a crucifix, and her assailant, who seems somewhat subdued whether by the giving of blood (he clutches his wound), the effect of the crucifix, or probably both. But rapidly, the shots present close ups on all of the men slowly emerging from their trance-like state and preparing for attack. Wider shots show a cornered Dracula, while close ups focus on his reactions. Several extreme close ups show his eyes, turning left and right as if seeking an illusory escape. This representational meaning may be doubled by a symbolic one, since Dracula’s eyes are the most significant feature of his foreign nature, his otherness.

The abundantly expanded theme of the fear of the other culminates in this scene, as the object of fear is destroyed. By focusing on all the members of the band of heroes, Mina included, and their active part in the process, Maddin seems to imply the strategic (in this case numerical) superiority of the imperialistic West. It could even be argued that the audience also participates in this process as Maddin inserts subjective camera shots as if the viewers themselves were threatening the vampire at stake point. At one point, a totally vertical high-angle camera reveals Dracula standing on a ground covered in banknotes (tinted green). There is then no mistaking the impulse of greed lying behind the conquering determination to destroy the "other".
There is in fact a tremendous amount of subtext in this slaying scene, and although it does not hinder the narrative progression, much of it can be subsequently interpreted in different ways. The preying vampire becomes the prey which must be hunted, the obstacle to the West’s conquering pretensions which must be removed, the threat it poses to its sexual integrity by tempting away its women which must be eradicated. It may even be surmised that, through the use of the cross in this scene and the role of religious imagery at large in the film, religion is considered complicit in this process. Maddin’s reading of the Victorian men as imperialistic, domineering and xenophobic might in fact reflect a wider judgment on the British Colonial Empire, or even colonization at large, and the ambiguous role played by religion and especially Churches in the process. This interpretation also seems to hold for the film’s final shots, which show the band of heroes looting castle Dracula and participating in some gratuitous destruction before they leave.

Daylight might not be the means of the vampire’s ghoulish destruction but it does provide assistance towards it. Maddin makes clever use of cinematic language to express the destructive power of light by using blinding overexposed shots and even a completely white screen.

The dichotomy between light and darkness and all the ensuing contrasts it evokes is central to the Gothic genre; the key role it played, and the resulting impact it had in a foundational film such as Nosferatu has been mentioned above. Once again Maddin places himself within this tradition while at the same time diverting its codes to suit his own themes and preoccupations: here it is the vampire who is backed up against a wall, as the shadows of his assailants creep up on him signalling his dark fate, much as Schreck’s shadow terrified its victims.

In Stoker’s text, Dracula’s murder was a communal and/or impersonal affair which involved and simultaneously cleared the band of heroes from direct or exclusive
responsibility. This is also the case here: Van Helsing is the definite “arm” of the vampire’s death but all the others are complicit in the murder, as is exemplified by the blood splatters resulting from the staking and which cover all their faces. Later shots will show them wiping away the blood from their faces, much as they had washed their hands of Lucy’s blood in a previous scene. The killing is presented as a very inglorious affair, mainly since Van Helsing literally stabs the vampire in the back.

Throughout the film, Van Helsing’s portrayal is ambiguous at best and increasingly negative as it progresses. David Moroni’s gentlemanly features and elegant demeanour gradually make way for a more cliché representation, in keeping with Maddin’s depiction of all the male protagonists. His deep insecurities, hidden under a smug surface, lead him to victimize others which he secretly fears or envies. This is symbolized for instance by the scenes with Mina’s petticoat which is used to block out a window but which he discreetly steals in the end, presumably to assuage some sexual fantasy. When he kills the vampire, the expression on his face dispels his already dwindling semblance of dignity; his features clearly display an appearance of sadistic enjoyment as he completes the act. There are no redeeming features for the ruthless, cowardly, self-centred band of “heroes”.

A final inversion takes place in these closing shots: rather than just being stabbed, the vampire is effectively impaled and then exposed by his killers on the stake. This is an obvious allusion to the historical figure of Vlad Tepes, also known as Vlad the Impaler for his cruel method of disposing of enemies, as depicted for instance in this German woodcut dating back to 1499 (P365). The imagery, which Coppola had also used in his prologue, is thus completely reversed here as the impaler becomes the impaled.

Finally, mention should be made of the soundtrack and especially of a sudden and somewhat dissonant change in mood. Energetic and fast-paced music is present in the background as the heroes draw in on their enemy but once he is killed, the melody becomes
softer, with ethereal singing. The violence and crudeness of the kill contrast with the delicate, soothing music and do not quite seem to match unless, of course, the music is intended as an ironic commentary: the killing would be cathartic and cleansing if the killers’ intentions were purer.

Even though he adheres to the novel’s narrative logic and progression, it is obvious that Maddin has a different, and very personal, thematic agenda which he drives through very forcefully in this scene. While issue might be taken with his extreme and somewhat clichéd portrayals, the manner in which he manages to reconcile these tensions and the creative use he makes of the deliberately restrictive (no colour, no speech) but still rich semiotic material at his disposal is truly original and at the same time replete with intertextual allusions.

2.13 Analytical Conclusions

The close scrutiny to which the different scenes have been submitted will hopefully have brought to light some of the parallels that may be drawn between the novel and the different films but also the films in relation to each other.

Rather than reprise all the particulars which have been examined with respect to individual meaning(s), this conclusion will focus on the different specificities of the respective semiotic materials, their strong points and limitations and how (when, why) they are used to shape the intended meanings.

An important factor which the methodological chapter sought to establish was that films, although not (exclusively) linguistic, presented textual features which enabled their analysis in terms of discourse analysis, be that discourse multimodal. Considering adaptation
from a non-evaluative yet comparative perspective was then deemed not only feasible but particularly relevant.

Some practitioners of film analysis have sought to expand the parallels which could be drawn between the different modes of expression and affix linguistic labels onto visual features. David Griffith, one of the Lead Practitioners of Scotland’s Moving Image Education program, sums up the issue in these terms:

Though moving image texts might seem transparent and obvious – simple almost – they nevertheless have a very definite and highly evolved ‘vocabulary’ of shots and angles, ‘punctuation’ in the form of clips camera movements and edits, and a codified audio-visual ‘grammar’ that gives specific meaning to particular shot sequences. This vocabulary, punctuation and grammar can be just as complex and nuanced as in verbal language, and just as rewarding to unpack.

One essential condition for these classifications to prove useful is to not apply them too rigidly; situational context, as with any linguistic utterance, is among the most powerful factors determining meanings. This is why these conclusions will not seek to establish absolute equivalences and/or disparities between filmic and linguistic features in this corpus: each properly contextualized analysis will have provided its own set of intermediary assumptions.

However, what is not only possible but pertinent is to take a global look at the eventual meanings which the analyses suggest, contrast them with each other and see whether some meaningful correlations can be established. This approach puts forward one major difference between the novel and the whole of the filmic corpus: the manner in which the different texts engage their audience.

Stoker, as established above, is at once part of an illustrious tradition and also one of its revitalizing forces, as he extends the “framing” devices typical of Gothic literature into a
wholly “fragmented” model. As a result, one would probably expect a multiplicity of points of view, coupled with diverse emotional perspectives. However closer scrutiny of the text shows that this is not the case. Whereas the different voices echo the characters’ different outlooks, this seldom serves as a vehicle for emotional involvement, whether from the character’s end or indeed the reader’s. Examination of the experiential metafunction, especially in terms of process selection, shows that, whoever’s voice is “heard”, they rarely relate actions or feelings of their own but serve as a vehicle for someone else’s feats. Whenever they narrate a scene, the emphasis (both active and emotional) is relegated to another party in the story.

The most striking example of this trend is Jack Seward, a secondary character who is however the main “voice” in the novel. Other more punctual instances further substantiate this analysis: Mina’s attack, rather than being told in her own voice, is mediated by Seward, the same goes for Jonathan killing Dracula, recounted by Mina etc...

The first chapters (the Transylvania section) are marginally different. Told by Jonathan in his diary, not only do they include more mental processes but they also make use of lexical selection (appraisal motifs) and interpersonal features (fluctuating pronoun selection in the mood block) to engage the reader more personally and generate empathy towards the character and his predicament. However, Jonathan still remains a passive character, rarely presented as a “doer” and the emphasis accordingly shifts to his tormentor, Dracula.

The narration is then generally presented in this indirect manner, as if perpetually shifting attention away from itself. The result is that the readership does not necessarily engage with the characters empathically but instead likely identifies with their exterior standpoint. The reader is cast into a similar position to the narrating characters’ and maybe vicariously encouraged to share in their perspective. Unlike other Gothic stories, the reader
here is not made to fear for the characters but rather with them. This might well be one of the reasons behind Dracula’s enduring success.

As it is transferred to the screen, this feature undergoes considerable transformation, but despite their many differences, there is still some common ground to all the film-texts and their transposition of the audience’s engagement.

Even more than novels, films could be considered as the epitome of the “witness” position. When Linda Hutcheon considered the different modes, she distinguished between telling and showing, yet noted that: “No one mode is inherently good at doing one thing and not another; but each has at its disposal different means of expression – media and genres– and so can aim at and achieve certain things better than others.” (24)

The medium of film was then probably uniquely suited to emulate Stoker’s indirectly exterior narration (mediated through other characters) and cast the viewer in a similar position. Although the films follow this path to a certain extent (and in different degrees), there is an additional dimension which they all share and which diverges from the novel: all the film texts engage the audience’s attention directly, beyond the boundaries of the story they are recounting and the characters who experience it. At the level of the modal metafunction, countless cues both visual and aural (and often both in combination) address the viewers directly, provoking emotions and reflections beyond the strict narrative scope of the story.

Film is by its very essence a medium which “calls out” to its audience in a blunter manner than written text. This may appear as stating the obvious, yet the systematic implementation of its principles goes a long way towards explaining some of the differences between the form(s) of the written text and its adaptations. True of any text, this takes on an even wider significance in the case of the Gothic/horror genre. One could argue that a more indirect type of fear, such as that provoked by Gothic novels, while less instantaneously effective, might prove more enduring and therefore all the more powerful. But if the aim of
the Gothic story is to instil immediate fear (terror, horror) in its audience, then there is no better way to do so than by approaching them directly.

Each film goes about this in its own way and varies as to the extent and manner in which they choose to startle and/or guide their audience. While directorial intent is generally the main drive behind these choices, the impact of context is obviously also critical. Every film in this corpus was produced at a different period and is to a large extent the result of its time, which comes to bear on its themes and style but also engenders its technological possibilities and/or restrictions. Within this corpus, the use of sound is particularly interesting in this respect.

