JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

VAMPIRISM AND QUEERNESS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE

Vedoucí práce: Einat Adar, M.A., Ph.D.

Autor práce: Bc. Eva Pečenková

Studijní obor: Anglická a americká literatura

Ročník: 2

2023

Poděkování:

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Einat Adar, M.A., Ph.D., for her patience and valuable advice.

I confirm that this thesis is my own work written using solely the sources and literature properly quoted and acknowledged as works cited.

České Budějovice, 8. 5. 2023

……Eva Pečenková

Anotace

Cílem této práce je analýza spojení mezi vampirismem a queer motivy v dílech *Drákula* od Brama Stokera a *Krev upírky* od Florence Marryat. Diplomová práce je rozdělena do tří částí. První část se zabývá vztahem viktoriánské Anglie k sexualitě a spojitostí mezi queer motivy a gotickým románem 19. století. Věnujeme se zde rozdílnému vnímání mužské a ženské homosexuality a zobrazování tzv. „Others" v dobové literatuře. Ve druhé části se zaměříme na interpretaci díla *Drákula* z hlediska queer teorie, a to prostřednictvím hraběte Drákuly a role, kterou v románu představuje, včetně jeho vztahu k ostatním mužským postavám. Třetí část se soustředí na analýzu díla *Krev upírky*, které popisuje osud ženské upírky Harriet Brandt. Nakonec se práce zabývá aspekty jinakosti, kterými Harriet ohrožuje viktoriánskou společnost, a zároveň dvojznačným chápáním tohoto díla.

Klíčová slova: queer motivy, vampirismus, viktoriánská Anglie, Bram Stoker, *Drákula*, Florence Marryat, *Krev upírky*, společnost

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is the analysis of the connection between vampirism and queerness in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*. The Master's thesis is divided into three parts. The first part examines the relationship of Victorian England to sexuality and the connection between queerness and the 19th-century Gothic novel. We will pay attention to the different perceptions of male and female homosexuality and the portrayal of the so-called "Others" in contemporary literature. In the second part, we will focus on the interpretation of *Dracula* in terms of queerness, namely through Count Dracula and the role he plays in the novel, including his relations to the other male characters in the novel. The third part concentrates on the analysis of *The Blood of the Vampire*, describing the fate of female vampire Harriet Brandt. Finally, the thesis explores the aspects of Harriet's Otherness that Harriet threatens Victorian society with, as well as the ambiguous understanding of this work.

Keywords: queerness, vampirism, Victorian England, Bram Stoker, *Dracula*, Florence Marryat, *The Blood of the Vampire*, society

Table of contents

Introduction

To this day, vampires remain a key part of the horror genre. Even after two centuries, when vampires first began to appear in English literature, these creatures still retain their popularity. In this thesis, my aim is to concentrate on two vampiric novels, Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*. Count Dracula is in a way the father of the modern vampire, although the pale aristocratic vampire was not Stoker's original creation. Over the years, the novel has received much attention from literary scholars, who have examined numerous distinctive features of the text, most notably the themes of xenophobia, reverse colonialism, and sexuality. This thesis addresses the issue of sexuality, specifically queer sexuality in connection to vampirism. In the Victorian era, people who did not fit into the strict binaries of what is appropriate set by society came under the so-called Victorian Others; they included for instance working-class people, homosexuals, prostitutes, or even women who did not meet the expectations of what a proper woman should look and act like, such as Harriet Brandt from *The Blood of the Vampire*. This female vampire has much in common with Dracula; both, for example, are foreigners who in essence pose a danger to Victorian England, and both vampires' danger lies in their sexuality. *Dracula* and *The Blood of the Vampire* were both published in the same year, 1897, two years after the trials of Oscar Wilde, in a society that was increasingly hostile to same-sex desire, and both provide the reader with different perspectives on queerness. In many ways, however, the two characters differ; while Stoker's Dracula is portrayed primarily as a heartless monster, such judgements cannot be made so clearly with Harriet Brandt. On the contrary, Marryat many times inspires compassion for Harriet. In fact, ambiguous portrayals of Victorian Others in fiction were common, and Marryat's ambivalent vampire only proves this.

This thesis is divided into three parts. The first part deals with the subject of sexuality, primarily queer sexuality, and the way it was treated in Victorian England. Any open discussions of sexuality were unthinkable in the repressive Victorian society; however, suppressing this subject only resulted in increased interest in it, including homosexuality. Contemporary society's attitude towards homosexual desire between men and women differed; while same-sex relationships between men were not only considered immoral and sinful, but were even criminal, women's homosexuality was never illegal. Furthermore, the distinction between platonic and romantic relationships between women

was far more fluid to the Victorians than it is today. Whatever the Victorians' perception of same-sex desire was, they were certainly fascinated by it; this was often covertly reflected in the Gothic genre, and coded same-sex desire was particularly popular in this kind of fiction. In numerous Gothic novels, there is a clear connection between sexuality (particularly queer sexuality) and abhumanness. Vampires were arguably the most popular monsters in Gothic fiction, and they were frequently used as a metaphor for social outcasts. That can be explained by the fact that the primary danger that the vampire poses, the bite, is queer by its very nature, as it is used for both reproduction and feeding. In that sense, the vampire is a penetrator and a receiver of bodily fluids at the same time. Moreover, the vampire can feed on anyone of any gender because there are no obvious normal male or female genitalia to these feedings; consequently, the vampire is inherently queer. This part of the thesis presents the reader with needed literary and historical context, for these novels must be assessed with consideration to their background. In the second part, queer sexuality portrayed in *Dracula* is examined, including the themes of gender reversal. The third and final part is concerned with Florence Marryat's novel *The Blood of the Vampire* where the focus is put primarily on Harriet Brandt's Otherness as both a biracial and bisexual woman.

1 PART ONE

1.1 Sexuality in Victorian England

Both novels chosen for this thesis take place during the Victorian period, known as an era of a class-based society, and vast industrial, social, and political development. In this chapter, general context of Bram Stoker's and Florence Marryat's time will be provided, for its introduction presents a better understanding of the novels' background and themes present in them. Firstly, I will describe society's attitude towards same-sex desire among both men and women, starting from a demonstration of how differently these two groups were viewed. Thereafter, I will proceed to address the connection between queerness and Gothic novel and the ways in which the representation of same-sex relationships as monstrous in fact hid lots of interest in such relationships. Finally, my intention is to look into the idea of vampires and how they were essentially portrayed as queer monsters. In organizing the chapter in this way, I aim to clarify the historical context of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*, both published in 1897.

The epoch in which both of these novels take place is typically called Victorian England and it formally marks the period between 1837 and 1901; nevertheless, it often refers to various stretches of time which may be even longer than the formal 64 years. The Victorian era, as the title suggests, was the period of Queen Victoria's reign. To this day, Queen Victoria remains one of the most significant figures in the history of the United Kingdom. Under her reign, Britain was a powerful nation with a stable government, a rich culture, and a growing economy. It had the status of the most powerful empire in the world, as it was "the empire on which the sun never set". Britain was also wealthy, partly because of its level of industrialization and its imperial holdings. On the other hand, Victorian era was also defined by extreme social inequality forcing numerous families to live in poverty, and many children had to work long hours in dangerous jobs to contribute towards the family budget. Health and hygiene were poor, and diseases spread easily. Nevertheless, while it is important to keep in mind that this era was a time of social injustice with child labour, racism, inequality between men and women, and other issues, there is no doubt that Victorian period was one of the most prosperous and significant eras in the history of the United Kingdom.

Today, one of the main principles people usually associate with the Victorian period is the Victorians' refusal to acknowledge the existence of sex; as Stephen Garton notes in

Histories of Sexuality, "[t]he Victorian era has found a central place in popular culture as a period of excessive sexual austerity, repression and prudery" (101). Michel Foucault argues that the history of sexuality since the eighteenth century is generally read with regard to what Foucault describes as the "repressive hypothesis" (10). According to the repressive hypothesis, any energy expenditure on purely pleasurable activities was frowned upon, and consequently, sex became a private and practical affair intended only for a husband and a wife, while sex outside of this establishment was not simply prohibited, but moreover repressed. Not only was there an effort to put an end to extra-marital sex, but there was also an effort to make it unthinkable and unspeakable. Nevertheless, it is important to note that this period was also an age of hypocrisy; discussions of sex, sexuality and bodily functions were taboo, but at the same time pornography and prostitution thrived; in other words, sex simply ended up being driven "underground", and incessant talks about sex were often disguised as well-meaning warnings (Garton 101). Ironically, no matter how improper discussions of sex were considered to be, the Victorians were not able to stop thinking about it all the same. In order to be able to express these "improper" sexual thoughts and feelings, Foucault argues that "if it was truly necessary to make room for illegitimate sexualities", their "infernal mischief" should be taken elsewhere, that is to "a place where they could be reintegrated, if not in the circuits of production, at least in those of profit" (4). The mental hospital and the brothel therefore, in a way, provided two official outlets for sexuality.

1.1.1 Victorian England and male homoeroticism

For Victorian authors, an outlet could also be provided by writing. Literature was one of the few outlets for discussion of this taboo. Needless to say, the subject of sexuality could not be discussed openly in literature either; for this purpose, it was often hidden in Gothic novels, and coded same-sex desire in particular was a popular subject in fiction. Sexual relations between men in the Victorian era was an open secret. It was something that everyone was aware of but could not openly discuss in polite society or a newspaper. What is more, not only was same-sex desire considered to be immoral, indecent, and sinful, but "between 1885 and 1967 all male homosexual acts, whether committed in public or private, were illegal" (Weeks 11). It was not until 1861 that the death penalty for sodomy was abolished. Characters representative of homosexuals were described as

monstrous, and monsters, in this sense, presented a possible outlet as themes the Victorians wanted to talk about, but society prevented them from doing so.

Both Stoker's *Dracula* and Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire* were published in 1897, that is two years after the trials of Oscar Wilde during which the famous playwright was convicted of "gross indecency". The trials concerned both Wilde's literary work and sexual behaviour, and the charges against him were preceded by reviews pointing out homoerotic themes in Wilde's work. As Morris B. Kaplan states in his essay about the trials of Oscar Wilde, "[a] hostile reviewer in 1890 already had sex scan mind when he suggested that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* was fit on 'outlawed noblemen and perverted delivery boys'" (114). This review is a direct reference to the Cleveland Street affair that, in Kaplan's words, "readers would hardly miss" (114). The Cleveland Street affair is the term used for a scandal which occurred in 1889 when police discovered a homosexual male brothel on Cleveland Street in London where telegraph delivery boys were employed part-time as prostitutes. Moreover, "[f]urther investigation revealed that the clientele had included highly-placed figures with connections to the court and the government" (114). By linking Oscar Wilde to the scandal of Cleveland Street, the reviewer conjured up ideas of "aristocratic decadence and sexual exploitation of working-class youth" (114). When Wilde was driven to court against the Marquess of Queensberry in 1895, he faced accusations of sexual misconduct which linked him to male prostitutes and criminals reminiscent of the ones exposed in the previous scandal (114).

Wilde's own incautious actions led to his downfall after he initiated a criminal prosecution against an aristocrat who accused him of "posing as a somdomite [*sic*]" and committing indecent acts with his son (Hyde 76). However, the situation was reversed when Wilde found himself under arrest and could not clear his name. As a result, he was sentenced to the maximum sentence: two years of hard labour in prison. Before the trials, public opinion on homosexuality in Victorian England was not as hateful as one might assume. Because homosexuality was such a taboo topic in public discourse, outright homophobia was less common than curiosity or indifference. After the trials, however, the subject of same-sex desire between men entered the public sphere in a dramatic way, and the previous indifference gave way to intolerance. At the end of the nineteenth century, the homosexual identity was beginning to be established. "Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of

sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphrodism of the soul. The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species" (Foucault 43). Wilde's scandal brought attention to the homosexual, and society did not like the image that Wilde created. Public attitudes toward homosexuals became harsher and less tolerant, and hostility towards homosexuality deepened. Queer men were seen more as a threat, as "[the trials] created a public image for the homosexual [as well as] a terrifying moral tale of the dangers that trailed closely behind deviant behaviour" and an impassable border was created between what was acceptable and what was "abhorrent behaviour" (Weeks 21).

The late nineteenth century also witnessed numerous sexological writings which attracted a wide reading audience. Among the most popular texts of this genre was Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886) and Havelock Ellis's *Sexual Inversion* (1897). In Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, one of the earliest works on homosexuality, the author focuses on male homosexuality and deals with the psychology of deviant sexual behaviour. Fetishism, sadomasochism, and other forms of perversion are constantly being tied to masturbation and homosexuality which were both seen as detrimental to people's physical and mental well-being (Haefele-Thomas 97). Writings of this nature, that is *scientia sexualis*, "stirred up people's fears" (Foucault 53). In Foucault's words, "strange pleasures, [scientia sexualis] warned, would eventually result in nothing short of death: that of individuals, generations, the species itself" (54). Krafft-Ebing's work had the effect of identifying deviance with pathology and with something that must be "cured" in order for the subject affected by homosexuality to become whole again.

In Ellis's *Sexual Inversion*, on the other hand, a subversive view of homosexuality is presented. The author's aim in this study was to demonstrate that homosexuality is a natural expression of the sexual instinct; Ellis even admitted that he "was inclined to slur [sexual inversion] over as an unpleasant subject", but in time he discovered that several people he respected and admired were in fact "the congenital subjects of this abnormality" (5). He argues that "the matter was in special need of elucidation and discussion", and he indicates that individuals who feel desire towards the same sex, and find it "natural and normal", face "a heavy penal burden and a severe social stigma" (5). In that sense, Havelock Ellis and his work opposed the morality of their time. *Sexual Inversion* fostered

sexual tolerance and proposed the idea that people had a right to follow their sexual inclinations and desires. Edward Carpenter, an English early activist for gay rights, even explored new definitions by referring to homosexuals as the third sex which is tied to neither male nor female gender identity (Haefele-Thomas 97). Although the public attitude towards homosexuality was mostly negative and homosexuality was "dismissed by sexology as an incompletely masculine and regressive state", the first defences of these relationships and desires were already appearing (Hurley 202).

However, even if one keeps in mind the more positively tuned works with ideas expressed in solidarity with homosexuals, it remains true that the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were, with few exceptions, filled with intolerance towards these groups. Britain had always been unusually radical in this respect; in many other countries the death penalty had long since been abolished and homosexuality ceased to be illegal, whereas in Britain the criminalization of same-sex desire continued until the latter part of the last century. To compare, the Netherlands abolished laws criminalizing homosexual conduct in 1811 and the Kingdom of Bavaria in 1813. By the time Britain abolished death penalty for sodomy in 1861, homosexuality had already been decriminalized in numerous countries, which did not happen in England until 1967. The mood in Victorian society was not favourable to male homosexuality. It is therefore not surprising that any man with an inkling of homosexuality tried to hide his sexuality as much as possible and, so to speak, stayed in the closet.