_Nosferatu_’s original soundtrack has been lost; many later versions and prints include different reconstituted or original scores. So, even though it was not Murnau’s intent, the film may appear and be interpreted as exclusively or primarily visual, since it offers no single straightforward association with an aural track. Then comes Browning’s film, which was one of the early talkies and one of the first to use sound for the horror genre. Some of its applications have proved particularly effective and even memorable, most notably Lugosi’s voice and particular diction which will forever resonate behind certain lines. Spadoni has extensively dealt with the “spectral” use of speech and the scarcity of sound effects in this production, but another aspect may be even more striking to a modern audience: the absence of music. Music has become such an important part of the multitrack medium of film and is so imbedded in our perception of it that its non-appearance, while not necessarily instantly perceptible, generates the impression of something lacking.

Although this applies to film in general, it has also become one of the most useful instruments in horror cinema, particularly to direct engagement, create spooky atmospheres and posit threats, unseen yet heard (Sipos, 230). To modern sensibilities, especially given the genre which it belongs to, Browning’s film may at times seem as though it has a (sonorous)
element missing. This is all the more true by contrast with the later versions in the corpus. Although with different styles and to different ends, Fisher and Badham both abundantly rely on their musical soundtrack to underline punctual actions and scenes and to build up a thematic backdrop to their personal visions of the story: dynamically horrific in the former’s case, epically romantic in the latter’s.

The intricacy of Coppola’s filmic weave, both visually and aurally, has been referred to in the examples above. The complexity of the soundtrack itself is dazzling: dialogues, voice-overs and music constantly intermingle but this version’s most personal aural feature is undoubtedly the pervasive use of sound effects (realistic or distorted, diegetic or non-diegetic). Whether the result, in conjunction with the similarly buoyant visual track, is flamboyant or over-the-top is a matter of subjective appreciation.

Finally, Maddin’s production comes full circle as to the use of sound but with a twist. Like the first film in the corpus, Nosferatu, it is a “silent” film. Only it isn’t: although it is non-spoken it makes punctual, but striking, use of sound effects. And of course there is the role of music. At the logical and representational level, the story (also) progresses through the actors’ dancing, in conjunction with the music, and the narrative and emotional impact which may be conveyed by both. The use of music then goes beyond the ornamental and is in fact foundational to the film-text: unlike Nosferatu, this particular soundtrack is inseparable from its visual counterpart.

Another way of exploring the context of situation is to investigate the “tradition” within which the films stand, notably in relation to the original source. The complexity of Dracula’s case and its evolving status, as examined above, is mirrored by the films in this corpus. Although they pertain to a clearly delineated genre and/or sub-genre (horror / Gothic / vampire / Dracula), few of them display features which belong solely or unambiguously to that genre. In fact, each film-text has its own agenda and accompanying thematic drift which
is set by relation (adherence or detachment) to generic conventions but also with respect to intertextual links: to the original novel, obviously, but also to other texts belonging to similar or even different genres and traditions (see for instance the romantic trend in Badham or Coppola, postmodern satire in Maddin, etc...). In this respect, Fisher's films are the productions which fit in most straightforwardly within the preconceptions of the horror genre in film.

Again, it must be said at this stage that this contextual dimension is inseparable from the wider context of production and notably the films' place in time. Murnau and Browning, for instance, were precursors of their genre, initiating some of its features and any posterior examination of their traits should bear this in consideration. For instance, the relative absence of suspense in Browning's film, as mentioned above, is fairly untypical of the genre. It is however the result of more discreet times and a film horror tradition which was still very tentative.

This is just a corollary of the basic premise underlying the model proposed here, as introduced in the chapter on methodology: analyses, be they substantiated by objectively perceptible elements, cannot ultimately help being subjective in their interpretations. Contextualization, notably intertextual, is an essential step of the process as is awareness of the unavoidable slants in the ensuing conclusions. But, as Bourdieu termed it, the "objectivity of the subjective" is a dynamic force in itself which may help validate the analytical findings.

Which is why, beyond the situational context pertaining to each film individually, certain thematic trends can be found to carry through the whole corpus transversally. This is the case of the polar opposition between light and darkness. Although embodied through different semiotic materials (language and image), this theme is apparent, obviously to different degrees, in all the texts in the corpus.
But it is especially the shift in material and the transferral to a newly-incarnated shape which makes the transition to the screen so vividly successful in this case: one need only think of Murnau and Coppola’s play on shadows to acknowledge that the evocative possibilities of language have not been lost, but advantageously replaced by an equally suggestive visual incarnation. This is also the case, although less pervasively, with the theme of blood.

Finally, these analyses have allowed for exploration - and comparison - not only of the content and thematic dimensions of the different texts but also of their form. Generally overlooked in the case of adaptation, the issue of enunciation is more easily accommodated by a systemic-functional model. The particularly intricate nature of the original fragmented text was especially interesting to contrast with the resulting film-texts. Whereas some disregarded it almost entirely (Browning, Badham), others sought to refer to or emulate it in their own way (Murnau, Fisher, Coppola, Maddin).

Observation of these features also links back to generic concerns since genres can be defined according to their form too. The persistent use of “framing” devices in the Gothic tradition, for instance, is an element which resonates at many levels in the observed film-texts. This is particularly the case in Nosferatu, through reference(s) to the Wisborg chronicle. This results from the combined necessity of a strong narratorial voice to tell the improbable story but also the fact that the (horror film) genre itself was new, or even unseen, and sought inspiration from the conventions of other modes, most notably literature.

So, beyond their individual characteristics and the necessity to always account for particularized contextualization, the texts scrutinized here have yielded to a systemic functional analysis which has in turn generated different global contrastable meanings. Whether these meanings are processed in terms of narrative or thematic content and/or form, they shed light not only on the individual products but also, importantly, on the interactions
which these come to develop with one another. This non-evaluative relational (intertextual) perspective is at the very core of the model proposed; the interpretive subjectivity which underlies it, unlike the stylisticians’ elusive “dream of scientificity”, has been come to terms with and, ultimately, constitutes one of its stronger points.

2.14 The intertextual aftermath

Since an intertextual perspective is at the core of the analytical approach conducted here, it was deemed interesting to devote a few lines to the intertextual reach of the corpus beyond itself. Hutcheon, for instance, saw adaptation not only as a formal entity or product and as a process of creation but also as a process of reception, “an extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work”. (7)

This next segment will thus deal with the incidence that certain meanings in certain texts have had on the Dracula myth and its perpetual re-invention(s). It is not within the scope of this section to delve into the intricacies of all the different Dracula-related products that have surfaced over the decade which has elapsed since the release of the last film in the corpus. Only certain trends and their most blatant incarnations will be mentioned, but it is undeniable that the passage of time and the resulting evolution of perceptions (value judgments) but also the influence of related cultural productions have had an important role to play.

 Appropriately enough for a shape-shifting vampire, the story of Dracula is a modern myth and cult phenomenon which has known almost innumerable incarnations, appropriations and re-inventions. Waller notes that rather than the vampire prototype, he is “the definite exemplar, recognizable by all.” (77) The modalities of this recognition, however, have strikingly evolved as the myth has been re-crafted and certain features which one would not
formerly have associated with the count have now become important traits of his common representation. The most persistent of these features is certainly the depiction of Dracula as a lover and/or romantic soul.

Stoker’s creature has few redemptive features and is globally presented as a monstrous fiend; there is certainly nothing overtly, or even remotely, attractive about him. He is not a vampire who seduces his preys but rather one who imposes on them. This was not necessarily the case with previous literary vampires, some of whom were extremely seductive figures, with prime examples such as Carmilla and Lord Ruthven.

His depiction on screen, as exemplified in the present corpus, has certainly been more ambiguous. Only Murnau makes him straightforwardly repulsive. With Browning and Fisher, he is still evil but also paradoxically attractive. Lugosi conferred exotic charm and intensity to his portrayal, qualities which the fictional Lucy can be seen responding to when she describes him as “fascinating”. He does not however lure women to him with his charm but with his power. This is also the case with Lee’s count, whose bestial nature (fangs bared, eyes bloodshot) stands in contrast with the elegance of his initial portrayal:

“The very personification of saturnine power, of mannered menace […] this is no monster – at least not in the conventional sense- but something far more threatening. Dracula greets his guest with casual charm, his richly sonorous voice complimenting the tall, dignified poise of this black-clad host perfectly.” (Baddeley, 165)

Despite the character’s malevolence, this contrastive interaction generated much sexual anticipation. Lee would be one of the last actors to portray Dracula as purely evil; later interpretations would generally add redeeming traits or justifications.

Next in the corpus comes Badham’s forlorn count, oozing seduction, which he wields as his main weapon. Langella’s representation of the vampire as the effective hero generated feelings of ambiguity which affected perception of the film and left some of its audience
dismayed. Badham's film was the first to take a firmly revisionist stand on the screen but the way had been paved for him not only by the play which was his inspiration but by other near-contemporary productions as well.

In 1974, ABC broadcasted a TV adaptation of *Dracula* directed by Dan Curtis and scripted by Richard Matheson. In his plot Curtis sought inspiration from his cult Gothic soap opera *Dark Shadows* (which ran on ABC from 1966 to 1971) and particularly from the character of Barnabas Collins, the romantic 200-year old vampire in pursuit of reincarnations of his dead lover Josette. Curtis thus gave his Dracula a similar motivation, Lucy was the reincarnation of his long-lost wife, thereby justifying his horrific acts.

A year later, writer Fred Saberhagen expanded this idea and rewrote Stoker's plot from Dracula's perspective in *The Dracula Tape*. In this novel, the conflict with the band of heroes is born out of a series of misunderstandings and the attacks on both Lucy and Mina are in fact consensual exchanges.

Although they do not strictly belong to the Dracula tradition, other influences were most certainly the publication of the first novels in Rice's and Quinn Yarbro's vampire series. In 1976, *Interview with a Vampire* was published; against the background of eighteenth century Louisiana and Europe, it featured many different vampires with new distinctive features and personalities. Louis is a vampire with a conscience who takes time to come to terms with his condition and whose instincts remain humanistic. Lestat, by contrast, is a hedonist both sensual and seductive who has no compassion for his helpless victims. There is also the child vampire, Claudia, mature beyond her years and the refined but cruel vampires of the Paris coven. With her *Vampire Chronicles* series, Rice thus established the vampire
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78 Although it only ran for five years, it was a daily show and therefore comprised a huge number of episodes (1,225). Its immediate impact was strong and it would develop into a camp cult phenomenon. Tim Burton has just adapted it for the screen (2012), starring Johnny Depp as Collins. His tone, however, is comedic rather than the darker one in the initial series.
world as a distorting mirror for humankind, with as many vampire types as there are humans. Central to her themes was also the sensuality of the vampiric act, as exemplified particularly by Lestat's character.