1.1.1.1 Bram Stoker and speculations on his sexuality

There has been much speculation that this was also the case with Bram Stoker. It is not an unknown fact that Bram Stoker and Oscar Wilde were friends; Schaffer even notes that Wilde and Stoker "had an intimate and varied history lasting for at least twenty years" (381). Therefore, Wilde's trials may have impacted Stoker for more than one reason. In fact, Stoker began writing *Dracula* one month after Oscar Wilde was convicted of the crime of sodomy (381). What is also quite well-known is the fact that Stoker had a nearly sexless marriage with his wife, Florence Balcombe. Some scholars attribute this to the morals of Victorian England, where sexual expression of any kind was taboo, and intercourse was perceived as an act only meant for reproduction. Others speculate that Stoker was a closeted homosexual. His friendship with Oscar Wilde, his admiration of Walt Whitman, or his relationship with Sir Henry Irving suggests that at the very least

such a possibility is admissible. The author whom Stoker much admired was Walt Whitman, and he even publicly defended Whitman's controversial book of poetry, *Leaves of Grass*. According to Stoker's grand nephew, Daniel Farson, Bram sent Whitman several letters but for a long time received no answer. As the attacks on Whitman continued, "Bram wrote emotionally to Whitman after midnight: 'This letter was one in which I poured out my heart. I had long wished to do so but was, somehow ashamed or diffident – the qualities are much alike. That night I spoke out; the stress of the evening had given me courage'" (20). This time, Stoker received an answer. The authors had exchanged a few letters and met in person. Stoker had written of the meeting: "I found him all that I had ever dreamed of, or wished for in him: large-minded, broad-viewed, tolerant to the last degree; incarnate sympathy; understanding with an insight that seemed more than human" (21). Bram Stoker's admiration of Whitman is obvious.

However, Stoker's letters to Whitman were suppressed, or "ignored or euphemized", as Talia Schaffer puts it in her study, owing to their "passionate homoeroticism." In one of his letters, Stoker thanks Whitman for "all the love and sympathy [Whitman] [has] given [him] in common with [his] kind" (Schaffer 383). It is interesting that Stoker believes that he has a "kind". At the turn of the century, homosexuality was seen as "an essential identity peculiar to a recognizable minority, rather than a frequently practiced act called 'sodomy'" (382). However, this is never mentioned by Farson, and he even doubts if Bram Stoker realized "the homosexual implications of Whitman's concept of idyllic boy-love" and that he recognized "the lesbianism in *Carmilla*, the novel that was to influence him so deeply" (22). He is also sure that "[Stoker] was unaware of the sexuality inherent in *Dracula*" (22). However, the fact that this biography was published in 1975 must be taken into consideration. While at that time homosexuality was no longer illegal, society was still homophobic. Therefore, it is unlikely that Farson would admit his great-uncle's orientation even if he suspected it. At the same time, when he describes Stoker's first "fateful" meeting with Henry Irving, he compares Stoker to "a young girl meeting her hero" (24).

Next to Wilde and Whitman, one of the most important figures in Stoker's life was Sir Henry Irving, an English stage actor. One day, Stoker was included in Henry Irving's private recitation of the dramatic poem *The Dream of Eugene Aram* (1829) by Thomas Hood and experienced "'something', in his own words, 'like a violent fit of

hysterics'" (Hughes, *Bram Stoker* 11). He exclaims that "Soul had looked into soul! From that hour began a friendship as profound, as close, as lasting as can be between two men" (11). After some time, Irving even invited Stoker, at the time a young civil servant, to join him in London as Acting Manager of the Lyceum Theatre in the Strand. Stoker accepted without hesitation and the next morning sent in his resignation, "discarding his career in the Civil Service after thirteen years and forfeiting his chance of a pension" (Farson 38). "Stoker brought forward his marriage to Florence Ann Lemon Balcombe […], the daughter of an army officer, in order to facilitate his transfer to London" (Hughes 11). Bram Stoker and Florence Balcombe were married at St Anne's Church in Dublin on 4 December 1878; however, there was no time for a proper honeymoon, as five days later they joined Henry Irving in Birmingham (Farson 42). The intimate friendship that the author of *Dracula* shared with Irving lasted until the actor's death, and Stoker even named his son, Irving Noel Thornley Stoker, after the actor. He wrote *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* (1906) after the actor's death in 1905. In the biography of Stoker published in 1996, written by Barbara Belford, the author depicts Irving as a controlling man and suggests that he was the inspiration for Count Dracula (in comparison, Schaffer attributes this role to Wilde). In Belford's reading, Stoker was always at Irving's disposal, and apparently enjoyed Irving's power over him. In that sense, Belford implies homoeroticism in their relationship. In addition, Talia Schaffer calls Stoker a "closeted homosexual" and she believes that "*Dracula* explores Stoker's fear and anxiety as a closeted homosexual man during Oscar Wilde's trial" (381).

What might conflict with reading Stoker as a closeted homosexual is the fact that he published an article called "The Censorship of Stage Plays" (1909). Schaffer states that in this text, Stoker uses code terms for homosexuality like "decadence", "indecency", and "morbid psychology" in combination with the genre of drama to target Wilde covertly. In the article, he advocates for state censorship on the arts, in particular regarding sex. According to Schaffer, "the article argues that these authors are criminal because they teach their otherwise 'normal' readers to experience homosexual desire" (389). As Daniel Farson comments: "Coming from the author of Dracula these views seem incredible… Is it possible that Stoker did not realize he had written one of the most erotic books in English literature?" (210). Schaffer believes that in this way, Stoker "identifies with the national anti-Wilde homophobia, partly to disguise his own

vulnerability as a gay man, partly because it justifies his belief in the value of the closet, and partly from horror at the monstrous image of Wilde produced by the media, which would haunt men of 'his kind'" (388). The truth remains that although Stoker and Wilde socialized frequently, Stoker never mentioned him, not even in a twelve-page list of his famous acquaintances (390). All of this suggests that Stoker may indeed have been a homosexual in the closet, for queer people in the closet often experience a phenomenon called internalized homophobia – the involuntary belief of queer people that the prejudice, hatred, and homophobic stereotypes about them are true. With Wilde "out of the closet" and the consequences it entailed, it would be then little wonder if Bram Stoker indeed decided to stay in the metaphorical closet and rather chose the safe option of an apparently loveless marriage.

1.1.2 Same-sex desire among women

With women, the situation has always been different; homosexuality between women was never illegal, and these relationships were accepted by Victorian society. In *Between Women*, Sharon Marcus introduces the book with a ten-year-old girl Emily Pepys and entry in her journal from 1844 in which she describes a dream she had about marrying "a very nice pretty young lady" (1). As Marcus explains, Emily recorded this in a journal that was meant to be read by friends and family, just as letters were often read publicly. Opposite to what one might expect, she is not repulsed by the idea of marrying a woman but seems rather bemused. According to Marcus, "Emily's dream was in fact typical of a world that made relationships between women central to femininity, marriage, and family life" (1). Relationships among women, whether platonic, maternal, sexual, or other, were ubiquitous in Victorian culture, and friendship between women was often central to the lives of Victorian women and was deemed necessary. Being a good friend was just as important for a woman as being a dutiful daughter, loving wife, and nurturing mother. Women were able to express a certain amount of sexuality through passionate friendships with other women. Marcus even suggests that the distinction between romantic and homosocial relationships, i.e., same-sex relationships that are not of a romantic or sexual character, between women was far more fluid to the Victorians than it is today. Female friendship, eroticism, sexuality, and desire was not in conflict with the Victorian norms of heterosexual normative marriage, but rather one of them – contrary to same-sex relationships between men. "The diacritical opposition between the

'homosocial' and the 'homosexual' seems to be much less thorough and dichotomous for women, in [Victorian] society, than for men. At this particular historical moment, an intelligible continuum of aims, emotions, and valuations links lesbianism with the other forms of women's attention to women: the bond of mother and daughter, for instance, the bond of sister and sister" (Sedgwick, *Between Men* 2). Between women, passionate friendships were commonly formed. Amanda Herbert suggests that even when there was no physical intimacy or joint living, women challenged social norms by referring to one another as "dear husband" and "sweet wife" (28). In fact, it strengthened the idea that female friendship is domesticated, which in turn increased the perception that women are domestic beings. As a result, same-sex desire between women was incorporated into Victorian ideals of domesticity and heteronormativity rather than existing in opposition to those institutions, and "Victorian society accepted female homoeroticism as a component of respectable womanhood and encouraged women and girls to desire, scrutinize, and handle simulacra of alluring femininity" (Marcus 112).

As Marcus argues, "female friendship, female marriage, and female homoeroticism [were accepted] as components of conventional femininity. Precisely because Victorians saw lesbian sex almost nowhere [that] they could embrace erotic desire between women almost everywhere" (113). Women living together was not uncommon, and moreover, marriage between women was "not only a Victorian dream but also a Victorian reality" (1); Marcus mentions Frances Power Cobbe, an activist and author, who lived together with sculptor Mary Lloyd. In her autobiography published in 1894, Cobbe reportedly references to joint finances, travels, "their" friends, garden, and "beautiful and beloved home" (1-2). The outside world usually assumed that this distinct identity was very similar to that of a typical passionate friendship. Since the boundaries of women's friendships blurred into more forms of friendship, lesbian relationships were consequently undiscovered or overlooked. Lillian Faderman argues in *Surpassing the Love of Men* that romantic friendships between women were accepted because they were asexual relationships (203). During the Victorian era, the belief that men and women are opposite sexes was predominant in nearly every part of society, and women were viewed as "inherently domestic, maternal, and self-restrained" (Marcus 6). Rather than for any emotional or sexual satisfaction, women were supposed to only desire marriage because it allowed them to become mothers. However, many of the same-sex relationships were

in fact sexual. For instance, Anne Lister's friendships with Marianna Lawton (née Belcombe) and Anne Walker both turned into passionate relationships that dominated most of her life. Lister even frequently preferred to assume a dominant role in these relationships, and her masculine appearance mirrored this. Lister wrote in her diary: "I love, & only love, the fairer sex & thus beloved by them in turn, my heart revolts from any other love than theirs" (Lister, Whitbread 161). She also recorded the number of orgasms she and her lovers had. Nevertheless, most women were more cautious and "used natural images that mimicked or drew attention to the desiring female body; opening flower buds, smooth, rounded jewels, tidal oceans, and lush gardens, all expressed an unnamed but not unknown sexual desire" (Vicinus n21). Because heterosexual women could publicly treat their friends in a similar manner, Anne Lister's behaviour remained unnoticed, as "lesbians were not a distinct social type during the years from 1830 to 1880, in spite of the fact that male sodomy was 'a public and private obsession'" (Marcus 6).
Women, sexuality, and marriage began to change dramatically in the 1880s. This change was connected to eugenics, the theory of racial improvement, which shifted the meaning of marriage from a spiritual union to a reproductive one which was dependant on heterosexual fertility, and which promoted racial purity (6). "A new sense of heterosexuality, as a distinct sexual orientation formed in diametrical opposition to homosexuality, made marriage and the family the province of male-female unions" (6). At the same time, distinct lesbian identities began to develop around 1880. Marcus argues that even though that evolution has been significant, its importance should not be overstated, in part because preconceptions and subcultures associated with lesbians have never completely replaced earlier beliefs. What is more, there is evidence that the idea of female marriage persisted into the twentieth century, demonstrating how absurd it is to suppose that lesbian marriage was, until fairly recently, an oxymoron (261).

1.2 Queerness and Gothic novel

The Gothic novel is a literary genre, or subgenre of the novel, which appears from the second half of the eighteenth century onwards. It is a predecessor of modern horror and is particularly typical of British literature, although it can also be found in other national literatures. Gothic novels are typically set in unusual and mysterious environments, for example an old, abandoned castle, a monastery, or even a cave with secret passages. The name Gothic novel is related to the fact that the setting were often various gothic

buildings, especially castles. Their purpose was to revive the spirit of the Middle Ages. Gothic novels typically contain mystery, suspense, and horror, and often involve supernatural phenomena and creatures. Common themes include various crimes, revenge, secrets from the past, but also madness and sexuality. Sexuality in particular played an important role in the genre, and special attention has been paid to the subject of "queerness", which Sedgwick defines as "the open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meaning when the constituent elements of anyone's gender, of anyone's sexuality aren't made (or can't be made) to signify monolithically" (Sedgwick, *Tendencies* 8). In Haefele-Thomas's words, "'gothic' and 'queer' are aligned in that they both transgress boundaries and occupy liminal spaces, and in so doing, they each consistently interrogate ideas of what is 'respectable' and what is 'normal'" (2). This gradually blurs the line between what is acceptable and what is not. Cultural distinctions tend to become less clear in the Gothic genre, whether they are based on gender, sexuality, or for instance race. Haefele-Thomas further discusses that some authors used the Gothic novel to defend queer and otherwise marginalized characters in ways that were quite subversive, while other writers took advantage of the fact that the Gothic novel allowed them to express the ambiguity of "others" in society who included " working-class people, imperial subjects, prostitutes, homosexuals and anyone else who did not fall into the prudish and rigidly structured identity deemed appropriate in the Victorian age" (Haefele-Thomas 2).

Gothic literature contains elements of horror and terror, and it is often centred around a victim helpless in face of their enemy or victimizer. This victimizer usually possesses some form of supernatural power or superiority over the victim and uses it to make the victim's life miserable. In monster literature, the victimizer is depicted in the form of a monster that torments the main characters. Kelly Hurley defines these monsters as "abhuman beings" – beings that retain remnants of their human identity but have already become or are in the process of becoming some half-human other being - wolfish, simian, or perhaps even tentacled. The abhuman being may also be some unimaginable "thing" that incorporates, mimics, or takes on a human form, and thus poses another kind of threat to the integrity of human identity (190). As with the question of sexuality, the Victorians seem both fascinated and repulsed by the subject of these monsters, and abhumanness returns again and again in the Gothic. In numerous Gothic novels, there is a clear

connection between sexuality (particularly homosexuality and bisexuality) and abhumanness. "Threats of and longings for gender-crossing, homosexuality or bisexuality, racial mixture, class fluidity, the child in the adult, timeless timeliness, and simultaneous evolution and devolution […]: all these motifs, as possibly evil and desirable, circulate through Gothic works across the whole history of the form" (Hogle 12). Jerrold E. Hogle discusses the way social and ideological tensions about these "deviations" are expressed in the Gothic and how it provides temptations toward these possibilities disguised in "aberrant and regressive forms" and at the same time creates means of othering them all so that "standard, adult, middle-class identities can seem to stand out clearly against them" (12).