In 1978, Quinn Yarbro initiated the St Germain series with the publication of Hotel Transylvania. Its hero, the Comte de St Germain, is a vampire of a new kind: sophisticated and mysterious, he is no incarnation of evil but a humanist instead, coming to the aid of people in need (especially damsels in distress) throughout history. The author wanted a clear break from the traditional vampire trope and one of her special concerns was to establish the erotically charged potential of the vampire and of the vampiric act, re-defining it as a shared mutual ecstasy. Thus, the image of the vampire, and of Dracula, was beginning to shift towards a more human (if not yet humane), fallible and especially carnal being.

In terms of reinvention or re-appropriation of the Dracula myth, the 1970s were a particularly active decade, closing with the double image of Badham's romantic vampire on the one hand and Herzog's sadder reincarnation of Nosferatu on the other. Another factor in the equation of this popularity was the increasing interest in the novel as an object of (critical) study which probably generated as much influence as it received. By contrast, the keen interest in the vampire would cool down over the 1980s and be re-activated with a vengeance in the 1990s, in the build-up to the centennial of the novel's publication.

1992 saw the release of Bram Stoker's Dracula. Despite its claims to finally do justice to the real Dracula, it polarized criticism for straying from it in two major ways: by making the link between the vampire and the historical figure of Vlad Tepes explicit and by introducing a (reincarnation) romance between the count and Mina. As abundantly developed above, it was probably the accumulation of the overblown claim and the conflicting determination to re-new the myth in more ways than one that led to confusion among some of its more discerning viewers. Coppola and screenwriter Hart may well state that they wanted to
do justice to the original, their purpose certainly stretched beyond that claim to putting their personal imprint on the myth, thus making it more attractive to a wide new audience in the process.

It is interesting that the two features which most attracted condemnation were the two trends that had already been steadily emerging in other versions: the historic and the romantic. But what makes matters even more illuminating is to look at these criticisms in retrospect and with the awareness that these two features have now become part and parcel of the Dracula myth, often present to some degree in all subsequent derivations.

*Bram Stoker’s Dracula* thus marked some kind of transition point towards a new, generally accepted and even predominant perception of the character of Dracula as not merely - or even necessarily - evil but complex and attractive in his complexity. Although the trend was to some extent already forthcoming, it is undeniable that, through its popularity, the film contributed to installing it. It thus became the norm of a new generation of viewers, which is probably what the critics had initially anticipated and recoiled from. Beard has commented on the pervasiveness of this interpretation:

The reading of the story is firmly in the revisionist camp where Dracula is interpreted not simply as a monstrous fiend, as in Stoker, but as a far more ambiguous and even sympathetic figure. This interpretation has for some years now been so strong that such revisionism is more the norm than a deviation. (165-6)

The two trends defining this revisionism have since inspired many different novels which developed them to different degrees. In 1997, in celebration of the centennial of the novel’s publication, Penguin requested Freda Warrington to write a sequel to Bram Stoker’s book, *Dracula the Undead*. Much in awe of her model, Warrington claims:

I aimed to write it with complete respect for the original novel, following Stoker’s original style and characters - as if I’d never seen a Dracula film, never read any other
vampire book. Rather, I tried to write it as if the original journals and papers and the experiences of Stoker's characters were all I had to go by.

She then not only reprises Stoker’s characters (adding a few of her own) but also his structure and weaves her narrative together through letters and diary entries. Despite her claims, she has made her villain into a more sympathetic character, notably through his ability to feel and his attachment to Mina. Conversely, and although her true allegiance remains to Jonathan, Mina is also tempted by the vampire’s attraction. It therefore seems as though the lure of the emotional/sexual vampire was irresistible, even in a novel which claimed allegiance, respect and/or fidelity to the original. But more extreme revisions were to come.

In 2005, Elizabeth Kostova published The Historian which instantly became an international bestseller. Despite mixed reviews, the novel sold extremely well: it was the first debut novel to hit the No 1 slot on the New York Times bestseller list in its first week of publication, and became the fastest selling debut hardback novel selling even faster than The Da Vinci Code to which it is often compared. (Burrows). Its success prompted Sony to acquire the rights to a film adaptation (Fleming), but it has not yet materialized. The premise of its plot was a twist on, almost an inversion of, the historical element. Rather than looking at the vampire Dracula as an eternal incarnation of Vlad Tepes, it focused on Vlad Dracula, with much historical detail, as an archaic figure who just happened to live, un-dead, through the centuries.

As to form, Stoker’s legacy was also clearly present. While not completely fragmented, the novel has an episodic feel; the chapters have a repetitive structure where pasts (different action plots take place in the 1930s, 1950s and 1970s) and present intermingle through the voices of the two main characters: the narrator and her father. It also features a series of framing devices: letters, diary entries, research papers etc... The most “teasing” of these devices is the inclusion of a “Note to the Reader”, commenting on the process of writing
and compilation of the documents presented in the book and including markers of plausibility, such as a list of thankful acknowledgements. There is definite and deliberate blurring of the reality/fictional boundaries when Dr Radu Georgescu is cited, a fictional scholar, but doubtless meant to evoke the eminent specialist on all matters relating to Vlad Tepes, Radu Florescu. Such intertextual twists abound and have prompted some critics, such as The Observer’s Jane Stevenson to label it “more knowing, and less fun, than its original.”

In 2009, another sequel, also titled Dracula the Un-Dead (with hyphen) was published. It aimed to distinguish itself from its predecessors by being the official sequel. What made it “official” was that it had the approval of the Stoker family and (because?) one of its authors bore the Stoker name. As is explained in the authors’ notes, horror screenwriter and Dracula buff Ian Holt approached the Stoker family to secure their input and the “stamp of approval” of their name on the cover of his sequel. Bram’s great-grandnephew, Dacre Stoker, a pentathlon athlete and coach took the bait:

In writing Dracula the Un-Dead, I felt a strong sense of duty and familial responsibility. I hoped to work with Ian to represent Bram’s vision for the character of Dracula. We aimed to resurrect Bram’s original themes and characters, just as Bram conceived them more than a century ago. So many books and films had strayed from Bram’s vision – and thus our intent was to bring both Bram and Dracula back their dignity in some way. (401)

A most surprising claim, if one looks at the basic elements of the sequel’s plot. The year is 1912, the surviving members of the band of heroes are still enduring the repercussions of their traumatic encounter with the count. Two events bring him back into their lives: a mysterious evil force killing them off and the encounter between Quincey Harker (Mina and Jonathan’s son) and a charismatic but elusive Romanian actor, Basarab. The plot’s twists and turns then reveal a series of shocking discoveries: Basarab is in fact Dracula; he is not - nor
has ever been- evil; when he initially traveled to England it was only to pursue his cousin, Countess Elizabeth Bathory, the real evildoer; he had a consensual love affair with Mina and Quincey is his son.

As to form, the novel is written from a third-person omniscient perspective and its main (almost only) nod to its predecessor’s fragmentation is the prologue, which takes the shape of a letter written by Mina to her son and conveniently summarizes the original novel's plot.

Stoker and Holt’s book has conjured up denigrations similar to those which had plagued Bram Stoker’s Dracula: its authors claim to abide by the original novel and seek artistic legitimacy and marketing potential through this “policy of fidelity” when in fact they have brought their personal vision to bear on the text and by doing so, have quite considerably - one might even argue fundamentally - revised its plot, themes, characterization, etc... The intertextual approach which has been favored in this thesis was chosen on the grounds that it was comparative but not necessarily evaluative. In the case of this sequel, it is difficult to keep this detached perspective⁷⁹. There is something perturbing about a book which needs both an eight-page afterword by an eminent scholar and a fifteen-page authors’ note to justify its status.

His passion for all things Dracula led Ian Holt to entertain friendships with prominent figures of Dracula scholarship such as Florescu and Miller, who wrote the afterword to the novel. But no matter the number of (prestigious) advocates the authors had on their side, their claims to pursue Stoker’s intentions fall flat in view of the changes operated in the novel at each and every level: dates, characters, plot elements, vampire features etc.

⁷⁹ This comment in an online video review of the book sums up matters quite well: “At times, even I wasn’t sure what this book was supposed to be. A sequel? A remake? A sequel to an unwritten remake? A parody even? Either way, none of it worked.” (DeathsPictures)
The date of the initial action was moved back to 1888 for three reasons, none of which are particularly considerate of Stoker’s “dignity”: it enabled the authors to include Bram himself as a character in the sequel (and not a particularly engaging one at that), to make a connection between vampiric activity and the murders of Jack the Ripper, and to set the novel’s action in 1912 and thus allow it to close aboard the Titanic. Working on the premise that Stoker (the character) in fact merely transcribed the story told to him by the unreliable Van Helsing, the authors also re-define the characters according to their own criteria. Dracula is a deeply misunderstood humanist and Mina a woman torn between her duty and her passion.

In view of the examples cited above, it is clear that this stance is not truly original but rather in keeping with a form of revisionism which has been gaining ground over the last decades. The rest of the “band of heroes” has also been subjected to changes most often resulting in drastic modification of their heroic status: Jonathan is a betrayed husband driven to alcoholism, Van Helsing is an ambitious and secretive schemer who eventually becomes a vampire, Arthur and Seward are both still haunted by Lucy’s death, leading the former to general indifference and the latter to drug-fuelled vampire hunting.

Dracula is also clearly identified as Prince Vlad. Holt comments on intertextual “pressures” in the notes:

Since the 1972 release of In Search of Dracula, the line between the historic prince Dracula and Bram’s Count Dracula has been irreversibly blurred for the public at large. The two forever merged in pop culture in the opening sequence to Francis Ford Coppola’s Bram Stoker’s Dracula. . . . Dacre and I felt we had no choice but to once and for all merge the count with the prince. (407)

Other concessions to contemporary vampire lore were also added: the authors revoked Dracula’s ability to walk in daylight and made him vulnerable to the sun - a cinematic legacy-
they also amended his capacity to transform and his lack of reflection and sought to comment “scientifically” on vampiric vulnerabilities (vampirism becomes a virus which changes a person’s DNA, susceptibility to garlic and wolfsbane may be ascribed to allergies).