Haefele Thomas believes that "while Gothic became a place to explore the terrain of taboo sexual desires and gender identities, […] it [also] became a safe location in which to explore ideas about race, interracial desire, cross-class relations, ethnicity, empire, nation and 'foreignness' during the nineteenth century" (3). In *Queering the Gothic*, William Hughes and Andrew Smith introduce the text with the idea that "[g]othic has, in a sense, always been 'queer'" (1). They argue that while the genre of Gothic "frequently espouses a characteristically conservative morality, and frequently a conventional and rather public heterosexuality[,] […] the inconsistency of Gothic proclaims a brittleness of definition which is imperfectly concealed by plot and characterisation" (1). While conventional moralities and identities are in the end victorious, it is important to note that the fact they have been challenged in the first place indicates that they have been interrogated. "The questionable moment, however brief, hints of pleasures still unrealised or unavailable but now known. Known and experienced, even vicariously, they become now a temptation, now an alternative" (2).

1.3 Vampires as queer monsters

Probably the most popular monster in the Gothic genre is the vampire. The vampire has been with mankind for millennia. Its various forms go back deep into antiquity, where they mix with cannibalism, human sacrifice, and fear of violence. From the same roots, stories of creatures feeding on human blood have arisen in the geographically distant cultures of China, India, Africa, and Europe. Although they may differ in many ways, they have one thing in common; vampires are creatures that feed on the vital force, usually blood, of the living. In European folklore, the undead often visit their relatives and loved

ones, causing trouble or death in the places they inhabited during their lifetime. According to legends, it was a person who died in an "unclean" way, for example suicide or execution, a person who excluded themselves from the society of people, or someone who ended up dying an unnatural death (either a sorcerer using black magic, or a victim of a sorcerer). The belief in the undead is also reflected in archaeological findings. A large number of methods existed as defences against vampires, some of which are archaeologically documentable. Most of these were to physically prevent the dead from leaving the grave. "The [vampire's] body [was] 'killed' in a variety of ways, one after another – dismembered, excoriated, and cremated, then thrown into a river" (Barber 14). One theory as to why they performed such rituals is their fear of vampirism.

The modern idea of the pale and gaunt vampire, often aristocratic and sophisticated, is quite different from the original idea of a vampire. It comes from the nineteenth-century Western European literature, especially John Polidori's 1819 short story *The Vampyre* and Bram Stoker's 1897 novel *Dracula*, the most famous work on the subject. It was also in Gothic literature that the vampire became most popular, for the Victorians were fascinated by the supernatural. In Gothic novels, vampires were frequently used as allegories for social outcasts, and "[i]n many cases, the vampire also represents queer monstrosity, racially miscegenated monstrosity or some combination of both" (Haefele-Thomas 99). What makes vampires so terrifying is also the way in which these creatures blend into human culture and society; whereas "[g]hosts, werewolves, and manufactured monsters are relatively changeless, more aligned with eternity than with time; vampires blend into the changing cultures they inhabit. They inhere in our most intimate relationships; they are also hideous invaders of the normal" (Auerbach 6). Haefele-Thomas also argues that in Victorian Britain, vampires represent a threat to the proper social order (99). Nevertheless, special interest has been paid to queer interpretations, as the horror of the vampire is primarily sexual. What is worse, it is sexual in all the wrong ways, and as a result, the vampire serves as a mediator for societal anxieties about queerness. It is a creature of the night, craving human flesh in forbidden ways. The vampire's cannibalistic nature is combined with a charm and attraction that captivate both its audience and victims. The vampire's bite is queer by its very nature, as it serves as both a source of reproduction and a means of feeding. The action is erotic by definition. There is a fluid interchange and a penetration, but none of these align with traditional,

heterosexual intercourse. The vampire is a penetrator and a receiver of bodily fluids at the same time. What is more, the victim always seems to be simultaneously aroused and horrified, enjoying the pleasure of sex and at the same time feeling the horror of being attacked by a monster. The victim serves as both a sexual object of desire and prey. Moreover, it can feed on anyone of any gender because there is no obvious male or female genital to these feedings; consequently, the vampire is symbolised as queer in the sense of sexuality.

2 PART TWO

2.1 Dracula

Dracula is a novel written by Irish author Bram Stoker and first published in 1897. Even though Bram Stoker wrote numerous novels in his lifetime, *Dracula* is the one that is definitely most etched in the minds of readers. While stories about vampires had already started gaining popularity in previous years – see Lord Byron's poem "The Giaour" (1813), John William Polidori's novella *The Vampyre* (1819), or Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu's *Carmilla* (1872) –, the truth remains that none of these works have left such a mark on literature and art in general as *Dracula*. Count Dracula represents the prototype of the modern vampire: tall, thin, pale, aristocratic, and somehow suave. Although vampires are not Stoker's original creation and neither is his modern depiction of the vampire, as aristocratic and sophisticated vampires already appeared in the aforementioned works, *Dracula* raised interest in the subject. Literary scholars have explored many themes in this novel, including but not limited to the role of women in Victorian society, sexuality, and race. *Dracula* presents symbols of repressed sexuality, and focus is put primarily on the connection between lust and evil as it was perceived in the late nineteenth century in a strongly conservative Victorian society. Since open discussions of sexuality were socially unacceptable, Bram Stoker, like many other writers of the time, reflected on these themes through the genre of Gothic. His vampire is the embodiment of society's typical idea of the Victorian Otherness including queer people, who were seen as a threat to society. It can be said that Dracula is essentially a sexual predator without specific sexual orientation, since both men and women are the objects of his desire. Not only does he turn Lucy Westenra into a vampire and nearly succeeds in permanently changing Mina Harker, but he also threatens Jonathan Harker with the danger of vampirism. Different kinds of gender inversion supporting the notion of queerness and homoeroticism may be observed in the novel as well. The ways in which these subjects are treated in *Dracula* will be discussed in this chapter.

2.2 The threat of Otherness: Dracula's sexuality and fluidity of gender roles

Dracula is the embodiment of one of many Victorian anxieties; he is a creature of the night, an exotic Other, a foreign threat to the British Empire. "Queers – and in this case multiethnic queers – move within literal and metaphoric geographies, across continents.

Traversing and reinventing languages and places, disturbing the 'natural' order" (Haefele 100). As a vampire, Dracula represents the horror of sexual deviation in the eyes of Victorian society. Christopher Craft argues that the fact that Jonathan Harker is the object of Dracula's lingering interest is the source of the novel's opening anxiety and its initial expression of the vampire threat. The sexual threat that this novel initially evokes but never fully represents is that Dracula will seduce, penetrate, and drain another man (Craft 110). Sexual same-sex relationships were understood as sexual perversion at the time, and homosexual individuals were demonized by society. The case of Oscar Wilde in 1895, in which he was found guilty of sodomy and condemned to two years of hard labour, brought "the Other Victorians" to light. Anxiety regarding same-sex desire is undoubtedly integrated in the vampire character, and the process of penetrating the victim's neck with vampiric teeth and sucking blood presents a metaphor for coitus. Dracula can "grow younger", "hypnotize and seduce his victims" and "he can transform his victims into vampires" (Stoker, *Notes* 63). Not only does the vampire prey upon their victims but they also transform the victims into creatures like themselves; hence, as a result of the intimate interaction between the vampire and their prey, individuals who become a vampire's prey are transformed into creatures with two genitalia, as they can penetrate others with their teeth and simultaneously receive their bodily fluids. Sexual deviance is alluded to by Jonathan Harker's observations of the Count's physical oddities; Dracula even has hairs in the centre of his palms (Stoker 20). Hairy palms belong among the lesser-known signs of vampirism; nevertheless, it also supports the idea of Dracula as a sexual deviant, a habitual masturbator, as hairy palms were a trait believed to be the by-product of masturbation in the nineteenth century. In *Beyond Dracula*, William Hughes explains that "the masturbator, the pallid male who 'spends' his seminal vitality unwisely and unproductively, is frequently depicted as an enemy to society as much as to himself" (Hughes 141).

In many respects, Dracula presents "a characteristic, if hyperbolic, instance of Victorian anxiety over the potential fluidity of gender roles" (Craft 111-2). The Count undermines British values by keeping no servants and executing all the tasks traditionally performed by women himself. "From the moment Harker steps foot [*sic*] inside Dracula's home, he finds his host catering to his every need in a manner that is more commonly attributed to the female sex" (Nystrom 64). In this instance, not only does Dracula defy

traditional gender roles, but more importantly, by doing so, Stoker indirectly reminds the contemporary reader of the figure of Alfred Taylor. This man was tied together with Oscar Wilde and he "supposedly procured him boys" (Schaffer 406). As Schaffer expands, "Taylor's nighttime visitors made his landlady suspicious" and "various witnesses testified to the state of his rooms" (406). Most importantly, Taylor "'kept no servant and did his own cooking on a gas stove'" (Schaffer 406) – just like Dracula who cooks and cleans, as "there were no servants in the house" (Stoker 30). In that manner, "the conditions of secrecy necessary for nineteenth-century homosexual life – nocturnal visits, shrouded windows, no servants – become ominous emblems of Count Dracula's evil" (Schaffer 406). Dracula's Otherness is thereby directly linked to his queerness.

According to Jerrold E. Hogle, "Bram Stoker in Dracula unquestionably castigates all the crossings of boundaries that his count inspires and embodies, especially the 'liberated' sexuality" (13). Hogle further discusses the ways in which Dracula poses a threat as a queer representation; that he can "disgorge blood from his breasts as much as he can penetrate flesh with his phallic teeth [Stoker, Dracula, p. 247]; can be attracted by Jonathan Harker [and vice versa] as much as Mina Murray [p. 31]" (Hogle 12). Overall, Bram Stoker creates instances of striking ambiguity as well as fluidity, in both his villain and specific situations throughout the novel. The Count seamlessly transitions between the roles of his guest's tormentor and protector throughout the novel; he rescues Jonathan Harker from his vampiric "brides" in a possessive manner while remaining Jonathan's jailor and threatening his life. And yet, Jonathan himself admits that "of all the foul things that lurk in this hateful place the Count is the least dreadful to [him]" and "that to [Dracula] alone [he] can look for safety" (Stoker 40). In the notes that Stoker left behind, a similar principle is to be found in the material that ultimately did not make it into the novel; it is, however, part of the short story "Dracula's Guest" (1914). Although the storyline of the "Dracula's Guest" was not included in the novel, Stoker's notes indicate that it was once an integral part of it (Eighteen-Bisang and Miller, *Notes* 278). In this story, a snowstorm forces the narrator to find shelter in the tomb of Countess Dolingen, and a lightning strike reveals a beautiful woman who appears to be sleeping on a bier. Just before the woman and the tomb are destroyed by lightning, the narrator is thrown from the tomb by a strong unseen hand, and when he awakens, he finds a big wolf lying on him and licking his throat. The wolf then shields him from the storm until its howls

attract a group of soldiers who have been sent to look for him. This corresponds to Stoker's notes "adventure snow storm and wolf" (Stoker, *Notes* 95). The narrator, like Jonathan Harker in Dracula's castle, finds himself in a vulnerable position in which he needs protection from a creature that is itself dangerous, and in a way, he becomes emasculated. Both Jonathan and the narrator of "Dracula's Guest" need protection from someone in a dominant position, and as a result, they both contradict the time-conditioned gender roles. Fluidity of gender roles is often associated with queerness in literature. Furthermore, the dynamic between Jonathan and Dracula, as well as the unnamed narrator and the wolf, support Haefele-Thomas's statement that queer people have often been portrayed in ambiguous ways in literature, as "Gothic as a genre allows [authors] to express their ambivalence regarding 'others' in society" (2).

2.3 Homoeroticism between Dracula and Jonathan Harker

In McCrea's words, "Jonathan's spell as a prisoner in Dracula's castle, with the count by turns courteous and menacing, is the novel's principal set piece" (255). Upon meeting Count Dracula for the first time, Jonathan describes him 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" (Stoker 17). He pays special attention to his mouth which is, in his words, "hard-looking" and "with very red lips and sharp-looking teeth" (11). At first glance, Dracula appears to be a friendly and charming host with his "courteous bow" (20) and a "charming smile" (19). He proves to be well read, courteous, and solicitous, and he attempts to befriend Jonathan. However, despite the vampire's chivalry, Jonathan begins to uncover more and more indicators that Dracula is in fact dangerous. Throughout Jonathan Harker's stay, it becomes evident that the Count does not intend to let Jonathan leave the castle. Jonathan Harker is kept in captivity for a long time by Dracula, almost two months, but this treatment is not particularly unpleasant as the solicitor is apparently allowed to roam the castle and learn the details of Dracula's vampire life without suffering any negative effects on his health. Furthermore, the Count is never violent with his guest; instead, he treats him in a gentlemanly manner. For instance, he "jumped down, and held out his hand to assist [Jonathan] alight" (Stoker 16) from the caleche, and he himself opened the door for Jonathan "with a courteous bow" (20). The Count also likes to call Jonathan "my friend"; in fact, he addresses Jonathan in this manner a total of 12 times, including one instance of "my young friend" (35), one of

"my good young friend" (35) and two instances of "my dear young friend" (36, 54). Furthermore, Dracula has no real reason to keep Jonathan Harker alive; he has even less reason to continue pretending that nothing is amiss and treating Jonathan in a courteous way. It would seem, then, that the main reason he does so lies in his desire to play with Jonathan, or even seduce him. Combined with the psychological torment that Jonathan experiences at the hands of the vampire, the horror of the novel takes on new dimensions. The dynamic between Jonathan Harker and Dracula borders on an abusive romantic relationship. Queerness thus becomes not only despicable, but downright terrifying. It is in his queer relationship with Dracula that Jonathan experiences his greatest powerlessness, and the moment he breaks free from the vampire's hold, he can finally achieve masculinity.

2.3.1 Feminisation of Jonathan Harker

In British Gothic literature, there is often a vulnerable female character, "a damsel in distress" so to speak; these Gothic heroines are typically incarcerated in a castle and tormented by a villainous tyrant. The Gothic in itself possesses an erotic quality, as it is fascinated by complete sexual power over young and innocent heroines, and the genre is constantly drawn to their vulnerability against obscene patriarchal figures who appear to have no restraints on their desire ("The Gothic"). In the case of *Dracula*, the role of a vulnerable incarcerated heroine is filled by Jonathan Harker who gets imprisoned by Dracula in his Gothic castle and in certain ways becomes emasculated in numerous other cases throughout the novel. By Victorian norms, men are expected to be in charge of their own destiny. According to John Ruskin, an English philosopher, writer, art critic and polymath, to be a man essentially means to take charge, make decisions, and to dominate, as "the man's power is active, progressive, defensive" and he is "eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender" (117). Victorian women, on the other hand, were meant to be passive and submissive. In *Dracula*, Jonathan Harker, while entrapped in Dracula's castle, finds his autonomy severely limited, and he is certainly not in control of his own destiny. The Count establishes boundaries of where Jonathan may or may not go, he cautions him against going into rooms that are locked and warns him never to sleep anywhere else in the castle other than his assigned bedroom. Dracula takes away his travel attire to prevent Jonathan from leaving the castle and starts locking Jonathan in his room during the day. What is more, Jonathan is a foreigner in Transylvania, which makes him

dependent on the Count's knowledge of the nation, despite the fact that Jonathan is supposed to be the one helping Dracula with legal matters. Jonathan Harker is therefore completely under the Count's control; the Englishman himself is aware of it, for he writes in his journal that Dracula "has a fearful hold upon [him]" (Stoker 40), and he is "so absolutely in his power" (45).

This fact that Jonathan is controlled by Dracula demonstrates a disparate power dynamic between them which puts Jonathan in a subservient and helpless role. Dracula, on the other hand, is described as immensely strong; when Jonathan meets the "driver", he notes "a hand which caught [his] arm in a grip of steel; his strength must have been prodigious" (11). Then again, a few pages later, he "could not but notice his prodigious strength. His hand actually seemed like a steel vice that could have crushed [his] if he had chosen" (16). The Count then grasped Jonathan's hand "with a strength which made [him] wince" (17). According to Van Helsing, Dracula is "so strong in person as twenty men" (260). Dracula's masculinity is further demonstrated when he narrates the history of his ancestors as well as the history of the country. The Count passionately tells Jonathan the tales of fighting against the Turks, and it becomes evident that Dracula is describing his own military prowess. Dracula's experience as a warrior highlights his masculinity, and Jonathan's manliness seems inadequate in comparison. In other words, where Dracula is strong and manly, Jonathan becomes weak and emasculated. As a result, Jonathan is forced to assume a woman's role with regard to the vampire, while Dracula represents masculine power.

Barry McCrea's reading of *Dracula* focuses on the theme of the marriage-plot, and the scholar points out that Jonathan is left to his own devices while Dracula, like an important and powerful husband, is "absent from the castle about his bloody business" (266). This leaves Jonathan waiting for him until he returns, and a parallel is drawn between Jonathan and women as Jonathan imagines himself as a lady in a marriage-plot; he is "sitting at a little oak table where in old times possibly some fair lady sat to pen, with much thought and many blushes, her ill-spelt love-letter, and writing in [his] diary in shorthand all that has happened since [he] closed it last" (Stoker 39). Just like this hypothetical lady, Jonathan is left alone in the castle, with the master of the house away, and writing. "This emphatic juxtaposition of the image of the lady with the image of Harker, both writing about their feelings and awaiting their destiny, is immediately

reinforced" several days later, as Jonathan moves "from the lady's seat into her bed" (Kuzmanovic 416). He then writes in his diary: "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" (Stoker 40). Once again, Jonathan likens himself to a lonely woman missing her husband who is away.

Dajen Kuzmanovic argues that these parallels confirm Jonathan's "strong identification with these ladies" and it also "implies that Harker begins to cultivate feelings for Dracula other than those of repulsion and fear" (416). This becomes apparent after he admits to himself that Dracula "is the least dreadful to [him]" (Stoker 40). Indeed, the pair spend numerous nights together, conversing by the fire, and Jonathan even compares himself to Shahrazad when he comments that "this diary seems horribly like the beginning of the 'Arabian Nights,' for everything has to break off at cock-crow" (Stoker 33). There can be little doubt that Jonathan is feminised during his "stay" in Dracula's home, and his emasculation can be interpreted in various ways. McCrea, for instance, argues that Stoker's *Dracula* is in fact a heterosexual horror; that, in fact, the novel uses a homosexual relationship of Jonathan and Dracula as a way to discuss heterosexuality and marriage, and "the demons of the novel are heterosexual ones, viewed with fear and wonderment from the outside", for Jonathan can be seen "as the new wife and the Count the older, sexually experienced, socially superior, professionally accomplished man by whom Jonathan is by turns attracted, excited, imprisoned, and terrorized" (McCrea 266). Hence, he essentially reads *Dracula* in the opposite way to Christopher Craft who shows how same-sex desire portrayed in *Dracula* is heterosexually displaced into homosociality. While it remains true that Jonathan is indeed emasculated in many ways during his time with the Count, and it is he who creates a parallel between himself and a lady worriedly waiting for her love to return from battle, the real horror lies in the inversion of gender roles. Fluidity of gender roles is fundamentally queer, and it moreover puts Jonathan in a helpless role. The queer dynamic therefore rather shows a homosexual horror. Only when Jonathan escapes from Dracula and enters into a heterosexual marriage with Mina does he gain masculinity.

2.3.2 Belongs to me

When analysing the homoerotic nature of Jonathan and Dracula's relationship, scholars often pay special attention to the famous passage in which Jonathan is threatened by the three vampire women, the "weird sisters", and then saved by Dracula (Stoker 53). A closer examination of Stoker's notes on Dracula reveals that references to this scene appear in the notes from the very beginning; it is clear that the author himself attached importance to the scene, named mostly "This man belongs to me I want him" or "Belongs to me" (Stoker, *Notes* 17, 29, 39, 75, 83). Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller, responsible for the annotation and transcription of Stoker's notes, admit that the scene "must have been embedded in Stoker's imagination from the start, for it emerges again and again like a recurring dream" (280). In fact, many "twists and turns" in the plot sketched in Stoker's notes disappeared, save for "Jonathan Harker's journey to the castle, his encounter with three vampire women and the Count's imperious 'This man belongs to me'" (277).

In this passage, after the female vampires find Jonathan asleep, they attempt to bite him; or more precisely, they attempt to *kiss* him (Stoker 40-3). The act of draining blood is called a kiss by both the female vampires and the Count; in this way, Stoker himself gives the vampire bite an erotic charge. In fact, sexual imagery appears frequently in the novel; the word "kiss" (or its variations) appears 42 times in the text. The scene is charged with eroticism, and Jonathan describes the women's behaviour and appearance in depth using sensual language. It is clear that he is sexually attracted to them; nevertheless, his description of the women's beauty is in fact quite similar to his description of Dracula; Jonathan often describes the details of the Count's face and body, and he even remarks that Dracula and the women share similar features. In particular, Jonathan Harker describes the other beautiful ladies in the room as having faces like the Count, with their "aquiline noses" and "piercing red eyes" (41). Jonathan could have likened the female vampires to the many women of the villages that he passed through on his way to Dracula's castle; in choosing to compare the brides' appearance to that of the Count, this passage gains a notable homoerotic subtext. In the scene, it becomes evident that "the vampiric kiss excites a sexuality so mobile, so insistent, that it threatens to overwhelm the distinctions of gender" (Craft 117), as "Jonathan Harker enjoys a 'feminine' passivity and awaits a delicious penetration from a woman whose demonism

is figured as the power to penetrate" (109). The queer undertone is only intensified when the act of "kissing" is interrupted by Dracula who exclaims: "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!" (Stoker 43).

Christopher Craft believes that this interruption "repeats the threat of a more direct libidinous embrace between Dracula and Harker" (110). Not only does Dracula protect Jonathan, but what is more, he claims him as his own. In that sense, Jonathan in a way becomes the fourth bride of Dracula, needing the Count's protection and serving him. After his outburst, Dracula is met with an accusation from the blonde bride which seems quite strange in the context; she answers Dracula with a mocking remark: "You yourself never loved; you never love!" (Stoker 43). Dracula responds by "looking at [Jonathan's] face attentively" and saying "in a soft whisper": "Yes, I too can love. You yourselves can tell it from the past. Is it not so?" (43). The question arises who it is that Dracula can love, as well as whether he is capable of it. In *Open Graves, Opens Minds,* Lindsey Scott comments that Dracula's response to the woman "hangs in the air, an unanswered, open-ended question – and it remains so for the duration of Stoker's novel" (Scott 118). As the scholar further clarifies, no other details about the Count's past or any display of affection or humanity support the claim that Dracula "can love" (118). Nina Auerbach too denies the notion that Dracula can love, while Bill Hughes speculates "who, exactly, Dracula can love" (2). Hughes admits that "in Dracula, romance is not clearly visible" (1). Nevertheless, as Hughes further elaborates, it is still Dracula who is "the principal archetype for fictional vampires – particularly the pale, sensual, moody undead of today's paranormal romance" (1). Nonetheless, Lindsey Scott observes that "the declaration that a vampire too 'can love' serves […] more as a question that Stoker poses to his readers, readers who are, more than likely, familiar with the stories of other literary vampires" (Scott 118). Scott argues that Stoker, in fact, refers to the vampires of earlier texts like Carmilla or Lord Ruthven, their homoeroticism and homosociality; in that way, he "banishes his readers from the pages of his own novel, asking them instead to recall the 'more playful and sinuous' vampires" (Scott 118-9). While it is never directly expressed in the novel, and the meaning behind the Count's claim is left for interpretation, the fact that he looks at Jonathan Harker, together with the homoerotic dynamic of their relationship, suggests the idea of a union between Dracula and Jonathan. This reading

would make the scene even more terrifying for contemporary readers, as it would go from a passive and feminised male character to a homosexual relationship. In such interpretation, not only does Dracula claim Jonathan as his own, but he also declares his ability to love the man that belongs to him. The consummation of Dracula and Jonathan's "libidinous embrace" in the form of vampiric bite, however, is not possible, for the novel's rigid gender binaries would be thereby disrupted (Craft 110). Hence, as Craft further argues, Dracula's unfulfilled ambition to turn Harker into a vampire is satisfied by his three vampire companions instead. Because of their anatomical femininity, they are able to conceal the Count and Jonathan's forbidden homoerotic embrace. In that sense, homoeroticism achieves representation "as a demonic inversion of normal gender relations", for "Dracula's daughters offer Harker a feminine form but a masculine penetration" (Craft 110). All these characters therefore represent both the fear of gender inversion and same-sex desire among men.

2.3.3 Dracula's attempts at penetrating Jonathan Harker

Many scholars rightly stress the importance of the "Belongs to me" passage, but Dracula's desire to bite (or "kiss") Jonathan is most overtly referenced when Jonathan Harker cuts himself shaving (Craft 110). Stoker thereby foreshadows how Dracula will behave when he sees Jonathan's blood: "When the Count saw my face, his eyes blazed with a sort of demoniac fury, and he suddenly made a grab at my throat" (Stoker 28). In this moment, the Count experiences exhilaration at the sight of a man's blood, which can be interpreted as homoerotic excitement. Overall, Craft argues that this unfulfilled sexual ambition is exactly what gives the opening chapter of *Dracula* its suspense and power, as the narrative is quietly and dangerously permeated by Dracula's yearning to "fuse with a male" (110). When Dracula notices Jonathan's blood, he threatens to violently penetrate him. As Hurley explains, "When homoerotic desire is represented as an attack by abhuman monsters […], this is again not unexpected, given the sociomedical conflation of homosexuality, degeneration, and animality" (202). In his diary, Jonathan makes no secret of his repulsion for the Count. In his description, Dracula essentially presents a fusion of a man and an animal; Jonathan uses animalistic language to describe Dracula's appearance, attire, and movements. For instance, he describes the Count as a "lizard", "with his cloak spreading out around him like great wings" when he sees him climbing down the castle wall (Stoker 37-8). In a different part of the novel, Jonathan describes

Dracula's "great nostrils of the white aquiline nose" and his "white sharp teeth, behind the full lips of the blood-dripping mouth, champed together like those of a wild beast" (Stoker 311). The Count has protruding fangs, red eyes, and sharp nails resembling claws. What is more, not only does Dracula resemble a beast, but he is also able to transform himself into one. He turns into a dog, a wolf, and a bat throughout the novel, and he also manipulates other animals to do his bidding. This makes Dracula a fluid mixture of the animalistic as well as aristocratic, a queer monster.

The undesirable character of queer Otherness through Victorian eyes is further confirmed during the very first night that Jonathan Harker spends with Dracula in his castle. Special attention should be paid to the passage in which the Count and the solicitor talk by the fireplace after dinner. Jonathan describes a moment when the Count "leaned over [Jonathan] and his *hands* touched [him]" (Stoker 20, emphasis added). It could hardly have been accidental touching, given that Dracula had to leave his spot to lean over Jonathan and afterwards "drew back; and with a grim sort of smile […] sat himself down again on his own side of the fireplace" (20). Moreover, Dracula touched his guest with both of his hands. As a response, Jonathan was shaken with revulsion and "could not repress a shudder", the origin of which even he could not explain (20). The question arises as to why Dracula felt the need to suddenly rise from his seat and lean over and touch his guest; in fact, the Count was initiating contact with an ulterior motive, for, like his vampiric brides later, Dracula was trying to seduce Jonathan Harker. Indeed, after the whole encounter, Jonathan is left to "think strange things which [he] dare not confess to [his] own soul" (Stoker 20). Physical touch with Jonathan Harker is initiated by Dracula numerous times throughout the novel. In the passage when Jonathan cuts himself shaving and in which the sexual threat of Dracula biting Jonathan becomes most prominent, the Count, not for the first time, lays a hand on Jonathan's shoulder as he salutes him and makes his presence known. At the beginning of the novel, he helps Jonathan get into the carriage "with a hand which caught [his] arm in a grip of steel" (11), several hours later he "jumped down, and held out his hand to assist [Jonathan] to alight" (16), and he "lay a heavy hand on [Jonathan's] shoulder" (35) as he told his "young friend" to write to his superior about his prolonged stay at the castle, and he "took [his] arm" to take him to the next room (26-7). After the encounter with the three female vampires, when Jonathan is left half aroused, half scared with the Count and faints, Dracula carries him to his bed and

undresses him. Touch is an intimate sign of familiarity, closeness, and friendship; it provides an emotional context. Through touch, trust and warm feelings are gained; "interpersonal touch not only has a special role in early human development but continues to be crucial across the span of human social life, promoting trust and cooperation and thereby deeply influencing our perceptions of others" (Linden 196). Through touch, Dracula tries to convince Jonathan of his safety, establish a connection, and possibly seduce him.