Not content with these changes, the authors wished to show their superior awareness of the original, its text, times and intertexts, by multiple references and name-dropping: minor characters are named after people mentioned in Dracula and/or Stoker’s working notes, there are also characters named Lee, Jourdan, Langella or Huntley (all actors who portrayed Dracula) and a plethora of real-life historical characters: Bathory and Stoker chief amongst them but also members of the Lyceum theatre, detectives of the Jack the Ripper case, passengers and crew members of the Titanic, etc...

As has been mentioned above, the notion of fidelity (in adaptation, but also more generally in intertextuality) is not only obsolete but difficult to define as it relies heavily on subjective notions: the spirit, the gist, the letter of a work ... In the case of this sequel, it has been blended with another concept with an equally vague referent: “official”. Whereas they might serve as marketing material, these notions are meaningless in terms of connection(s) to the original or artistic merit. But beyond this observation, one may question the reasoning of authors who go to extreme lengths to create a plausible connection to the original work, only to completely transform most of its foundational traits. In their defence it may be argued that these traits have so consistently and integrally been altered by the intertextual plurilogue which the text has engaged in over the decades that this transformation is part of the collective unconscious and how the text, in its enriched entirety, is now perceived. This is something which Miller acknowledges in her afterword:

While it might seem that the co-authors are only sacrificing accuracy for artistic purposes (a completely legitimate enterprise), something else is taking shape. They re-establish the “true” text of Dracula, which in turn forms the basis of this sequel; at the
same time, they recognize in that sequel that there is no single *Dracula* but many *Draculas*, ranging from Stoker's earliest notes to the latest Hollywood adaptation, and that the boundaries between them are blurred indeed. The urge to reclaim and reshape *Dracula* is a mark of the novel's enduring power and influence. (397)

These are but a few of the many adaptations, re-visitations, derivations or re-inventions that Bram Stoker's book has undergone beyond the filmic corpus presented here. It is a trend which shows no signs of abating in the foreseeable future. Vampires are more popular than ever and these first decades of the twenty-first century have shown the niche of teenage vampire romances to be particularly lucrative. But despite the constant emergence of new contenders, or perhaps thanks to it, the lure of Dracula, the original and quintessential vampire remains. If at times his popularity and pervasiveness seem to wane, it is only to re-emerge more firmly elsewhere. Through the reputation of his fictional avatar, for instance, Vlad Tepes has become such a popular figure that two different films about him are currently under development, one produced by Plan B, the other by Warner (CinemaSpy and “Dracula Year”).

As I put the finishing touches to this thesis, Dracula is never far away, even at the local level. Just last week, Manneken Pis donned a Dracula costume to celebrate the opening parade of the Brussels International Fantastic Film Festival. Brussels theatre *Le Public* has just staged its own version of *Dracula*. Although it claims to be based on Bram Stoker (and does indeed mostly follow the author as to plot and characterization) adapters Sofia Betz and
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80 Initiated by now-cult TV series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997-2003), the phenomenon grew to include other series such as *Angel* (1999-2004), *True Blood* (2008-ongoing) and *The Vampire Diaries* (2009-ongoing) (the last two being inspired by book series, the latter clearly targeting a teenage audience). But the most widely popular and lucrative example of this trend has been the *Twilight* book series (2005-2008) and its film adaptations (2008-2012).
Antoine Bours bring their own twist to the story. The brides are pivotal characters in this version; they are portrayed as identical sisters, wearing matching outfits and wigs with their voices constantly intertwining. The effect is that of an Ancient Greek chorus but they are also reminiscent of mythological figures such as the Fates (the Moirai or Parcae). They surreptitiously instil such terror into the other characters that they come to believe in an evil creature who is never actually shown. The implication is that Dracula is just another bogeyman, a monster who lives only in the twists and turns of the characters’ – and maybe even the audience’s – imaginations.

At the same time, the musical Dracula, l’amour plus fort que la mort is touring through France and Belgium. According to stage director and choreographer Kamel Ouali, it is loosely based on Bram Stoker: he includes the characters of Dracula, Mina, Jonathan, Van Helsing and Lucy along with a few supernatural creatures (three other vampires and an angel). The plot seems to have been lifted straight from Coppola’s film (the link to Prince Vlad, his wife’s suicide, the reincarnation romance with Mina) as do some aspects of characterization (a red-haired Lucy is portrayed as seductive and fickle). This is another example of the impact of Coppola’s film, particularly in popular culture, and its decisive role in establishing the re-invented myth of the Romantic/sexual vampire and related themes.

Wherever one turns, it seems, Dracula is close. Un-dead indeed.
Conclusion

As was mapped out in the introduction, this thesis’ aim has been double:

- To present a multimodal model for adaptation which would transcend the obstacle of intrasemiotic transfer and enable comparative analysis on the basis of metafunctionally retrieved meanings;
- To apply this model to *Dracula* (the novel and seven of its adaptations) and on the basis of its application gauge its suitability to the task.

By exploring the meanders of adaptation theory and its pitfalls, the first part of this work has put forward the necessity for a new model, especially in terms of pragmatic contrastive analysis. Recent adaptation theories (Stam, Leitch) have supported this premise and also encouraged the adoption of a theoretically diverse model.

It is my contention that a multimodal approach is uniquely suited to this task. The systemic functional background which underlies this model offers maximum flexibility even as it cohesively unifies the analysis. The systemic dimension underscores the almost infinite expressive variety of the different matters of expression while the functional dimension returns them to their meaning-making potential, thus facilitating comparison and its articulation.

However, as has repeatedly been mentioned, the ultimate subjectivity in the processing of these meanings cannot be denied nor disregarded. This bias can be redressed only partially through contextualisation, but as long as it is acknowledged, as for any stylistic approach, that need not invalidate the analysis itself.

The model’s scope is foremost relational and anchored in an intertextual perspective; nevertheless it may help shed light not only on the scrutinized adapted products but also on the process of adaptation itself.
The analytical chapter has then sought to break down the mechanisms of adaptation within the selected material. This is a worthy enterprise in its own right, since it has allowed the unearthing of some less instantly recognizable means and procedures at play in the corpus. Partial conclusions have already been drawn out as to the observations conducted at close range in terms of narrative content, thematic content and form. What then remains to be tentatively determined is what this corpus can teach us as to the wider scope of adaptation as a practice.

For one thing, it may help to finally put paid to the notion of “fidelity” which has plagued adaptation criticism since its beginnings. It is now widely established that fidelity is an illusory aspiration, one which is furthermore often shaped by subjective interpretations or beliefs rather than objective criteria. What the present analysis helps establish is that meanings may be contrasted and present commonalities, even when they take diverging paths in their expression. Fidelity then becomes obsolete and is superseded by comparative equivalence.

One such example is Coppola’s use of a complex visual/aural apparatus to reflect the novel’s fragmentation. Although his technique and use of devices necessarily differs from Stoker’s, in many respects it can be deemed equivalent in the eventual effect it conveys. Fidelity upholders who had deemed the style inappropriate to its subject matter (Joslin) have thus misconstrued the nature and expressive potential of both texts.

Other examples abound in the analyses for all the directors examined: Murnau’s use of lighting to reflect Gothic polarities, Browning’s phantasmagorical absence of sound effects to re-instil eeriness, Fisher’s blatant reliance on the expressive potential of music as emotional cue, Badham’s structural generating of suspense through delayed introduction of his re-invented “villain”, Maddin’s use of tinting and colourization to incarnate different themes...
There are constant echoes of Stoker's text, but these are not necessarily embodied purely through references to content, quite the contrary. A multimodal approach generates greater awareness of the different expressive forms which film can take. The need for appropriate encompassing contextualization is paramount as always, or in Hutcheon's terms: "We engage in time and space, within a particular society and a general culture. The contexts of creation and reception are material, public and economic as much as they are cultural, personal and aesthetic." (28)

A necessary corollary to this point must however be mentioned: if certain meanings can be paralleled, even though they are shaped through different semiotic materials, others seem to resist transposition.

The most striking example in the corpus is the addressees' (readers or viewers) differing modes of engagement. It has been established how Stoker, through the use of indirect perspectives, creates an exterior standpoint for his readership to identify with. His audience is thus prompted to engage emotionally, notably in terms of fear, with the story and its characters through vicarious projection. Written language is obviously constrained in its fear-inducing or startling potential, unlike spoken language or (especially moving) images. Stoker pushes this logic to its limits by constantly shifting the narration to characters with a more exterior perspective, and thereby uses it to good effect. It is therefore arresting to notice that all the films in this corpus have taken a different track to the novel by introducing visual and/or aural cues which address the audience directly (modally).

As Hutcheon has mentioned (23), language is used to tell, images to show. Resulting differences in the modes of engagement necessarily impact on all levels of the final product. However, the separation of the generated effects is not necessarily clear-cut: music, in the form of audio threat cues, can startle the viewer directly but it can also underscore other
dimensions, such as sad music to emphasize a character’s distress and help generate empathy. The same goes for the other matters of expression.

The observation that all the examined film-texts have used the potentialities of film to startle or scare their audience directly, beyond the limited scope of the story and characters, then raises a series of questions. Is the medium of film by essence modally direct, addressing its audience’s emotions without or beyond the intermediary of the characters’ predicament? Or can it possibly present a more “neutral” perspective in which the viewer is, witness-like, left to engage with the material from a (relative) distance? Is the direct filmic engagement just a feature and necessary corollary of the Gothic genre? Does that entail that the Gothic genre will necessarily find different incarnations on the page and on screen?

A multimodal analysis has brought these issues to light; it can also help solve them through the use of a different, more variegated, corpus. It has not been within the scope of this thesis to address these matters but it would constitute an interesting track to pursue.

Another appealing question to develop further would be wider exploration of the issue of fragmentation in adaptation. I have had the opportunity to test the multimodal approach on another fragmented text, or rather in this case a more traditionally epistolary one: Laclos’ Dangerous Liaisons and Frears’ 1988 film adaptation of it. (Kemlo, “Beyond”) The analysis carries its own set of observations but some of these come to strengthen certain conclusions reached here, notably in terms of the differences in engagement. The transfer of novelistic narrational modes to film has generally been under-explored as Mc Farlane laments:

One of the areas in which potentially interesting work remains to be done is the study of the varying susceptibility of different kinds of novel to adaptation. There are plenty of incidental perceptions about which novels adapt ‘better’ than others but no sustained treatment of how matters such as a novel’s length, its narrational mode, its characteristic diction (degrees of abstraction or concretization, use of trope, etc.), or
the relative weight of dialogue and discursive prose might bear on the process of adaptation . . . The question of what happens to a novel's narrational mode in the transposition to film is one which requires major study. It opens up the whole issue of the effect of the cinema's institutional mode of representation on the display of a narrative derived from a text in a different medium. (199)

Although he does not develop the issue, he later points out that "[his] own study . . . suggests that attempts to duplicate a novel's narrational mode on film may be doomed." (199)

Whereas duplication might be elusive, I hope this investigation has demonstrated that a manner of equivalence may be posited, not only in content but also in form.

Stoker's novel ends on a note written seven years after the events which it describes. It mentions the birth of Quincey Harker, Jonathan and Mina's son born on the anniversary of his namesake's death. For this reason "his mother holds the secret belief that some of our brave friend's spirit has passed into him" (402). It is the same date on which Dracula dies, the sixth of November. It is also my birthday. A more superstitious mind might contend that I was therefore destined to choose this corpus. Ever the pragmatist, I would rather argue that Dracula established itself as the perfect material for this investigation. If adaptation is to transcend the boundaries which had previously constricted it and helped label it vampiric, it must embrace an intertextual perspective. And what better way to do so than with a text which represents the epitome of intertextuality through its multivocal structure on the one hand and its innumerable adaptations, derivations and metatexts on the other? It is now time to drive a stake through the heart of the matter and put it to rest, at least momentarily: Dracula has never failed to rise from his ashes...


"CBC on-shoot documentary". *Dracula: Pages from a Virgin's Diary*. Dir. Guy Maddin. CBC Television, 2002. DVD.
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### Appendix 1: Word counts

(Numbers correspond to the number of words written/spoken by the characters in the novel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrator</th>
<th>Diary</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Telegram</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>General Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>5703 (ch 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346 (ch 27) = final note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5502 (ch 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5694 (ch 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5818 (ch 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>870 (ch 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>876 (ch 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3164 (ch 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3284 (ch 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5476 (ch 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1889 (ch 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237 (ch 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1623 (ch 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>969 (ch 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1276 (ch 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1008 (ch 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 (ch 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1 to 4 = 22717)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43496</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mina</strong></td>
<td><strong>2674 (ch 6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>375 (ch 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43842</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1499 (ch 6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1339 (ch 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>843 (ch 7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>535 (ch 12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3499 (ch 8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>361 (ch 12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>743 (ch 8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>166 (ch 14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1071 (ch 13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>413 (ch 14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2778 (ch 14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (ch 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2495 (ch 24) = meeting report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1014 (ch 26) = memorandum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>843 (ch 17)</th>
<th>559 (ch 17)</th>
<th>1454 (ch 17)</th>
<th>3032 (ch 18)</th>
<th>1785 (ch 19)</th>
<th>131 (ch 26)</th>
<th>280 (ch 26)</th>
<th>1483 (ch 26)</th>
<th>330 (ch 26)</th>
<th>791 (ch 27)</th>
<th>2561 (ch 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26769</strong></td>
<td><strong>2776</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>3509</strong></td>
<td><strong>33077</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucy</strong></td>
<td>282 (ch 9)</td>
<td>165 (ch 10)</td>
<td>181 (ch 11)</td>
<td>307 (ch 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>559 (ch 5)</td>
<td>2005 (ch 5)</td>
<td>210 (ch 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1185 (ch 11) = memorandum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>935</strong></td>
<td><strong>2774</strong></td>
<td><strong>1185</strong></td>
<td><strong>4894</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seward</strong></td>
<td>323 (ch 5)</td>
<td>1492 (ch 6)</td>
<td>1264 (ch 8)</td>
<td>771 (ch 9)</td>
<td>896 (ch 9)</td>
<td>873 (ch 9)</td>
<td>918 (ch 9)</td>
<td>166 (ch 10)</td>
<td>6 (ch 9)</td>
<td>14 (ch 9)</td>
<td>25 (ch 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1774 (ch 14)</td>
<td>3845 (ch 15)</td>
<td>1588 (ch 15)</td>
<td>4561 (ch 16)</td>
<td>583 (ch 17)</td>
<td>598 (ch 17)</td>
<td>599 (ch 17)</td>
<td>1867 (ch 18)</td>
<td>2027 (ch 18)</td>
<td>730 (ch 19)</td>
<td>1990 (ch 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61189</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td>198 (ch 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>236 (ch 9)</td>
<td>18 (ch 5)</td>
<td>25 (ch 9)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Helsing</td>
<td></td>
<td>192 (ch 9)</td>
<td>224 (ch 14)</td>
<td>169 (ch 14)</td>
<td>370 (ch 15)</td>
<td>409 (ch 24)</td>
<td>2663 (ch 27) = memorandum</td>
<td>1349 (ch 27) = memorandum</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4012</td>
<td>5416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>First Page</td>
<td>Second Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper cuttings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2952 (ch 7) = storm &amp; shipwreck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 (ch 11) = escaped wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 (ch 13) = bloofer lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 (ch 13) = bloofer lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>5494</strong></td>
<td><strong>5494</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeter log &amp; note in bottle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 (ch 7)</td>
<td><strong>1776</strong></td>
<td><strong>1776</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal / commercial correspondence</td>
<td>328 (ch 8)</td>
<td>7 (ch 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 (ch 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
<td><strong>448</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Agatha Budapest hospital</td>
<td>402 (ch 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hennessy MD</td>
<td>976 (ch 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Others</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9096</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td><strong>132389</strong></td>
<td><strong>11124</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>16322</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>159993</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minus 1 to 4)= 109672</td>
<td><strong>11282</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Review Scores

To give an indication of how the films in the corpus have been received the scores which they have obtained on two popular online review aggregators have been collected here. Although both present a professional bias, they also give some suggestions as to audience reception. This view by itself is obviously not inclusive but it offers an interesting counterpart to the more critical perspective presented in the text.

- IMDb

The scores (out of ten) are computed on the basis of votes submitted by registered users. Voters have different statuses and the final score is a weighted mean. The number of users to have voted for each film may also give an idea of the movies’ popularity, in the numerical sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>38,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>79,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rotten tomatoes

This site takes into account not only reviews -making a further distinction between Top critics (major film reviewers) and all critics- but also an audience voting score. A note out of 100 is then given to the films, based on the amount of scores they receive as positive instead of the review scores themselves. The audience score is based on the same model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>«Tomatometer»</th>
<th>Average rating</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murnau</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher (Horror)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher (Prince)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badham</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppola</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddin</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Representational survey

One of the issues relating to the choice of this corpus was the "iconic" status of some of the Draculas included. The particular association of Lugosi with the count, which has been repeatedly developed, is often mentioned as self-evident by Dracula scholars. However, the majority of these experts tend to be from a cultural background (American, now in their sixties or seventies) which gave them a privileged access (at pivotal moments) to certain representations of the vampire over others. By contrast, how would a more contemporary, more local audience envision Dracula?

I decided to put the idea to the test and conduct a small-scale survey. 120 students of English language and literature (with an average age of twenty) were presented with representative images of the different Draculas in the corpus. For Coppola, two contrasted representations were chosen: the old Count as Harker encounters him in Transylvania and Mina's rejuvenated "Prince". I also decided to include an image of the historical figure of Vlad Tepes, whose link to the fictional Dracula is increasingly considered as part and parcel of the myth. The students were required to grade the different images, according to which one(s) they most associated with Dracula. These results were then converted into percentile proportions.
The results, as displayed in the graph above, substantiate the claims of Dracula scholars, putting Browning in the lead with 25%. However, it is worth noting that Fisher is almost on a par with him, scoring 23%. Although none of the rest are completely unfamiliar, they all lag far behind these two films. Murnau’s rat-like villain scores 11%, maybe due to the fact that most prints in circulation do not mention the link to Stoker and/or have retained the characters changed identities. Badham’s representation of a handsome fang-less vampire in evening dress also rings familiar and scores 11%, although it is unlikely that many students are familiar with the film itself. Coppola’s old vampire comes in just behind with 10%, while the younger version and Maddin’s Asian vampire complete the filmic corpus with 7% each. Most unfamiliar of all is the woodcutting of Vlad Tepes (6%), whose link to Dracula (at least visually) is not that manifest after all...

On the basis of these small-scale results, it then appears that the prevailing image of Dracula is still the one which was put forward by the earliest on-screen (authorized) portrayals. Despite its popularity amongst contemporary audiences (see appendix two), Coppola’s creative representations are not instantly or straightforwardly associated with the character of Dracula, at least in terms of visual incarnation... (its thematic import has however been strong as section 2.14 develops).
Appendix 4: Excerpts from Dracula
(Page numbers between brackets correspond to the Penguin edition)

Scene 1: Encounter with locals / warning (10-11)

4 May—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. This could not be true, because up to then he had understood it perfectly; at least, he answered my questions exactly as if he did.

He and his wife, the old lady who had received me, looked at each other in a frightened sort of way. He mumbled out that the money had been sent in a letter, and that was all he knew. When I asked him if he knew Count Dracula, and could tell me anything of his castle, both he and his wife crossed themselves, and, saying that they knew nothing at all, simply refused to speak further. It was so near the time of starting that I had no time to ask anyone else, for it was all very mysterious and not by any means comforting.

Just before I was leaving, the old lady came up to my room and said in a hysterical way: "Must you go? Oh! Young Herr, must you go?" She was in such an excited state that she seemed to have lost her grip of what German she knew, and mixed it all up with some other language which I did not know at all. I was just able to follow her by asking many questions. When I told her that I must go at once, and that I was engaged on important business, she asked again:

"Do you know what day it is?" I answered that it was the fourth of May. She shook her head as she said again: "Oh, yes! I know that! I know that, but do you know what day it is?" On my saying that I did not understand, she went on: "It is the eve of St. George's Day. Do you not know that to-night, when the clock strikes midnight, all the evil things in the world will have full sway? Do you know where you are going, and what you are going to?" She was in such evident distress that I tried to comfort her, but without effect. Finally, she went down on her knees and implored me not to go; at least to wait a day or two before starting.

It was all very ridiculous but I did not feel comfortable. However, there was business to be done, and I could allow nothing to interfere with it. I tried to raise her up, and said, as gravely as I could, that I thanked her, but my duty was imperative, and that I must go. She then rose and dried her eyes, and taking a crucifix from her neck offered it to me. I did not know what to do, for, as an English Churchman, I have been taught to regard such things as in some measure idolatrous, and yet it seemed so ungracious to refuse an old lady meaning so well and in such a state of mind. She saw, I suppose, the doubt in my face, for she put the rosary round my neck and said, "For your mother's sake," and went out of the room.

I am writing up this part of the diary whilst I am waiting for the coach, which is, of course, late; and the crucifix is still round my neck. 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. If this book should ever reach Mina before I do, let it bring my good-bye. Here comes the coach!