2.4 Dracula and Renfield

Another of Dracula's victims, as well as one of the most vulnerable ones, is R. M. Renfield, a "homicidal maniac" who is under the care of Dr John Seward and who suffers from a bizarre mental condition – Seward diagnoses him as a "zoophagous maniac" (Stoker 78). This means that Renfield is driven to devour animals, for "The blood is the life!" (156). Renfield believes that blood is the source of life and that by consuming other creatures, he absorbs their life force. To achieve his goal to consume as many lives as possible, he "gave many flies to one spider and many spiders to one bird, and then wanted a cat to eat the many birds" (78). At one point in the novel, Renfield even attacks John Seward; he cuts the doctor's wrist and then licks his blood off the floor. He longs for eternal life and is hence the Count's devoted slave, for he serves Dracula in exchange for an endless supply of flies and spiders to devour, as well as the promise of immortality. He even attempts to escape from the asylum several times to meet the Count. It becomes evident in the novel that Count Dracula has power over Renfield, but the reader does not learn what exactly the nature of their relationships is, or how these two met. Nevertheless, there are homoerotic undertones which may be observed in their dynamic. Lindsey Scott describes Renfield as "a sexually ambiguous 'madman' who becomes a devoted, imprisoned slave to his former 'lover'" (123). Bill Hughes too believes that Renfield may be "one potential lover of Dracula" (3). He builds his argument primarily on the way that Renfield "breathlessly anticipates the coming of his lord to his bedchamber: 'The bride-maidens rejoice the eyes that wait the coming of the bride; but when the bride draweth nigh, then the maidens shine not to the eyes that are filled'. This blasphemously parodic Biblicism", he states, "is laden with erotic suggestions of the Song of Songs" (3). Moreover, the reader may once again notice an interesting parallel. Just as Jonathan compares himself to the sighing ladies of the marriage-plot, Renfield draws a parallel

between himself and Dracula and bride-maidens with the bride. In that manner, interestingly, both he and Dracula become feminised in the passage. In a different part of the novel, Renfield compares Dracula to the Moon: "He slid into the room through the sash, though it was only open an inch wide – just as the Moon herself has often come in through the tiniest crack, and has stood before me in all her size and splendour" (Stoker 308). From the use of feminine pronouns along with the traditional portrayal of the Moon as a feminine symbol, it is clear that this description is another instance of feminisation of Dracula. Nevertheless, just like Jonathan Harker, Renfield still takes on a subservient role towards Dracula, and it is clear that the vampire has complete power over him. From this perspective he is no longer purely masculine; not only is he "lunatic", but through his submissive role in his relationship with the vampire he also becomes queer, and thus Other. It is Renfield's insanity that allows him to come close to openly expressing same-sex desire.

According to John Seward, Renfield is "mixed up with the Count in an indexy kind of way" (Stoker 273). By observing what Renfield says and does, one should be able to locate the Count. Renfield is therefore thought of as the Count's metaphorical index; in a sense, then, the two are conjoined. This notion is exemplified in the striking way in which Renfield describes the vampire's latest visit; he says that he "couldn't hold him" and that Dracula "didn't even smell the same" (Stoker 309). This passage at the very least implies that there must have been physical contact between Renfield and the vampire, and for Renfield to notice a change in Dracula's smell suggests a considerable amount of intimacy. A similar intimacy can be seen in the fact that Jonathan Harker seems to recognize the Count by "the neck and the movement of his back and arms" and that he "could not mistake the hands which [he] had had so many opportunities of studying"; this shows Jonathan's perfect knowledge of Dracula's body, acquired by frequent and careful observation (Stoker 37). Dracula is hence Renfield's Master, whom he can recognize by smell, just as Jonathan is able to recognize the vampire by his neck and the movement of his back. Moreover, after Renfield has been savagely beaten by the Count, and John Seward with Van Helsing find him lying bloodied on the floor of his room, he admits to them that Count Dracula visits him frequently: "I would't ask Him to come in at first, though I knew He wanted to – just as He had wanted all along. Then He began promising things – not in words but by doing them" (Stoker 307). Here the reader may notice the

intensity of Dracula's persuasion, or even seduction; in the end, Dracula gets what he wants from Renfield, and he is let inside his servant's room. The question also arises as to what kind of promises Dracula makes to Renfield when he visits him during the moonlight. Dracula, of course, ultimately promises to turn Renfield into a vampire, but this promise is never actually fulfilled; just as in Jonathan Harker's case, there is no male-to-male penetration. Since the vampire bite occurs only between a man and a woman in the novel, Renfield's wish does not come true, as it would disrupt the strict gender binaries on which the novel is constructed.

2.5 Dracula and the Crew of Light

It is important to mention that despite the fact that Dracula is never seen directly feeding from any of the men in the novel, he does consume their blood. When Lucy is dying from Dracula's bite, Van Helsing bids all her suitors to come together and donate blood to her through transfusions – blood which the Count then, ironically, drinks through her. Given the close association of sexual intercourse and vampiric blood-drinking, blood is symbolically interchangeable with semen in the novel; this corresponds to the idea of a "sanguine economy" prevalent in Victorian England, described by William Hughes. Sanguine economy expresses beliefs and rules on why English people should not blend with people of other races, relating the idea to health, and it moreover provides reasons as to why people should not unnecessarily pursue sexual activities. A significant counterpart of the "sanguine economy" was the "spermatic economy", a popular medical discourse in which semen is regarded as a product of the blood (Hughes 140). In the Victorian era, there was a "medical theory through which health and vitality were related to the presence of blood and semen"; according to this hypothesis, if semen is "spent", "the consequent generation of fresh spermatozoa 'drains from the blood all its purest and most strengthening qualities', leaving the patient drained and exhausted'" (140). Hence, a decrease in sperm would directly result in a decrease in blood (12). Knowledge of this association sheds light on the erotic character of the men's blood exchange.

It is apparent that Stoker intended the vampire attacks to be sexual, as well as the act of sharing blood. Lucy gets her first blood transfusion from her fiancé, Arthur Holmwood, and her blood is replenished. Afterwards, Arthur Holmwood interprets the blood transfusion between himself and Lucy as a sexual consummation of their marriage; he feels as if he and Lucy "had been really married and that she was his wife in the sight of

God" (Stoker 191). However, after Arthur is forced to leave Lucy and visit his dying father, Dracula comes back for Lucy and drains her blood again. Consequently, Lucy is in need of a transfusion again, and this time it is provided by John Seward. This passage further proves that blood exchange in itself has erotic nature in *Dracula*, as Van Helsing warns the psychiatrist that "nothing must be said of this", as it "would at once frighten him and enjealous him, too" (Stoker 141). Nevertheless, Van Helsing later rejects Arthur's notion of "marriage" as it implies a sexual relationship even for himself as well as the other men who had donated blood to Lucy; in his words, it would make him a "bigamist" (as he is married, even though his wife has gone insane) and Lucy a "polyandrist" (193). The sexual innuendo of the act becomes even clearer with the fact that Jonathan, as the only married man, is spared the ritual transfusion by Bram Stoker.
Furthermore, Christopher Craft and Talia Schaffer discuss the fact that through these blood transfusions, the group of men experience same-sex sexual activity. As the Crew of Light (as entitled by Christopher Craft) perform multiple transfusions of blood to improve Lucy's health, "their blood [mingles] sensuously inside of her" (Ting 23). According to Angela Maria Hipolito Ting, "the sexual dimension of the men's bond happens solely within the corpus of Lucy Westenra, while she is bed-ridden and battling an unknown disease that is later identified as vampirism" (23). This principle is related to Craft's argument that in order to retain the gender binaries of the novel, desire in *Dracula* "seeks a strangely deflected heterosexual distribution; only through women may men touch" (111). The scholar further argues that the penetrations performed by the men of the novel "represent displaced marital (and martial) penetrations" and that "the text is emphatic about this substitution of medical for sexual penetration"; in short, he confirms the sexual nature of the transfusions, for "blood substitutes for semen here" (121).

Nina Auerbach, on the other hand, further examines the bond among the Crew of Light which is, ironically, forged by Dracula. "Innovative in his isolation, Dracula can do nothing more than catalyse homoerotic friendship among the humans who hunt him" (Auerbach 81). The relationships between all the male characters in *Dracula* are intertwined in their struggle to defeat the vampire. He creates a male community of intense mutual admiration, but he is not part of it. In a sense, Dracula can only join this brotherhood by feeding on Lucy's blood, but after the four men have "married" both her and one another in a series of transfusions, he becomes "stripped of his power of

combination catalysing homoerotic friendships in which he cannot participate" (Auerbach 82). Craft claims that "the novel, nonetheless, does not dismiss homoerotic desire and threat; rather it simply continues to diffuse and displace it" (111). Later in the novel, Dracula admonishes the men of the Crew of Light: "My revenge is just begun! I spread it over the centuries, and time is on my side. Your girls that you all love are mine already; and through them you and all others shall yet be mine" (Stoker 339). In this way, "the Count himself announces a deflected homoeroticism" (Craft 111). Once again, it is not only women that the vampire desires to possess; through them, he seeks the possession of their men as well. Craft further explains that it is another example of "the heterosexual displacement of a desire mobile enough to elude the boundaries of gender" (111).

Next to the blood transfusions, the matter of Dracula's death has also often received literary scholars' attention. Regarding Dracula's death, Jonathan Harker plays an important role in the Crew of Light, as he is "the only character who is both an object of the vampire's seduction and an agent of his destruction" (Kuzmanovic 411). At the end of the novel, Dracula is killed by Jonathan Harker and Quincey Morris; it could be said that, in a way, they end up penetrating the Count, as Quincey penetrates the vampire's heart, and Jonathan penetrates his throat. Contrary to popular belief, however, Dracula did not have a wooden stake driven through his heart; in fact, Jonathan used a Kukri knife, while Quincey stabbed the Count with a bowie knife. Barbara Belford, the author of Bram Stoker's biography, opines that "Dracula was spared the ritual vampire death because his staking would be a counterpart to Lucy's orgiastic death" because the male-to-male vampire death would be "too overtly suggestive" for the novel (267). In fact, the difference between the description of Lucy and Dracula's respective deaths is striking. Only a few sentences are devoted to the description of Dracula's death before Stoker proceeds to narrate Quincey's heroic death and his final words, whereas Lucy's "corrective penetration" is narrated in great detail (Craft 118). It is interesting that Arthur, who desired to marry Lucy and felt a physical attraction to her, is the one who murders her. The ritualistic nature of Lucy's death consists of driving a stake through her; the stake can be understood as a hard, phallic object used to violently penetrate Lucy in order to consummate her and Arthur's marriage. Even Craft recognizes that "Violence against the sexual woman here is intense, sensually imagined, ferocious in its detail" (122). The death of Dracula, on the other hand, seems like a mere afterthought in comparison. The fact that

Lucy is staked by a man, moreover her fiancé, perfectly fits the binaries of gender roles set in the novel, and the same principle prevents Dracula from meeting the same fate.

Literary scholars have also been paying attention to Mina and Jonathan Harker's son, little Quincey, who is directly linked to Dracula's destruction. The child is born on "the same day as that on which Quincey Morris died" (Stoker 417). What is more, however, little Quincey is also born on the anniversary of Dracula's final death. Talia Schaffer believes that he "can be read as the child of Dracula's and Harker's mutual desire" (Schaffer 419). Since Quincey and Dracula died on the same day, "Dracula's spirit could have passed into him, rather than Quincey's spirit" (419). The scholar acknowledges the implications of the passage of Quincey Morris's death – how he dies in Jonathan's lap, "fluids 'spurting through his fingers'", with his own body "soaking Harker's lap into a sticky pool of blood" (418-19). However, to build her argument, Schaffer puts emphasis on the fact that "Dracula's blood poured into Mina's mouth, and Harker's body would be covered with Dracula's blood, both from decapitating him and from supporting the bloodstained Quincey" (419). Christopher Craft too comments that while Quincey's "official genesis is, obviously enough, heterosexual, […] Stoker's prose quietly suggests an alternative paternity" (129). The son's name is a blend of the entire Crew of Light, and, in Jonathan's words, it "links all [their] little band of men together" (Stoker 417). Nevertheless, they call him Quincey in honour of their friend whose spirit Mina believes has passed on to their son. Contrary to Schaffer, Craft argues that Quincey Harker is "the fantasy child of those sexualized transfusions, son of an illicit and nearly invisible homosexual union" and he states that Quincey Harker is in fact "the unacknowledged son of the Crew of Light's displaced homoerotic union, and his name, linking the 'little band of men together,' quietly remembers that secret genesis" (Craft 130).

Whichever way the reader interprets the origin of the Harkers' son, the truth remains that Dracula, like little Quincey, is the one who links them all together; without Dracula, there would have been no need for the creation of the Crew of Light or the blood transfusions that created the homoerotic bond between these men. The vampire, nevertheless, poses multiple threats to the Victorians, both with his foreignness and queerness. Moreover, he corrupts innocent women and turns them into wanton beings like himself, thirsting for the human body and inverting gender norms set by society. Through his fault, Lucy becomes a blood-thirsty inversion of a mother, feeding on children instead

of feeding them, whereas Jonathan Harker oftentimes becomes feminised throughout his time with the Count. The theme of gender inversion is frequent in the text, and it is directly linked to the queerness inherent in vampires. Once a person is turned into a vampire, they lose all their humanity and become a monster who deserves no sympathy. Stoker's *Dracula* thus expresses numerous anxieties that Victorian society had regarding queer individuals, or Others in general.

3 PART THREE

3.1 The Blood of the Vampire

The Blood of the Vampire is a Gothic novel written by Florence Marryat and published in 1897, the same year as Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. That is certainly one of the reasons why this text remained unnoticed for such a long time; *Dracula* simply overshadowed it. Today, *The Blood of the Vampire* is still not widely recognized, but recently, the novel has been receiving more critical attention. Literary scholars emphasise primarily the novel's discussion of race, eugenics, and the matter of social classes in Victorian England. In this chapter, focus will be put mainly on the subject of sexuality and the way it is portrayed in the novel. *The Blood of the Vampire* follows Harriet Brandt, daughter of a mad scientist and a mixed-race voodoo priestess. Harriet grows up on her parents' Jamaican plantation and is placed in a convent after a slave uprising which resulted in her parents' death. As an adult, Harriet leaves for Europe and longs to fully experience the world. Most people are immediately charmed by the beautiful Harriet; however, it becomes evident that those who get close to her fall ill and die. Harriet, unlike Dracula, does not drain the blood of her victims, but rather their energy, and she kills unknowingly and unintentionally. The "blood" in the novel's title is a metaphor for heredity and refers to the legend that Harriet's grandmother, a Jamaican slave, was bitten by a vampire bat when she was pregnant with Harriet's mother. Harriet also inherited bad blood from her father, an Englishman who was expelled from medical school in Switzerland for unauthorized and deadly vivisection experiments. As a wealthy and unscrupulous man, he moved to Jamaica and continued his experiments on animals as well as on slaves. In terms of heritage, then, Harriet has all the makings of becoming a woman who poses a threat to Victorian society. Her fate was predestined the moment she was born, as she "appears to be cursed, or fated, by bad blood as well as bad parenting" and "[a]s a victim of the fin de siècle's version of original sin (heredity), she is biologically and spiritually determined" (Hammack n5). Because of her curse, Harriet's story ends tragically; her husband dies, she is denied happiness and love, and in the end, she commits suicide.