Scene 2: The calèche scene (16-20)

Then, amongst a chorus of screams from the peasants and a universal crossing of themselves, a calèche, with four horses, drove up behind us, overtook us, and drew up beside the coach. I could see from the flash of our lamps as the rays fell on them, that the horses were coal-black
and splendid animals. They were driven by a tall man, with a long brown beard and a great
black hat, which seemed to hide his face from us. I could only see the gleam of a pair of very
bright eyes, which seemed red in the lamplight, as he turned to us.

He said to the driver, "You are early tonight, my friend." The man stammered in reply,
"The English Herr was in a hurry." To which the stranger replied, "That is why, I suppose,
you wished him to go on to Bukovina. You cannot deceive me, my friend. I know too much,
and my horses are swift." As he spoke he smiled, and the lamplight fell on a hard-looking
mouth, with very red lips and sharp-looking teeth, as white as ivory. One of my companions
whispered to another the line from Burger's "Lenore": "Denn die Todten reiten Schnell." ("For
the dead travel fast.") The strange driver evidently heard the words, for he looked up with a
gleaming smile. The passenger turned his face away, at the same time putting out his two
fingers and crossing himself. "Give me the Herr's luggage," said the driver, and with
exceeding alacrity my bags were handed out and put in the caleche. Then I descended from
the side of the coach, as the caleche was close alongside, the driver helping me with a hand
which caught my arm in a grip of steel. His strength must have been prodigious.

Without a word he shook his reins, the horses turned, and we swept into the darkness
of the pass. As I looked back I saw the steam from the horses of the coach by the light of the
lamps, and projected against it the figures of my late companions crossing themselves. Then
the driver cracked his whip and called to his horses, and off they swept on their way to
Bukovina. As they sank into the darkness I felt a strange chill, and a lonely feeling come over
me. But a cloak was thrown over my shoulders, and a rug across my knees, and the driver said
in excellent German— "The night is chill, mein Herr, and my master the Count bade me take
all care of you. There is a flask of slivovitz (the plum brandy of the country) underneath the
seat, if you should require it." I did not take any, but it was a comfort to know it was there all
the same. I felt a little strangely, and not a little frightened. I thought there been any
alternative I should have taken it, instead of prosecuting that unknown night journey. The
carriage went at a hard pace straight along, then we made a complete turn and went along
another straight road. It seemed to me that we were simply going over and over the same
ground again, and so I took note of some salient point, and found that this was so. I would
have liked to have asked the driver what this all meant, but I really feared to do so, for I
thought that, placed as I was, any protest would have had no effect in case there had been an
intention to delay.

By-and-by, however, as I was curious to know how time was passing, I struck a
match, and by its flame looked at my watch. It was within a few minutes of midnight. This
gave me a sort of shock, for I suppose the general superstition about midnight was increased
by my recent experiences. I waited with a sick feeling of suspense.

Then a dog began to howl somewhere in a farmhouse far down the road, a long,
agonized wailing, as if from fear. The sound was taken up by another dog, and then another
and another, till, borne on the wind which now sighed softly through the Pass, a wild howling
began, which seemed to come from all over the country, as far as the imagination could grasp
it through the gloom of the night. At the first howl the horses began to strain and rear, but the
driver spoke to them soothingly, and they quieted down, but shivered and sweated as though
after a runaway from sudden fright. Then, far off in the distance, from the mountains on each
side of us began a louder and a sharper howling, that of wolves, which affected both the
horses and myself in the same way. For I was minded to jump from the caleche and run,
whilst they reared again and plunged madly, so that the driver had to use all his great strength
to keep them from bolting. In a few minutes, however, my own ears got accustomed to the
sound, and the horses so far became quiet that the driver was able to descend and to stand
before them.
He petted and soothed them, and whispered something in their ears, as I have heard of horse-tamers doing, and with extraordinary effect, for under his caresses they became quite manageable again, though they still trembled. The driver again took his seat, and shaking his reins, started off at a great pace. This time, after going to the far side of the Pass, he suddenly turned down a narrow roadway which ran sharply to the right.

Soon we were hemmed in with trees, which in places arched right over the roadway till we passed as through a tunnel. And again great frowning rocks guarded us boldly on either side. Though we were in shelter, we could hear the rising wind, for it moaned and whistled through the rocks, and the branches of the trees crashed together as we swept along. It grew colder and colder still, and fine, powdery snow began to fall, so that soon we and all around us were covered with a white blanket. The keen wind still carried the howling of the dogs, though this grew fainter as we went on our way. The baying of the wolves sounded nearer and nearer, as though they were closing round on us from every side. I grew dreadfully afraid, and the horses shared my fear. The driver, however, was not in the least disturbed. He kept turning his head to left and right, but I could not see anything through the darkness.

Suddenly, away on our left I saw a faint flickering blue flame. The driver saw it at the same moment. He at once checked the horses, and, jumping to the ground, disappeared into the darkness. I did not know what to do, the less as the howling of the wolves grew closer. But while I wondered, the driver suddenly appeared again, and without a word took his seat, and we resumed our journey. I think I must have fallen asleep and kept dreaming of the incident, for it seemed to be repeated endlessly, and now looking back, it is like a sort of awful nightmare. Once the flame appeared so near the road, that even in the darkness around us I could watch the driver's motions. He went rapidly to where the blue flame arose, it must have been very faint, for it did not seem to illumine the place around it at all, and gathering a few stones, formed them into some device. Once there appeared a strange optical effect. When he stood between me and the flame he did not obstruct it, for I could see its ghostly flicker all the same. This startled me, but as the effect was only momentary, I took it that my eyes deceived me straining through the darkness. Then for a time there were no blue flames, and we sped onwards through the gloom, with the howling of the wolves around us, as though they were following in a moving circle.

At last there came a time when the driver went further afield than he had yet gone, and during his absence, the horses began to tremble worse than ever and to snort and scream with fright. I could not see any cause for it, for the howling of the wolves had ceased altogether. But just then the moon, sailing through the black clouds, appeared behind the jagged crest of a beetling, pine-clad rock, and by its light I saw around us a ring of wolves, with white teeth and lolling red tongues, with long, sinewy limbs and shaggy hair. They were a hundred times more terrible in the grim silence which held them than even when they howled. For myself, I felt a sort of paralysis of fear. It is only when a man feels himself face to face with such horrors that he can understand their true import.

All at once the wolves began to howl as though the moonlight had had some peculiar effect on them. The horses jumped about and reared, and looked helplessly round with eyes that rolled in a way painful to see. But the living ring of terror encompassed them on every side, and they had perforce to remain within it. I called to the coachman to come, for it seemed to me that our only chance was to try to break out through the ring and to aid his approach, I shouted and beat the side of the caleche, hoping by the noise to scare the wolves from the side, so as to give him a chance of reaching the trap. How he came there, I know not, but I heard his voice raised in a tone of imperious command, and looking towards the sound, saw him stand in the roadway. As he swept his long arms, as though brushing aside some impalpable obstacle, the wolves fell back and back further still. Just then a heavy cloud passed across the face of the moon, so that we were again in darkness.
When I could see again the driver was climbing into the caleche, and the wolves disappeared. This was all so strange and uncanny that a dreadful fear came upon me, and I was afraid to speak or move. The time seemed interminable as we swept on our way, now in almost complete darkness, for the rolling clouds obscured the moon.

We kept on ascending, with occasional periods of quick descent, but in the main always ascending. Suddenly, I became conscious of the fact that the driver was in the act of pulling up the horses in the courtyard of a vast ruined castle, from whose tall black windows came no ray of light, and whose broken battlements showed a jagged line against the sky.

Scene 3 First encounter of Dracula (22-23)

Just as I had come to this conclusion I heard a heavy step approaching behind the great door, and saw through the chinks the gleam of a coming light. Then there was the sound of rattling chains and the clanking of massive bolts drawn back. A key was turned with the loud grating noise of long disuse, and the great door swung back.

Within, stood a tall old man, clean shaven save for a long white moustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of colour about him anywhere. He held in his hand an antique silver lamp, in which the flame burned without a chimney or globe of any kind, throwing long quivering shadows as it flickered in the draught of the open door. The old man motioned me in with his right hand with a courtly gesture, saying in excellent English, but with a strange intonation. "Welcome to my house! Enter freely and of your own free will!" He made no motion of stepping to meet me, but stood like a statue, as though his gesture of welcome had fixed him into stone. The instant, however, that I had stepped over the threshold, he moved impulsively forward, and holding out his hand grasped mine with a strength which made me wince, an effect which was not lessened by the fact that it seemed cold as ice, more like the hand of a dead than a living man. Again he said. "Welcome to my house! Enter freely. Go safely, and leave something of the happiness you bring!" The strength of the handshake was so much akin to that which I had noticed in the driver, whose face I had not seen, that for a moment I doubted if it were not the same person to whom I was speaking. So to make sure, I said interrogatively, "Count Dracula?" He bowed in a courtly way as he replied, "I am Dracula, and I bid you welcome, Mr. Harker, to my house. Come in, the night air is chill, and you must need to eat and rest."

Scene 4 The "Brides" scene (43-47)

Later: The morning of 16 May.--God preserve my sanity, for to this I am reduced. Safety and the assurance of safety are things of the past. Whilst I live on here there is but one thing to hope for, that I may not go mad, if, indeed, I be not mad already. If I be sane, then surely it is maddening to think that of all the foul things that lurk in this hateful place the Count is the least dreadful to me, that to him alone I can look for safety, even though this be only whilst I can serve his purpose. Great God! Merciful God, let me be calm, for out of that way lies madness indeed. I begin to get new lights on certain things which have puzzled me. Up to now I never quite knew what Shakespeare meant when he made Hamlet say, "My tablets! Quick, my tablets! 'tis meet that I put it down," etc., For now, feeling as though my own brain were unhinged or as if the shock had come which must end in its undoing, I turn to my diary for repose. The habit of entering accurately must help to soothe me.
The Count's mysterious warning frightened me at the time. It frightens me more not when I think of it, for in the future he has a fearful hold upon me. I shall fear to doubt what he may say!

When I had written in my diary and had fortunately replaced the book and pen in my pocket I felt sleepy. The Count's warning came into my mind, but I took pleasure in disobeying it. The sense of sleep was upon me, and with it the obstinacy which sleep brings as an outrider. The soft moonlight soothed, and the wide expanse without gave a sense of freedom which refreshed me. I determined not to return tonight to the gloom-haunted rooms, but to sleep here, where, of old, ladies had sat and sung and lived sweet lives whilst their gentle breasts were sad for their menfolk away in the midst of remorseless wars. I drew a great couch out of its place near the corner, so that as I lay, I could look at the lovely view to east and south, and unthinking of and uncaring for the dust, composed myself for sleep. I suppose I must have fallen asleep. I hope so, but I fear, for all that followed was startlingly real, so real that now sitting here in the broad, full sunlight of the morning, I cannot in the least believe that it was all sleep.

I was not alone. The room was the same, unchanged in any way since I came into it. I could see along the floor, in the brilliant moonlight, my own footsteps marked where I had disturbed the long accumulation of dust. In the moonlight opposite me were three young women, ladies by their dress and manner. I thought at the time that I must be dreaming when I saw them, they threw no shadow on the floor. They came close to me, and looked at me for some time, and then whispered together. Two were dark, and had high aquiline noses, like the Count, and great dark, piercing eyes, that seemed to be almost red when contrasted with the pale yellow moon. The other was fair, as fair as can be, with great masses of golden hair and eyes like pale sapphires. I seemed somehow to know her face, and to know it in connection with some dreamy fear, but I could not recollect at the moment how or where. All three had brilliant white teeth that shone like pearls against the ruby of their voluptuous lips. There was something about them that made me uneasy, some longing and at the same time some deadly fear. I felt in my heart a wicked, burning desire that they would kiss me with those red lips. It is not good to note this down, lest some day it should meet Mina's eyes and cause her pain, but it is the truth. They whispered together, and then they all three laughed, such a silvery, musical laugh, but as hard as though the sound never could have come through the softness of human lips. It was like the intolerable, tingling sweetness of waterglasses when played on by a cunning hand. The fair girl shook her head coquettishly, and the other two urged her on.

One said, "Go on! You are first, and we shall follow. Yours' is the right to begin." The other added, "He is young and strong. There are kisses for us all."

I lay quiet, looking out from under my eyelashes in an agony of delightful anticipation. The fair girl advanced and bent over me till I could feel the movement of her breath upon me. Sweet it was in one sense, honey-sweet, and sent the same tingling through the nerves as her voice, but with a bitter underlying the sweet, a bitter offensiveness, as one smells in blood. I was afraid to raise my eyelids, but looked out and saw perfectly under the lashes. The girl went on her knees, and bent over me, simply gloating. There was a deliberate voluptuousness which was both thrilling and repulsive, and as she arched her neck she actually licked her lips like an animal, till I could see in the moonlight the moisture shining on the scarlet lips and on the red tongue as it lapped the white sharp teeth. Lower and lower went her head as the lips went below the range of my mouth and chin and seemed to fasten on my throat. Then she paused, and I could hear the churning sound of her tongue as it licked her teeth and lips, and I could feel the hot breath on my neck. Then the skin of my throat began to tingle as one's flesh does when the hand that is to tickle it approaches nearer, nearer. I could feel the soft, shivering touch of the lips on the super sensitive skin of my throat, and the hard
dents of two sharp teeth, just touching and pausing there. I closed my eyes in languorous ecstasy and waited, waited with beating heart.

But at that instant, another sensation swept through me as quick as lightning. I was conscious of the presence of the Count, and of his being as if lapped in a storm of fury. As my eyes opened involuntarily I saw his strong hand grasp the slender neck of the fair woman and with giant's power draw it back, the blue eyes transformed with fury, the white teeth champing with rage, and the fair cheeks blazing red with passion. But the Count! Never did I imagine such wrath and fury, even to the demons of the pit. His eyes were positively blazing. The red light in them was lurid, as if the flames of hell fire blazed behind them. His face was deathly pale, and the lines of it were hard like drawn wires. The thick eyebrows that met over the nose now seemed like a heaving bar of white-hot metal. With a fierce sweep of his arm, he hurled the woman from him, and then motioned to the others, as though he were beating them back. It was the same imperious gesture that I had seen used to the wolves. In a voice which, though low and almost in a whisper seemed to cut through the air and then ring in the room he said, "How dare you touch him, any of you? How dare you cast eyes on him when I had forbidden it? Back, I tell you all! This man belongs to me! Beware how you meddle with him, or you'll have to deal with me."

The fair girl, with a laugh of ribald coquetry, turned to answer him. "You yourself never loved. You never love!" On this the other women joined, and such a mirthless, hard, soulless laughter rang through the room that it almost made me faint to hear. It seemed like the pleasure of fiends. Then the Count turned, after looking at my face attentively, and said in a soft whisper, "Yes, I too can love. You yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so? Well, now I promise you that when I am done with him you shall kiss him at your will. Now go! Go! I must awaken him, for there is work to be done." "Are we to have nothing tonight?" said one of them, with a low laugh, as she pointed to the bag which he had thrown upon the floor, and which moved as though there were some living thing within it. For answer he nodded his head. One of the women jumped forward and opened it. If my ears did not deceive me there was a gasp and a low wail, as of a half smothered child. The women closed around, whilst I was aghast with horror. But as I looked, they disappeared, and with them the dreadful bag. There was no door near them, and they could not have passed me without my noticing. They simply seemed to fade into the rays of the moonlight and pass out through the window, for I could see outside the dim, shadowy forms for a moment before they entirely faded away. Then the horror overcame me, and I sank down unconscious.

Scene 5 Lucy's exorcism (228-231)

When we were alone and had heard the last of the footsteps die out up the road, we silently, and as if by ordered intention, followed the Professor to the tomb. He unlocked the door, and we entered, closing it behind us. Then he took from his bag the lantern, which he lit, and also two wax candles, which, when lighted, he stuck by melting their own ends, on other coffins, so that they might give light sufficient to work by. When he again lifted the lid off Lucy's coffin we all looked, Arthur trembling like an aspen, and saw that the corpse lay there in all its death beauty. But there was no love in my own heart, nothing but loathing for the foul Thing which had taken Lucy's shape without her soul. I could see even Arthur's face grow hard as he looked. Presently he said to Van Helsing, "Is this really Lucy's body, or only a demon in her shape?" "It is her body, and yet not it. But wait a while, and you shall see her as she was, and is."

She seemed like a nightmare of Lucy as she lay there, the pointed teeth, the blood stained, voluptuous mouth, which made one shudder to see, the whole carnal and unspirited
appearance, seeming like a devilish mockery of Lucy's sweet purity. Van Helsing, with his usual methodicalness, began taking the various contents from his bag and placing them ready for use. First he took out a soldering iron and some plumbing solder, and then small oil lamp, which gave out, when lit in a corner of the tomb, gas which burned at a fierce heat with a blue flame, then his operating knives, which he placed to hand, and last a round wooden stake, some two and a half or three inches thick and about three feet long. One end of it was hardened by charring in the fire, and was sharpened to a fine point. With this stake came a heavy hammer, such as in households is used in the coal cellar for breaking the lumps. To me, a doctor's preparations for work of any kind are stimulating and bracing, but the effect of these things on both Arthur and Quincey was to cause them a sort of consternation. They both, however, kept their courage, and remained silent and quiet.

When all was ready, Van Helsing said, "Before we do anything, let me tell you this. It is out of the lore and experience of the ancients and of all those who have studied the powers of the Un-Dead. When they become such, there comes with the change the curse of immortality. They cannot die, but must go on age after age adding new victims and multiplying the evils of the world. For all that die from the preying of the Un-dead become themselves Un-dead, and prey on their kind. And so the circle goes on ever widening, like as the ripples from a stone thrown in the water. Friend Arthur, if you had met that kiss which you know of before poor Lucy die, or again, last night when you open your arms to her, you would in time, when you had died, have become nosferatu, as they call it in Eastern Europe, and would for all time make more of those Un-Deads that so have filled us with horror. The career of this so unhappy dear lady is but just begun. Those children whose blood she sucked are not as yet so much the worse, but if she lives on, Un-Dead, more and more they lose their blood and by her power over them they come to her, and so she draw their blood with that so wicked mouth. But if she die in truth, then all cease. The tiny wounds of the throats disappear, and they go back to their play unknowing ever of what has been. But of the most blessed of all, when this now Un-Dead be made to rest as true dead, then the soul of the poor lady whom we love shall again be free. Instead of working wickedness by night and growing more debased in the assimilating of it by day, she shall take her place with the other Angels. So that, my friend, it will be a blessed hand for her that shall strike the blow that sets her free. To this I am willing, but is there none amongst us who has a better right? Will it be no joy to think of hereafter in the silence of the night when sleep is not, 'It was my hand that sent her to the stars. It was the hand of him that loved her best, the hand that of all she would herself have chosen, had it been to her to choose?' Tell me if there be such a one amongst us?"

We all looked at Arthur. He saw too, what we all did, the infinite kindness which suggested that his should be the hand which would restore Lucy to us as a holy, and not an unholy, memory. He stepped forward and said bravely, though his hand trembled, and his face was as pale as snow, "My true friend, from the bottom of my broken heart I thank you. Tell me what I am to do, and I shall not falter!"

Van Helsing laid a hand on his shoulder, and said "Brave lad! A moment's courage, and it is done. This stake must be driven through her. It will be a fearful ordeal, be not deceived in that, but it will be only a short time, and you will then rejoice more than your pain was great. From this grim tomb you will emerge as though you tread on air. But you must not falter when once you have begun. Only think that we, your true friends, are round you, and that we pray for you all the time." "Go on," said Arthur hoarsely. "Tell me what I am to do." "Take this stake in your left hand, ready to place to the point over the heart, and the hammer in your right. Then when we begin our prayer for the dead, I shall read him, I have here the book, and the others shall follow, strike in God's name, that so all may be well with the dead that we love and that the Un-Dead pass away." Arthur took the stake and the hammer, and
when once his mind was set on action his hands never trembled nor even quivered. Van Helsing opened his missal and began to read, and Quincey and I followed as well as we could.

Arthur placed the point over the heart, and as I looked I could see its dint in the white flesh. Then he struck with all his might. The thing in the coffin writhed, and a hideous, bloodcurdling screech came from the opened red lips. The body shook and quivered and twisted in wild contortions. The sharp white teeth champed together till the lips were cut, and the mouth was smeared with a crimson foam. But Arthur never faltered. He looked like a figure of Thor as his unshaking arm rose and fell, driving deeper and deeper the mercy-bearing stake, whilst the blood from the pierced heart welled and spurted up around it. His face was set, and high duty seemed to shine through it. The sight of it gave us courage so that our voices seemed to ring through the little vault. And then the writhing and quivering of the body became less, and the teeth ceased to champ, and the face to quiver. Finally it lay still. The terrible task was over.