3.2 Harriet Brandt: the biracial and bisexual Other

Harriet, as a Victorian Other, is inherently a threat to contemporary society. Her Otherness stems from many factors. She resembles Dracula in that she represents Victorian anxieties about racial impurity and foreignness. Although she is fluent in English and in fact has English blood in her veins, there is no hiding the fact that her ways are not English and that she cannot fit into English society. What is more, not only is she not purely English, but she is also not purely white; as her grandmother was black, Harriet's Otherness is deepened by her biracialism. Harriet can pass as a white woman, but her blood is horribly tainted; she is thus seen as impure and offensive. The British in the nineteenth century were generally wary of foreigners and what is known as reverse colonialism – the idea that instead of being the conquerors, they would be the ones conquered. In *Dracula*, this danger is expressed clearly; Dracula is almost successful in his desire to relocate to London, to the heart of vibrant England where he would be able to drain the blood of more and more people and turn them into monsters like himself. The previous chapter has already explained how the figure of vampire threatens humanity; in addition to the strong themes of fear of reverse colonialism, Victorian anxiety about sexuality, and queer sexuality in particular, can also be traced in vampires. For instance, the very act of sucking blood is very intimate and erotically charged, as the teeth represent a phallic object that penetrates the victim, who can be both female and male. In that sense, vampires have always been inherently queer. Nevertheless, the argument that vampiric teeth represent a sexual object does not apply in *The Blood of the Vampire*, because while it remains true that Harriet is afflicted with the vampiric curse, her vampirism does not consist of consuming human blood like Count Dracula's does. Harriet is thus stripped of her penetrator quality in this regard. Furthermore, her "curse of black blood" and her foreignness does not threaten English society in the same way that her male counterpart does. Her aim is not to subjugate Victorian society, to feed on its members and multiply, and her killing is unknowing and unintentional. Yet she is not allowed to live the life she desires, for while Harriet may not pose the same kind of threat as Dracula, she is still dangerous for Victorian society.

Her danger stems mainly from her unrestrained and passionate sexuality. Harriet Brandt differs remarkably from other English women – she is not shy or in denial about her desire; on the contrary, her longing for love consumes her completely, and she

"exhibits a predisposition for sadistic pleasure as well as a vengefulness elicited when she is disappointed in love" (Hammack 887). This is related to the fact that "Harriet has acquired a draining personality, rather than a giving one, which leads her to unknowingly deplete the health and strength of her intimates" and "[a]lthough she does not actually drink blood, Harriet does render her companions anaemic" (Hammack 887). In fact, the notion that Harriet "renders her companions anaemic" is closely linked to "contemporary popular and scientific understandings of heredity and sexuality, which constructed the sexually mature female body as dangerous and in need of control" (Davis 40). Octavia Davis discusses the threatening power of the procreating woman's body in the article "Morbid Mothers: Gothic Heredity in Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*". She states that "[a]ccording to contemporary beliefs, all women, blood-deprived and parasitic by nature, embody the dangerous and horrifying Other" (Davis 52). This subject is also addressed by Sian Macfie who argues that "the function or dysfunction of the female body was juxtaposed with notions of the perceived threat of vampirism […]. [These notions] were largely based upon a sense of women's association with blood" (Macfie 60). Furthermore, "vampirism came to be associatively linked with the notion of moral contagion and especially with the 'contamination' of lesbianism" (Macfie 60). By the late nineteenth century, "close female bonding and lesbianism are conflated with notions of the unhealthy draining of female vitality" as a result of women's perceived association with vampirism (Macfie 62). In that sense, the women's body itself was demonised.

In Harriet's case, both men and women are victims of her psychic vampirism and dangerous sexuality. This notion can be further proven by a remark which the Baroness makes to Harriet when she extolls her beauty: "Well! you've only got to shew those eyes of yours, to get plenty of people to love you, and let you love them in return – that is, if the men count in your estimation of what's beautiful!" (Marryat 42). Of course, Baroness Gobelli could have meant many things by what already counts in Harriet's "estimation of what's beautiful", such as different objects or places. From the beginning of the novel, Harriet is constantly admiring something, whether it is the musicians she meets along with Margaret and Elinor, or the goods displayed in the shop windows – "[e]verything she saw seemed to astonish and delight her" (15). Nevertheless, given the queer subtext that pervades the novel, the Baroness's remark could be understood in a different way; if Harriet considers also men, and not only women (such as Margaret Pullen), to be

beautiful. It remains true that the question whether "the men count in [Harriet's] estimation of what's beautiful" is not obvious at first; the only hint that Harriet might have thought of a man is the conversation that she has with Margaret about her time in the convent. During this talk, she tells Margaret that "[i]t would be so dreadful to be like the poor nuns, and never have a lover to the end of one's days" (19). The word "lover" is gender neutral and could refer to both men and women. Harriet herself had not previously expressed any preference; she only longs to "find some one to be a friend, and to love [her], only [her], and all for [herself]!" (42). Harriet's longing for love, both mental and physical, is present throughout the whole text.

Harriet's physicality and sexuality is closely linked to her "curse of black blood". In Victorian England, there was a perception that black women were tainted by sexual desire, as they were seen as more "primal" than white women. Harriet's biracialism is "seen as a product of miscegenation, that is the mixing of Anglo blood with a person of colour"; these individuals "have been portrayed as monsters who exist in the shadows, waiting to suck innocent children into a deviant and ultimately fatal lifestyle" (Haefele-Thomas 99). Harriet Brandt's ancestry is closely linked not only to her sexuality but consequently also to her prominent animality; in fact, what Harriet has in common with Dracula is the way in which she is constantly compared to animals. The first such comparison occurs after Harriet first makes an appearance in the novel and dines with the other visitors of the hotel. She eats "rapidly and with evident appetite" and, more importantly, with "her eyes upon the food, as if she feared some one might deprive her of it" (Marryat 5). It is no coincidence that animals behave the same way. And indeed, after the subject of Harriet is brought up by Margaret Pullen after dinner, Elinor Leyton remarks that Harriet "only distinguished herself by eating like a cormorant" (7) and later compares her eating to that of a pig (10). Both Harriet's sexuality and hunger are related to her dangerous and insatiable lust. However, Harriet's bestiality is not limited to her dining. When she is enraged, she bites her pillow and shakes it "as a terrier worries a rat" (108). In one passage, she attaches herself to Margaret Pullen "like a coiling snake", and later she seems to "hypnotise [Margaret] as the snake is said to hypnotise the bird" (35). The author and the other characters in the novel often liken Harriet to predators stalking their prey; at different points in the novel, she is also likened to a "panther" (45), a "lynx" (56), a "sly cat" (100), and a "puma's cub" (199). Most frequently, however, Marryat

associates Harriet with a "tigress" (105, 109, 130, 218). This feline was deemed the most fearful of all animals during the Victorian period, as it was "an 'emblem of savageness and butchery,' undoubtedly 'the most cruel, rapacious, and destructive animal in creation'" (Ritvo 28). Harriet Brandt, in spite of her conventionally good qualities, is still inherently destructive. The same principle of women's animality can also be noticed in *Dracula*'s character of Lucy who reacts to the men who come to kill her with "an angry snarl, such as a cat gives when taken unawares", and she "growl[s] over [a child's body] as a dog growls over a bone" (Stoker 231-2). Straddling the line between human and animal, Harriet, as a quadroon, is the result of degeneration, just like Lucy as a vampire. Overall, Victorian Others were often associated with animals by contemporary writers, and Harriet, just like Lucy and Dracula, is proof of this. Her animalism is put into context along with her mixed race, which is simultaneously related to her violent emotions and unconcealed sexuality, the objects of which are both the male and female characters of the novel. By being a biracial and bisexual woman, Harriet poses a double threat to Victorian England.

3.3 Gender inversion in Harriet Brandt

Nevertheless, Harriet's biracialism and bisexuality are not the only dangers the young vampire poses to Victorian society; Harriet Brandt is also characterized by the reversal of gender roles. It has already been discussed several times in the thesis that contemporary society was anxious about the reversal of gender roles; in *Dracula*, for instance, the reader can observe this principle in Jonathan Harker, who becomes emasculated in numerous passages of the novel, most notably in the scene where the "weird sisters" attempt to bite him, and he passively awaits their "kiss". It is also evident in the female vampires who assume the active role of men in the novel. Harriet Brandt, who is anything but passive, is equally dangerous. Most importantly, though, she is young, independent, and rich. She is well aware of the fact and intends to take advantage of it: "I am my own mistress now. I can be what I like!" (Marryat 12). Harriet's "parents left [her] everything, and as soon as [she] came of age [she] entered into possession of it" (12). Her guardian wanted Harriet to live with him and his wife and pay them for her keep, but Harriet claims that "[t]hey had kept [her] too tight" and that "[she] wanted to see the world and life" (12). Such attributes were undesirable in women. It is another of many ways in which Harriet does not conform to contemporary ideas of a proper young lady supposed to wait passively for

a sufficiently wealthy man to take care of her. Harriet does not need such a man; in fact, it is she who in a sense fills the role of a wealthy young man at the beginning of the novel, as she longs for adventure in foreign lands, wants to pay for the ladies' refreshments at the café and showers Margaret Pullen's baby girl with gifts, which puts her in the role of a provider.

Gender inversion, however, is most prominently represented in the novel in the form of Harriet's perverse inversion of motherhood; rather than fulfilling the role of mother, which in Victorian society represented the pinnacle of every respectable woman's life, Harriet instead kills children with her emotional vampirism. Thus, not only does Harriet not have any children of her own, but through the death of Margaret Pullen's baby, she becomes a sinister draining mother figure who subverts the sacredness of motherhood. This is reminiscent of Lucy Westenra and the vampiric brides in *Dracula*; Lucy, transformed into a vampire, fed on children at night by clutching them to her chest in a parody of a mother's embrace, or breast-feeding, and Dracula's vampiric brides drained a baby that Dracula had brought them in a sack. All these women feed on children rather than feeding them. Moreover, at this point in the novel, Harriet is, although unknowingly, ruining an engaged couple, as well as a young family, for she is simultaneously killing Margaret's baby and having an affair with Ralph Pullen.

The situation is made even worse by Harriet also corrupting the baby's mother. Margaret Pullen, as a married English woman, represents the very foundation of English society. Margaret fulfils the Victorian notions of a proper young woman: she is a devoted wife and caring mother, and no fault can be found in her behaviour. She behaves decently in all circumstances, and is kind and loyal, both to her husband and friend Elinor Payton. Although she does not always agree with her friend, she stands up for her when Harriet comments that "[Harriet and Margaret] can do very well without her" and expresses the opinion that Elinor is not "very nice" (18). The threat of Margaret's corruption, and in that sense the corruption of what is considered good and "pure" by contemporary standards, results in Harriet posing the ultimate threat to Victorian morals. In essence, Harriet corrupts these ideals both by her negative influence on Margaret and defying the strongly perceived gender roles of the time. In nineteenth-century England, these roles were clearly defined, and "[a]s [they] solidified, the homosexual who did not fit neatly into the male/female binary was excluded completely" (Anolik 6). Harriet Brandt too

"lurks on the other side of the sexual border", and this fact is closely linked to her gender inversion. Harriet differs in many ways from the other female characters in the novel, who meet the period's ideals of "proper" women; she is neither chaste nor passive, but instead intends to use her wealth and independence. Her monstrosity, however, lies primarily in the fact that she metaphorically feeds on children instead of feeding them, and thus desecrating the role of a mother.

3.4 Harriet Brandt and Margaret Pullen

The dynamic between Harriet and Margaret plays a key role in *The Blood of the Vampire*. From the very beginning of the novel, Harriet Brandt wants nothing more than to love and be loved. Harriet flirts and bonds with numerous characters as she tries to make sense of the new world that has been revealed to her, but it is her first flirtation that identifies Harriet Brandt as a queer character and that provides a queer foundation to the novel. Harriet's desire for love initially knows no boundaries; she does not limit herself to men, but instead intensely seeks the favour of a woman staying at the same hotel, Margaret Pullen. She does everything to win her affection, and later bears the loss of Margaret's friendship heavily. In fact, right from the moment she meets Margaret, Harriet becomes almost obsessed with her. She constantly wants to be close to her, spend time with her, and accompany her on walks, much to the displeasure of Margaret's friend Elinor Payton. When Harriet invites herself along on the evening walk, and Elinor walks ahead without them, Harriet and Margaret sit down together at a café. "Within moments, Harriet begins an overt flirtation with Mrs. Margaret Pullen" (Haefele-Thomas 110); as she is telling Margaret of her life in Jamaica, she keeps drawing her chair closer to that of Margaret Pullen, telling her how "different" she is from Elinor Payton (Marryat 18). Harriet also says to her: "I knew I should like you at once. And I want you to like me too – so much!" (Marryat 19). It is apparent that her love for Margaret is not merely platonic, as she "had crept closer and closer to Mrs. Pullen as she spoke, and now encircled her waist with her arm, and leaned her head upon her shoulder" (19). Since they barely know each other, Margaret is uncomfortable with such familiarity. Nevertheless, "[Harriet] refuses to accept rejection from either men or women. [Margaret Pullen] who finds herself the uncomfortable object of Harriet's affection rationalizes the girl's neediness by suggesting that Harriet has 'had so few people to love, or to love her, during her lifetime,

that she is glad to practise on anyone who will reciprocate her affection'" (Hammack 891-2, Marryat 48). Harriet quickly becomes attached to the amiable Margaret.

Harriet's account of her upbringing in the convent too is worth closer examination. When she and Margaret get to the question of whether Harriet had friends in the convent, Harriet's answer is oddly queer; she says that "even the nuns were obliged to walk three and three, never two, together, lest they should have secrets between them", and that the girls were "never left alone for a single minute! There was always a sister with [them], even at night, walking up and down between the row of beds, pretending to read her prayers, but with her eyes on [the girls] the whole time and her ears open to catch what [they] said" (Marryat 19). Furthermore, she tells Baroness Gobelli that in the convent, "[i]f ever [she] took a liking to a girl, [they] were placed in separate rooms! (42). Haefele-Thomas comments that Harriet's "description of the discipline at the Ursuline order raises the possibility of both lesbian sex and masturbation" (111).

The danger of lesbianism is apparent in the text. One of the most significant moments regarding same-sex desire in the novel comes when Margaret herself notices that the affection Harriet has for her may go deeper than she first thought: "Margaret Pullen, glancing up once was struck by the look with which Harriet Brandt was regarding her – it was so full of yearning affection – almost of longing to approach her nearer, to hear her speak, to touch her hand!" (Marryat 27). Furthermore, Margaret recognizes and acknowledges Harriet's queer desire: "She had heard of cases, in which young unsophisticated girls had taken unaccountable affections for members of their own sex, and trusted she was not going to form the subject for some such experience on Miss Brandt's part" (27). While the depiction of homoeroticism in male vampires has been left mostly to implications and interpretations, the authors could afford to be more direct in the case of same-sex desire in women. That does not mean, however, that such relationships were openly discussed in literature; indeed, Margaret Pullen thinks of Harriet's same-sex desire "in terms of unsophisticatedness" (Haefele-Thomas 112). Similarly, when Harriet presses herself against Margaret, Margaret thinks that "[t]he poor girl was evidently quite unused to the ways and customs of Society, [and] she seemed moreover very friendless and dependent" (Marryat 20). In Victorian thinking, a woman in love with another woman was not deemed a real and proper love; instead, it was reduced to something that young unsophisticated girls do, and in that sense, such

behaviour was "unaccountable" (27). Nevertheless, even if Harriet's queer desire towards Margaret is not given full weight, its acknowledgement in the text is of great importance. Given that such an explicit admission of queerness is not common in writings from the Victorian era, it is significant that Margaret acknowledges that Harriet may feel romantic attraction for her. In that way, the queer narrative of *The Blood of the Vampire* becomes more apparent, and the passage offers "a complex, subversive and much more ambiguous reading of Marryat" (Haefele-Thomas 112). The text's subversiveness is further justified by the fact that Harriet seeks the affections of Margaret Pullen, a heterosexual married woman and a mother, and in that sense, "the queer desire does not happen where the audience then or even the audience now would expect it" (Haefele-Thomas 112).

Although it is clear that it is mainly Harriet who actively seeks Margaret's affections, it is important to note that Harriet's interest is not one-sided; Margaret is intrigued by Harriet and quickly befriends her. From the start, Margaret is extremely interested in who the young lady that has joined their table is: "I don't know whether I like her or not, but there is something rather distinguished-looking about her!" (Marryat 7). Margaret is interested in Harriet from the beginning – she wants to know Harriet's name and worries that she is too young to travel alone. Her friend Elinor does not share Margaret's curiosity at all, neither does she understand it; when Margaret finally discovers that "the new girl's name is Brandt and she comes from England", wondering whether Elinor "would have believed it", Elinor responds: "I did not take sufficient interest in her to make any speculations on the subject. I only observed that she had a mouth from ear to ear, and ate like a pig! What does it concern us, where she comes from?" (10). Margaret answers, in Haefele-Thomas's words, "with a combination of fascination and maternal concern" (110): "O! I don't know! I feel a little curious, that is all! She seems so young to be by herself!" (Marryat 10). "Margaret Pullen's reaction here marks one of numerous moments of ambiguity in the text. While Elinor Leyton makes it very clear that she wants nothing to do with the wealthy Jamaican, Margaret's interest is at once titillated and protective" (Haefele-Thomas 110).

When Harriet admits that she had been "shut up in a horrid Convent ever since [she was] eleven years old", all the other ladies are horrified and begin to turn away from Harriet, as if the very content of a conversation about "the national Protestant horror" might taint them (Marryat 11). Only Margaret not only does not turn away, but on the

contrary, she urges Harriet to continue her story: "Margaret Pullen was interested and encouraged the girl to proceed" (12). Something similar happens shortly after Harriet and Margaret officially meet; Harriet, full of childlike naivety and enthusiasm, declares to the ladies present: "I should like to tear up and down this road as hard as ever I could, throwing my arms over my head and screaming aloud!" (11). This is just another of several examples of how little Harriet conforms to Victorian society's idea of how a "proper" young lady should behave. Indeed, the ladies, unused to such unrestrained behaviour, "exchanged glances of astonishment, but Margaret Pullen could not forbear smiling as she asked their new acquaintance the reason why" (11). While the other women are taken aback, if not outright offended, Margaret again reacts in a rather positive way to Harriet.

In a later passage, when Margaret Pullen has the opportunity to "examine Harriet's eyes more closely than she had done before", her observations also offer an interesting insight into their relationship (35). First, she notes that Harriet's eyes are "beautiful in shape and colour" but do not look "like the eyes of a young girl"; there is "no sparkle nor brightness in them, though they [are] underlaid by smouldering fires" (35). What is most striking, however, is what Margaret thinks to herself next: "There was an attraction about the girl, which Mrs. Pullen acknowledged, without wishing to give in to. She could not keep her eyes off her! She seemed to hypnotise her as the snake is said to hypnotise the bird, but it was an unpleasant feeling, as if the next moment, the smouldering fire would burst forth into flame and overwhelm her" (35). Margaret comes to these realizations *after* Harriet was regarding her with a look "so full of yearning affection" (27); only after Margaret "wonders about the lesbian possibility" (Haefele-Thomas 112). "She keeps up a flirtation", which only serves to emphasise the queerness of their dynamic (112). Instead of distancing herself from Harriet and her mesmerising sexuality, she admits in a strangely queer manner that whether she wants to or not, she cannot take her eyes off Harriet. The way in which Harriet seems to draw Margaret's gaze is reminiscent of the moment of the women's first meeting as Harriet remembers it – how "[Margaret] smiled at [Harriet] at dinner" (18). It is important to note that it is Margaret Pullen who initiates the first eye contact with Harriet, and, in Haefele-Thomas's words, "we are left to speculate about the implied flirtation" (Haefele-Thomas 110).

There is no doubt that although Margaret's feelings towards Harriet are mixed, there is something about Harriet that appeals to Margaret and that she cannot always resist. Shortly after Elinor declares in front of Margaret that she has always thought Harriet "odious" (Marryat 48), the two ladies overhear her singing and playing the mandolin "most skilfully" (50). Neither of them knows that it is Harriet they are hearing, and they admire the musical performance of the "unknown woman" immensely. Allegedly, Harriet's "skilful manipulation of the instrument […] evinced such art as they had never heard before except in public" (50). The two women have no doubt that a professional musician is performing at the hotel. "[T]he melody was wild, pathetic, and passionate, and the singer's voice was touching beyond description" (50). Before Margaret and Elinor discover that it is Harriet singing and playing, even Elinor declares that "[she doesn't] think [she] ever heard such a lovely voice before" (50) and that "[she] should like to be lulled to sleep each night by just such strains as those" (51). Doctor Phillips later talks about the danger this talent of Harriet's poses to men, but here it becomes clear that Harriet is also endangering women with her singing and mandolin playing, as even Elinor, who hates Harriet, is charmed by her performance.

On the whole, looking at Harriet Brandt and Elinor Payton, a sharp contrast can be seen. These women differ from one another perhaps in all possible ways. In a way, Elinor Payton and Harriet Brandt serve as each other's foil. While Harriet is passionate, emotional, and enthusiastic about life and everything it has to offer, Elinor is her exact opposite. On the outside, she is cold and reserved, she is the only character who has not liked Harriet from the very beginning, and she frequently expresses displeasure at Harriet's unrestrained behaviour. In a way, Elinor embodies England, or at least its morals and tradition, along with the idea of a proper woman; she is "pre-eminently a woman for a man to be proud of as the mistress of his house, and the head of his table" (28). Nevertheless, this image is exaggerated, and Elinor is in fact criticised for this by both the author and numerous characters of the novel. She never shows her emotions, except perhaps contempt for those who, in her opinion, are not worthy of respect. Her coldness towards her fiancé borders on asexuality; she refuses to show any kind of affection towards Ralph who "accustomed to attention […] will take it wherever [he] can get it" and falls under the spell of the passionate Harriet (66). For the characters of the novel, Harriet represents something new and fresh, tempting, but dangerous; an "exotic" Other

in the eyes of Victorian society, vastly different from Elinor Payton and even Margaret Pullen. In fact, it is Margaret who links the characters of Harriet Brandt and Elinor Payton, because, figuratively speaking, Margaret stands between the two poles which Elinor and Harriet respectively symbolize. While reading the novel, the reader cannot help feeling that apart from Ralph Pullen, these two women are also competing for Margaret Pullen. Their mutual dislike, which Margaret is trying to reconcile, is evident throughout the whole text, as well as Harriet's efforts to win Margaret's favour and "corrupt" her with lesbianism. When Harriet tells Margaret that she is "so different" and that "[she] could see it when [Margaret] smiled at [her] at dinner", she may mean Margaret's potential queerness that Harriet is trying to seduce her into (18-9). Her potential queerness stems from the obvious interest that she shows in Harriet Brandt. In the end, Margaret resists this temptation, and Harriet is in a sense conquered by Elinor, the traditional Englishness, and essentially punished for her bad blood.

3.5 The ambiguity of Harriet's character

It is important to note that while the text ends with Harriet's "deserved" death, it does not inspire any feelings of triumph, as is the case in *Dracula*. On the contrary, Harriet's suicide underscores the tragic nature of her fate and the injustice of heredity that Harriet is not able to escape. This principle further confirms the ambiguity of both the text and Harriet's character. Although Margaret stops her friendship with Harriet for the safety of herself and her loved ones and remains faithful to Elinor's friendship along with the ideals that she represents, it is no coincidence that Elinor too has to undergo a change. For her own happiness, she can no longer remain the same seemingly unfeeling young woman. She becomes more warm-hearted to her fiancé until eventually they both find their happiness together; it can be said that Elinor has to become more similar to Harriet. Importantly, too, it is Elinor's encounter with Harriet that achieves this effect in the first place; it is only when the powerful experience this encounter provokes in Elinor that her transformation begins. In this respect, the text is very ambiguous; on the one hand, Harriet represents a cursed woman who brings nothing but suffering and death to those around her, but at the same time she is, ironically, the catalyst for Elinor's character growth and future happiness.

Harriet Brandt is in general a deeply ambivalent character. At one point, she is almost childishly naive, excited about life and terrified of the idea of hurting anyone. She is

generous to her intimates, unhesitatingly wanting to pay for the ladies' refreshments, explaining that she has plenty of money and asking what else she should spend it on other than making others happy. She buys Margaret's baby daughter many lovely presents (even though Margaret thinks they are inappropriate for a child her age). Indeed, she is enamoured of Margaret's baby from the beginning, and "[t]he sight of the infant seemed to drive Miss Brandt wild" (Marryat 16). She gushes about how beautiful, how "sweet and fresh and clean […] little white babies" are (16). Subsequently, in the same context, she makes shocking comments about black babies; she calls them "little niggers who smell so nasty, you can't touch them" (16). The moment after Harriet makes these racist remarks, she lunges for Margaret's baby, frightening Margaret and angering Elinor to the point that Margaret orders the nurse to take the baby back to the hotel "as the rest walk on in an awkward silence" (Haefele-Thomas 110). In that manner, "Harriet simultaneously underscores much British sentiment about the filth of 'the natives' while at the same time she reinforces another stereotype: the cannibalistic other who wants to devour English babies" (Haefele-Thomas 110).

In a different passage, Harriet even enthuses about how as a young child, "Pete used to let [her] whip the little niggers for a treat" and how "[i]t used to make [her] laugh to see them wriggle their legs under the whip and cry!" (Marryat 20). Similarly, the reader and other characters in the novel are shocked by Harriet's cold reaction to the death of Margaret's baby, whom she could not tire of at first, constantly gushing over her, cuddling her, referring to her as "sweet dear little angel", and insisting on watching and caring for her every day (16). Even Baroness Gobelli, whom the other characters dislike for her rudeness, vulgarity, and the callous treatment of her son, wonders at Harriet's cold reaction: "She ain't got much 'eart – I couldn't 'ave believed that she'd receive the news of that poor baby's death, without a tear or so much as a word of regret, when at one time she 'ad it always in 'er arms" (111). Harriet's growing indifference also becomes apparent the moment Margaret tells her that her baby was "quite ill all night – so restless and feverish" (64). Margaret is sure that Harriet will be sorry to hear that, but she just replies unconcernedly that "she'll be all right directly her teeth come through", and leaves to join her friends "without a word of sympathy or comfort" (64). Margaret is unpleasantly surprised by Harriet's cold response; she "didn't think [Harriet] would be so heartless" (64).

The origins of Harriet's indifference stem from the moments when Harriet shifts all of her interest to Ralph Pullen, shortly after Harriet has lost Margaret's friendship and been taken in by the Baroness; "[o]nce Harriet discovers the effects she can have on males, she clearly opts for heterosexual predation" (Hammack 892). Nevertheless, when Harriet's efforts to win Margaret's affection permanently are unsuccessful, she bears this loss with a heavy heart: "there was a cold empty feeling in her breast, as though, in losing her hold on Margaret Pullen, she had lost something on which she had depended" (22). Probably the most noticeable moment of the women's separation is after Margaret feels "fainter and fainter" in Harriet's company, and Elinor saves her by taking her away from Harriet (21). Harriet is distressed by the turn of events. "She liked [Margaret] so much – so very much – she had so hoped she was going to be her friend – she would have done anything and given anything sooner than put her to inconvenience in any way" (22). These are Harriet's thoughts as she watches Margaret leave with Elinor for the hotel. Moments earlier, however, she "burst into a loud laugh" when Margaret was explaining her sudden illness, the way she felt "just as if [she] had been scooped hollow!" (21). Throughout the novel, Harriet often behaves in an incomprehensible way that no one expects; it remains a mystery what she found so amusing about her friend not feeling well, especially considering the depressing thoughts she has after Margaret and Elinor's departure.