The hammer fell from Arthur's hand. He reeled and would have fallen had we not caught him. The great drops of sweat sprang from his forehead, and his breath came in broken gasps. It had indeed been an awful strain on him, and had he not been forced to his task by more than human considerations he could never have gone through with it. For a few minutes we were so taken up with him that we did not look towards the coffin. When we did, however, a murmur of startled surprise ran from one to the other of us. We gazed so eagerly that Arthur rose, for he had been seated on the ground, and came and looked too, and then a glad strange light broke over his face and dispelled altogether the gloom of horror that lay upon it.

There, in the coffin lay no longer the foul Thing that we had so dreaded and grown to hate that the work of her destruction was yielded as a privilege to the one best entitled to it, but Lucy as we had seen her in life, with her face of unequalled sweetness and purity. True that there were there, as we had seen them in life, the traces of care and pain and waste. But these were all dear to us, for they marked her truth to what we knew. One and all we felt that the holy calm that lay like sunshine over the wasted face and form was only an earthly token and symbol of the calm that was to reign for ever.

Scene 6  Mina's attack (300-307)

The moonlight was so bright that through the thick yellow blind the room was light enough to see. On the bed beside the window lay Jonathan Harker, his face flushed and breathing heavily as though in a stupor. Kneeling on the near edge of the bed facing outwards was the white-clad figure of his wife. Her head stood a tall, thin man, clad in black. His face was turned from us, but the instant we saw we all recognized the Count, in every way, even to the scar on his forehead. With his left hand he held both Mrs. Harker's hands, keeping them away with her arms at full tension. His right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. Her white night-dress was smeared with blood, and a thin stream trickled down the man's bare chest which was shown by his torn-open dress. The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten's nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink. As we burst into the room, the Count turned his face, and the hellish look that I had heard described seemed to leap into it. His eyes flamed red with devilish passion. The great nostrils of the white aquiline nose opened wide and quivered at the edge, and the white sharp teeth, behind the full lips of the blood dripping mouth, clamped together like those of a wild beast. With a wrench, which threw his victim back upon the bed as though hurled from a height, he turned and sprang at us. But by this time the Professor had gained his feet, and was holding towards him the envelope which contained the Sacred Wafer. The Count suddenly stopped, just as poor Lucy had done outside the tomb, and cowered back.
Further and further back he cowered, as we, lifting our crucifixes, advanced. The moonlight suddenly failed, as a great black cloud sailed across the sky. And when the gaslight sprang up under Quincey's match, we saw nothing but a faint vapor. This, as we looked, trailed under the door, which with the recoil from its bursting open, had swung back to its old position . . .

"I took the sleeping draught which you had so kindly given me, but for a long time it did not act. I seemed to become more wakeful, and myriads of horrible fancies began to crowd in upon my mind. All of them connected with death, and vampires, with blood, and pain, and trouble." Her husband involuntarily groaned as she turned to him and said lovingly, "Do not fret, dear. You must be brave and strong, and help me through the horrible task. If you only knew what an effort it is to me to tell of this fearful thing at all, you would understand how much I need your help. Well, I saw I must try to help the medicine to its work with my will, if it was to do me any good, so I resolutely set myself to sleep. Sure enough sleep must soon have come to me, for I remember no more. Jonathan coming in had not waked me, for he lay by my side when next I remember. There was in the room the same thin white mist that I had before noticed. But I forget now if you know of this. You will find it in my diary which I shall show you later. I felt the same vague terror which had come to me before and the same sense of some presence. I turned to wake Jonathan, but found that he slept so soundly that it seemed as if it was he who had taken the sleeping draught, and not I. I tried, but I could not wake him. This caused me a great fear, and I looked around terrified. Then indeed, my heart sank within me.

Beside the bed, as if he had stepped out of the mist, or rather as if the mist had turned into his figure, stood a tall, thin man, all in black. I knew him at once from the description of the others. The waxen face, the high aquiline nose, on which the light fell in a thin white line, the parted red lips, with the sharp white teeth showing between, and the red eyes that I had seemed to see in the sunset on the windows of St. Mary's Church at Witby. I knew, too, the red scar on his forehead where Jonathan had struck him. For an instant my heart stood still, and I would have screamed out, only that I was paralyzed. In the pause he spoke in a sort of keen, cutting whisper, pointing as he spoke to Jonathan.

"'Silence! If you make a sound I shall take him and dash his brains out before your very eyes.' I was appalled and was too bewildered to do or say anything. With a mocking smile, he placed one hand upon my shoulder and, holding me tight, bared my throat with the other, saying as he did so, 'First, a little refreshment to reward my exertions. You may as well be quiet. It is not the first time, or the second, that your veins have appeased my thirst!' I was bewildered, and strangely enough, I did not want to hinder him. I suppose it is a part of the horrible curse that such is, when his touch is on his victim. And oh, my God, my God, pity me! He placed his reeking lips upon my throat!" Her husband groaned again. She clasped his hand harder, and looked at him pityingly, as if he were the injured one, and went on.

"I felt my strength fading away, and I was in a half swoon. How long this horrible thing lasted I know not, but it seemed that a long time must have passed before he took his foul, awful, sneering mouth away. I saw it drip with the fresh blood! "The remembrance seemed for a while to overpower her, and she drooped and would have sunk down but for her husband's sustaining arm. With a great effort she recovered herself and went on.

"Then he spoke to me mockingly, 'And so you, like the others, would play your brains against mine. You would help these men to hunt me and frustrate me in my design! You know now, and they know in part already, and will know in full before long, what it is to cross my path. They should have kept their energies for use closer to home. Whilst they played wits against me, against me who commanded nations, and intrigued for them, and fought for them, hundreds of years before they were born, I was countering them. And you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood, kin of my kin, my bountiful wine-press for a while, and shall be later on my companion and my helper. You
shall be avenged in turn, for not one of them but shall minister to your needs. But as yet you are to be punished for what you have done. You have aided in thwarting me. Now you shall come to my call. When my brain says "Come!" to you, you shall cross land or sea to do my bidding. And to that end this! With that he pulled open his shirt, and with his long sharp nails opened a vein in his breast. When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow some to the . . . Oh, my God! My God! What have I done? What have I done to deserve such a fate, I who have tried to walk in meekness and righteousness all my days. God pity me! Look down on a poor soul in worse than mortal peril. And in mercy pity those to whom she is dear!" Then she began to rub her lips as though to cleanse them from pollution.

Scene 7 Dracula’s death (399-401)

In the midst of this I could see that Jonathan on one side of the ring of men, and Quincey on the other, were forcing a way to the cart. It was evident that they were bent on finishing their task before the sun should set. Nothing seemed to stop or even to hinder them. Neither the levelled weapons nor the flashing knives of the gypsies in front, nor the howling of the wolves behind, appeared to even attract their attention. Jonathan’s impetuosity, and the manifest singleness of his purpose, seemed to overawe those in front of him. Instinctively they cowered aside and let him pass. In an instant he had jumped upon the cart, and with a strength which seemed incredible, raised the great box, and flung it over the wheel to the ground. In the meantime, Mr. Morris had had to use force to pass through his side of the ring of Szgany. All the time I had been breathlessly watching Jonathan I had, with the tail of my eye, seen him pressing desperately forward, and had seen the knives of the gypsies flash as he won a way through them, and they cut at him. He had parried with his great bowie knife, and at first I thought that he too had come through in safety. But as he sprang beside Jonathan, who had by now jumped from the cart, I could see that with his left hand he was clutching at his side, and that the blood was spurting through his fingers. He did not delay notwithstanding this, for as Jonathan, with desperate energy, attacked one end of the chest, attempting to prise off the lid with his great Kukri knife, he attacked the other frantically with his bowie. Under the efforts of both men the lid began to yield. The nails drew with a screeching sound, and the top of the box was thrown back.

By this time the gypsies, seeing themselves covered by the Winchester, and at the mercy of Lord Godalming and Dr. Seward, had given in and made no further resistance. The sun was almost down on the mountain tops, and the shadows of the whole group fell upon the snow. I saw the Count lying within the box upon the earth, some of which the rude falling from the cart had scattered over him. He was deathly pale, just like a waxen image, and the red eyes glared with the horrible vindictive look which I knew so well. As I looked, the eyes saw the sinking sun, and the look of hate in them turned to triumph. But, on the instant, came the sweep and flash of Jonathan’s great knife. I shrieked as I saw it shear through the throat. Whilst at the same moment Mr. Morris’s bowie knife plunged into the heart. It was like a miracle, but before our very eyes, and almost in the drawing of a breath, the whole body crumbled into dust and passed from our sight. I shall be glad as long as I live that even in that moment of final dissolution, there was in the face a look of peace, such as I never could have imagined might have rested there.

The Castle of Dracula now stood out against the red sky, and every stone of its broken battlements was articulated against the light of the setting sun. The gypsies, taking us as in
some way the cause of the extraordinary disappearance of the dead man, turned, without a word, and rode away as if for their lives. Those who were unmounted jumped upon the leiter wagon and shouted to the horsemen not to desert them. The wolves, which had withdrawn to a safe distance, followed in their wake, leaving us alone.

Mr. Morris, who had sunk to the ground, leaned on his elbow, holding his hand pressed to his side. The blood still gushed through his fingers. I flew to him, for the Holy circle did not now keep me back, so did the two doctors. Jonathan knelt behind him and the wounded man laid back his head on his shoulder. With a sigh he took, with a feeble effort, my hand in that of his own which was unstained. He must have seen the anguish of my heart in my face, for he smiled at me and said, "I am only too happy to have been of service! Oh, God!" he cried suddenly, struggling to a sitting posture and pointing to me. "It was worth for this to die! Look! Look!" The sun was now right down upon the mountain top, and the red gleams fell upon my face, so that it was bathed in rosy light. With one impulse the men sank on their knees and a deep and earnest "Amen" broke from all as their eyes followed the pointing of his finger. The dying man spoke, "Now God be thanked that all has not been in vain! See! The snow is not more stainless than her forehead! The curse has passed away!" And, to our bitter grief, with a smile and in silence, he died, a gallant gentleman.
Appendix 5: Average and medium shot lengths

As explained before, Cinemetrics is a simple software program that allows the collection of statistics regarding a film’s dynamic features, such as the length of shots, scenes, sequences but also the calculation of the average and medium shot length. Data has been used punctually in certain scenes but to have a wider understanding of its import, the grid below presents the global average and medium shot length for all the movies considered in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASL</th>
<th>MSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murnau</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badham</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppola</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddin</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>