Harriet Brandt can be both sweet and unbelievably selfish, to the point of even callousness. Marryat's approach to her vampiric heroine is ambiguous. On the one hand, the reader is exposed to the consequences of Harriet's curse and her alternating sweetness and heartlessness, but at different points of the narrative they sympathise with her, and her death is essentially read as a tragedy. Overall, Marryat exhibits a profound sense of ambivalence in her portrayal of Harriet Brandt, and it is impossible to determine unequivocally whether Florence Marryat intends for the reader to like Harriet or not. Haefele-Thomas admits that *The Blood of the Vampire* "wavers between demonizing and showing empathy toward its vampire" (97). Furthermore, it remains true that "[i]n some cases, the precise characters who 'should' be monstrous within typical Victorian Gothic frameworks are given great sympathy as well as crucial roles within the narrative" (Haefele-Thomas 4). Haefele-Thomas examines Harriet Brandt's ambiguity further. They discuss how the decade during which *The Blood of the Vampire* was published was "rife with sexual panic, threats of reverse-colonization and socioeconomic woes", and

comment that "[t]wo years after Oscar Wilde's trials, […] Marryat could have created a detestable genderqueer and racially miscegenated monster – a monster who could unify a British reading public through a nationalist insistence on heterosexuality, gender binaries and racial and national 'purity'" (98). Nevertheless, while it remains true that the novel can be understood as "utterly xenophobic and homophobic", on closer inspection "Marryat delivers a Gothic novel that eventually portrays the British as hypocritical and unsympathetic to marginalized people" (98).

Doctor Phillips, who represents the mindset of Western society and the "voice of reason", warns the other characters of the danger Harriet poses to them; he speaks of her terrible curse and bad blood that causes Harriet to drain the life force from her loved ones. The other characters stand up for her; after all, Harriet is not to blame for the atrocities her parents committed, and she herself is a victim of her origins. Doctor Phillips is adamant, however, and insists that everyone better stay away from her, for "a child born under such conditions cannot turn out well" (Marryat 83) and "that which is bred in her will come out sooner or later, and curse those with whom she may be associated (84). Those who follow his advice are eventually rewarded for their decision; it is too late to save Margaret's daughter Ethel, but when Harriet disappears from her vicinity, Margaret's life is slowly returning to normal, and she is reunited with her husband, "more like an angel than a man" (16). Similarly, Ralph Pullen, Harriet's first lover, finds happiness when he breaks free from her grasp, whereas the characters who remain close to Harriet are not so lucky; the Baroness's son Bobby, as well as Anthony Pennel, Harriet's husband, both eventually die as a result of Harriet's proximity. In the end, Doctor Phillips's warning comes true.

At the end, Harriet Brandt dies by suicide rather than murder, contrary to many other vampire texts, and "she is not hunted down and staked in some great moment of male triumph" (Haefele-Thomas 119). Harriet dies by her own hand because "[her] parents have made [her] unfit to live" (227). Octavia Davis argues that "[i]n its depiction of Harriet's suicide, *The Blood of the Vampire* confirms that women must act first and foremost as mothers of the race, even if it means sacrificing their own lives", and Harriet "must kill herself, therefore, for the good of others and to prevent the birth of future monstrosity" (Davis 51). Harriet may have caused the death of Margaret Pullen's child, but at least she prevents the birth of a child who would undoubtedly carry the same curse

as her. Before she dies, Harriet leaves her entire fortune to Margaret Pullen – "the woman with whom she has had a mutual (albeit fraught) attraction" (Haefele-Thomas 119). Haefele-Thomas notes that "Marryat's ambivalence in *The Blood of the Vampire* gives us room for sympathy as well as space to wonder about the author's ultimate intent" (Haefele-Thomas 119). The truth remains that Harriet's ambivalence renders a clear interpretation of Marryat's work impossible. Harriet is a multiethnic and queer woman, which makes her a double threat in the eyes of Victorian society. Perhaps she even poses a triple threat, as she is a woman of procreating age and is therefore believed by the Victorians to be blood-deprived and thus in essence vampiric. She also possesses an animalistic sexuality, related to her mixed ancestry, that attracts people around her, and she even threatens Margaret Pullen with the danger of lesbianism. Worst of all, however, she is responsible, albeit unknowingly, for the death of Margaret's baby, which makes her the perverse opposite of a nurturing mother. Furthermore, she is vindictive and refuses to accept rejection. Despite all this, however, she does not arouse pure displeasure in the reader; on the contrary, we often do not know what to think, but it remains true that Harriet certainly inspires sympathy. When she learns of the curse that afflicts her and realizes that she has caused the deaths of so many people, she commits suicide under the weight of this new piece of information and out of grief over her husband's death. Her death is tragic and does not evoke any feelings of triumph in the reader. Overall, the entire text is written in a way that allows for many ways of understanding it.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was the analysis of queerness in conjunction to vampirism in Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire*, both published in 1897. In the first part, the reader was familiarised with Victorian stance towards sexuality and same-sex desire in both men and women, as well as the link between Victorian Others and the Gothic genre. After having given a brief introduction of the Victorian era, the author proceeded to focus on the subject of sexuality and the way it was treated in Victorian society. In this section, different attitudes towards same-sex desire in both men and women are characterised. While homosexuality in men was demonised as well as illegal, female same-sex desire was treated more liberally, and homosexual relationships between women were never forbidden by law. This was helped by the fact that Victorian society considered such relationships asexual, as a proper woman was not supposed to feel any sexual desires and was only supposed to endure her "marital duty" so that she could become a mother. After having established the different attitudes towards homosexuality in men and women, the author moved to the matter of the Gothic genre and how it was connected to queer sexuality.

Same-sex desire and its connection to the Gothic were discussed in detail in the first part, and thereby, the way that this subject was reflected in contemporary literature was established and ready to be examined in the novels. The second and third part respectively discussed queer features in *Dracula* and *The Blood of the Vampire*. Both novels chosen for this thesis share many similar features; both Count Dracula and Harriet Brandt are foreigners who intrude into English society, threatening its morals as well as human lives. In both vampires we can also observe fluidity of gender roles, which in itself posed a threat to the delicate Victorian sensibilities. To conclude this thesis's findings, the queer Otherness of Count Dracula and Harriet Brandt was examined. In the second part, the author described the instances that show Dracula as a queer character. As a vampire, Dracula embodies the horror of sexual deviation in the eyes of Victorian society, moreover indicated by Jonathan Harker's observations of the vampire's physical peculiarities; Dracula even grows hairs in the centre of his palms, which supports the idea of Dracula as a sexual deviant, a habitual masturbator. Dracula's danger also lies in his opposition to traditional gender roles; by employing no servants and executing all the duties usually performed by women himself, the vampire undermines British values. A similar gender

role of fluidity can also be observed in Jonathan Harker with whose narration the novel begins. Jonathan Harker fills the role of a vulnerable incarcerated heroine when he gets imprisoned by Count Dracula in his Gothic castle. The dynamic between himself and Dracula places Jonathan, according to Victorian ideas, in a woman's submissive and helpless role. Themes of queer sexuality, as well as gender inversion, can be seen most notably in the first part of the novel, but they are present in the entire text.

The Blood of The Vampire offers a different kind of vampire to the reader; while it remains true that the two vampires share similar traits, as they are for instance both foreign and bisexual, they also differ in many ways. Contrary to Dracula, Harriet does not drink blood and nor does she intend to kill anyone. Like Dracula, however, Harriet represents the danger of queer sexuality. She longs for love, and the gender of the person she gets it from is irrelevant. At the beginning of the novel, Harriet takes a liking to a woman staying at the same hotel, Margaret Pullen, and tries to befriend her. Margaret is also immediately interested in Harriet, although she has conflicting feelings about her. Related to the danger of lesbianism is gender inversion, similarly to *Dracula*. Harriet is rich and completely independent, and at first, her only goal is to travel and see the world, which contradicts the image of a homely mother and wife whose only desire is to take care of her family. On the contrary, in Harriet we see a twisted parody of motherhood when she causes the death of Margaret Pullen's baby. Ironically, it is Harriet's love that kills the baby. As is typical for contemporary texts with Victorian Others, the novel is filled with ambivalence. At first glance, the novel condemns its main character; on closer reading, however, Marryat inspires sympathy for Harriet in the reader, most notably in Harriet's suicide which does not evoke any kind of triumph but rather fills the reader with a sense of tragedy. In that manner, *The Blood of The Vampire* offers a subversive understanding of Otherness.

In both novels, it is proven that individuals who did not fit the binaries set by Victorian society were often reflected as monstrous characters; what queerness and monstrosity had in common is that they posed a danger to the Victorians and simultaneously fascinated them. Vampires in particular fit this description, for they can be both alluring and repelling, intimate and dangerous. It is no coincidence that vampires were the most popular monsters to appear in Victorian literature. The reason why vampires were most frequently associated with queer characters is the fact that unlike, for

instance, werewolves or ghosts, vampires have the ability to blend into human society and culture for they merge into the changeable civilisations that they inhabit. Similarly, queer Others can blend into Victorian society. Moreover, vampiric bites, the corporeal form of their threat, are fundamentally queer. The vampire's teeth represent a phallic object which is used to penetrate the victim in a parody of coitus, and furthermore, a person of any gender may become the vampire's victim. At the same time, different attitudes towards bisexual male and bisexual female vampires can be observed in these works. Count Dracula is a physical vampire, so to speak, who drains his victims' blood by biting their neck, whereas Harriet Brandt is rather a physic vampire who kills people by her mere proximity. Dracula is portrayed as a true monster, but Harriet Brandt provides the reader with a more ambiguous reading of her character. As with *Dracula*'s vampire(s), Harriet is paralleled with predatory animals, and she can be selfish and cruel. However, these are contrasted with her positive qualities that Marryat has not neglected to give her vampire. Both novels therefore deal with similar themes and yet offer different perspectives on the issues depicted in them. This fact offers an interesting insight into Victorian society in which discussions of sex and sexuality were reflected in many spheres of the Victorians' lives, as well as varying attitudes to these topics.

Works cited

Primary sources

Marryat, Florence. *The Blood of the Vampire*. Kansas City, Mo.: Valancourt Books, 2009.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. New York, NY: Barnes & Noble Books, 1993.

Secondary sources

Anolik, Ruth Bienstock. "Introduction." *Horrifying Sex: Essays on Sexual Difference in Gothic Literature*, edited by Ruth Bienstock Anolik. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2007.

Auerbach, Nina. *Our Vampires, Ourselves.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Barber, Paul. *Vampires, Burial, and Death: Folklore and Reality*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Belford, Barbara. *Bram Stoker: A Biography of the Author of Dracula*. New York: Random House, 1996.

Bowen, John. "The Gothic." YouTube, uploaded by The British Library, 6 June 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gNohDegnaOQ&t=326s.

Clark, Anna. "Anne Lister's Construction of Lesbian Identity." *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1996, pp. 23–50.

Craft, Christopher. "'Kiss Me with Those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Representations*, no. 8, 1984, pp. 107–33.

Davis, Octavia. "Morbid Mothers: Gothic Heredity in Florence Marryat's *The Blood of the Vampire." Horrifying Sex: Essays on Sexual Difference in Gothic Literature*, edited by Ruth Bienstock Anolik. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2007.

Ellis, Havelock. *Sexual Inversion*. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1915.

Faderman, Lilian. *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present*. New York: Morrow, 1981.

Farson, Daniel. *The Man Who Wrote Dracula: A Biography of Bram Stoker*. London, M. Joseph, 1975.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Garton, Stephen. *Histories of Sexuality*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2004.

Haefele-Thomas, Ardel. *Queer Others in Victorian Gothic: Transgressing Monstrosity*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2012.

Hammack, Brenda Mann. "Florence Marryat's Female Vampire and the Scientizing of Hybridity." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2008, pp. 885–96.

Hammack, Brenda Mann. "Introduction." *The Blood of the Vampire*. Kansas City, Mo.: Valancourt Books, 2009.

Herbert, Amanda. *Female Alliances: Gender, Identity and Friendship in Early Modern Britain*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014.

Hogle, Jerrold E. "Introduction: the Gothic in western culture." *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, edited by Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hughes, Bill. "'I, too, can love': Genre, Knowledge, and Dracula's Romantic Progeny", Academia.

Hughes, William; Smith, Andrew. *Queering the Gothic*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.

Hughes, William. *Beyond Dracula: Bram Stoker's Fiction and Its Cultural Context*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Hughes, William. *Bram Stoker: Dracula*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Hurley, Kelly. "British Gothic fiction, 1885–1930." *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*, edited by Jerrold E. Hogle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 189–208.

Hyde, H. Montgomery. *The Trials of Oscar Wilde*. New York: Dover Publications, 1962.

Kaplan, Morris B. "Literature in the Dock: The Trials of Oscar Wilde." *Journal of Law and Society*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2004, pp. 113–30.

Kuzmanovic, Dejan. "Vampiric Seduction and Vicissitudes of Masculine Identity in Bram Stoker's 'Dracula.'" *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2009, pp. 411–25.

Linden, David J. *Touch: The Science of Hand, Heart, and Mind*. New York: Viking, 2015.

Lister, Anne; Whitbread, Helena. *The Secret Diaries of Miss Anne Lister (1791-1840).* London: Virago, 2010.

Macfie, Sian. "'They Suck Us Dry': A Study of Late Nineteenth-century Projections of Vampiric Women." *Subjectivity and Literature from the Romantics to the Present Day,* edited by Philip Shaw and Peter Stockwell. London; New York: Pinter Publishers, 1991.

Marcus, Sharon. *Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

McCrea, Barry. "Heterosexual Horror: Dracula, the Closet, and the Marriage-Plot." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2010, pp. 251–70.

Nystrom, Lisa. "Blood, Lust, and the Fe/Male Narrative." *Draculas, Vampires, and Other Undead Forms: Essays on Gender, Race, and Culture*, edited by John Edgar Browning and Caroline Joan (Kay) Picart. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2009, pp. 63–76.

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lilies: And, The Political Economy of Art.* London: Collins' Clear-Type Press, 1890.

Schaffer, Talia. "'A Wilde Desire Took Me': The Homoerotic History of Dracula." *ELH*, vol. 61, no. 2, 1994, pp. 381–425.

Scott, Lindsey. "Crossing oceans of time: Stoker, Coppola, and the 'new vampire' film." *Open Graves, Open Minds: Representations of Vampires and the Undead from the Enlightenment to the Present Day,* edited by Sam George and Bill Hughes. Manchester University Press, 2013, pp. 113–130.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Tendencies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Stoker, Bram. *Bram Stoker's Notes for* Dracula, edited by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Russell Miller. Jefferson; N.C.: McFarland & Co. Pub., 2008.

Ting, Angela Maria Hipolito. "'Our Love Is Stronger than Death': Enforcing Heterosexuality by Erasing Homosexuality in Francis Ford Coppola's Bram Stoker's

Dracula." *Writing for a Real World 2019-2020: A Multidisciplinary Anthology by USF Students*, 2019–2020.

Vicinus, Martha. *Intimate Friends: Women Who Loved Women, 1778–1928.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Weeks, Jeffrey. *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain, from the Nineteenth Century to the Present.* London; Melbourne; New York: Quartet Books, 1977.