

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci
Filozofická fakulta
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Hana Zámečníčková

The Metamorphosis of the Character of Count Dracula during the Century

Bakalářská práce

Studijní obor: anglická filologie
Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Libor Práger, Ph.D
Olomouc 2013

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne

.....

Table of contents:

1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Dracula as a subject of study.....	2
2 Dracula in the novel.....	6
2.1 The visual appearance of Count Dracula.....	6
2.2 Dracula's Personality.....	7
2.3 Dracula as a supernatural being.....	8
2.4 Dracula as a metaphor.....	11
3 Dracula emerges on screen.....	15
3.1 Dracula in the 1920s.....	15
3.2 The 1931 Universal Dracula.....	16
3.2.1 <i>The Significance of the Universal Dracula</i>	16
3.2.2 <i>The Look in the 1931 Film</i>	17
3.2.3 <i>The Emotionless Count in the 1931 Film</i>	19
3.2.4 <i>The Supernatural Dracula in the 1931 Film</i>	21
3.2.5 <i>The monster in Hollywood in the 1930s</i>	23
4 Dracula in Color.....	26
4.1 The appearance of the 1958 Dracula.....	26
4.2 A dualistic personality of Dracula in the 1958 film.....	27
4.3 Supernatural Dracula in the 1958 film.....	29
4.4 The 1958 Dracula as a metaphor.....	30
4.5 The 1979 Handsome Dracula.....	32
5 A Modern Vision.....	34
5.1 Dracula of Many Faces in the 1992 Film.....	34
5.2 The Complex Character in the 1992 Film.....	36
5.3 The Modern Dracula in the 1992 Film.....	38
6 Conclusion.....	42
7 Resumé.....	44
8 Abstrakt.....	47

9 Abstract.....	48
10 Works cited.....	49
11 Films cited.....	51

1 Introduction

"It's a fable of a trapped spirit within a weighted body. A beautiful eroticism and a call for eternal life. An occultic lesser analogy of a potential in man for perfection."

Peter Murphy, author of the song "Bela Lugosi's Dead"

This bachelor thesis is going to examine the character of Dracula in the novel and on screen. I decided to write about the character firstly because of my personal interest in the genre. From an early age, I have been fascinated with vampires and I loved to both read about them and watch the films. One of my most favorite films about vampires is definitely *Bram Stoker's Dracula* from 1992, directed by Francis Ford Coppola. When I saw the film, I thought that it was based on the novel and what I did not quite understand was why the image of Dracula that I knew from TV commercials was so different from Coppola's vision. When I had to choose the topic for my bachelor thesis, I was positive that I wanted to write about vampires and, since I thought Dracula would be a great representative, I read the novel. To my astonishment, it was completely different from both Coppola's film and the iconic Halloween costume.

As a consequence, I decided to research the character starting with the novel and proceeding through several film adaptations. Since I am a student of English philology, I focused mainly on the British and American ones. Some I liked and some I did not, but one thing was clear. Every Dracula incarnation was different from the other and different from the novel. I then went to study to England for a semester and I had a fantastic course on the history of Hollywood cinema there. Thanks to the course, I realized that there are many things going on behind the camera. I learned about the studio system, realized that censorship was an issue as well and discovered that, in fact, the history of the United States reflected in Hollywood as it was a strong tool to show the political views.

Thanks to my Erasmus stay in England, I was also able to purchase several books and studies on the subject and I started researching it. I wanted the thesis not

only to compare the films with the novel but to also bring the answer to why the incarnations are so different and why do we now live with the image of Dracula that is so different from Stoker's novel. Horror is a genre much connected to our psychology and there is much debate as to why we are so attracted to it. I am a victim of the genre, especially when it comes to vampires and I thought it would be really interesting to see why Dracula kept incarnating in film to this day.

As a consequence, this thesis is going to examine the character of Dracula in the novel and three, in my opinion, significant film adaptations. I will start with an introduction, explaining why the research is valid and why Dracula is an good subject of study. I am then going to focus on the image in the novel itself, trying to explain what Stoker tried to express with it. Three other chapters are going to deal with the film adaptations, each of them representing a different age, so that the thesis covers the span of the whole century. I will start with the first adaptation from 1931. I will then proceed to the 1958 Hammer *Horror of Dracula*, the first adaptation in color and I will end the thesis with a personal favorite and the modern vampire character in *Bram Stoker's Dracula*.

1.1 Dracula as a subject of study

There are several reasons why studying the vampire character is sufficient for an academic research. Firstly, films and literature about vampires and the horror genre in general deals with the fears of the society. The horror genre never lost its popularity among the audience "because it addresses these fears changing and adapting to reflect the concerns of succeeding generations, from Freudian preoccupations to economic and social changes" (Dunbar 6). Dunbar also suggests that the ending of a horror film, where the main villain or the monster is defeated, symbolically represents us confronting our fears. As a consequence, it may be argued that horror films provide social catharsis.

Horror as a genre remains popular to this time and one can follow the development of the character of Dracula from its creation in 1897 to the present day while the novel was never out of publication. As for the film industry, Dracula as a character was depicted numerous times and he has appeared frequently on screen

since its first appearance in the 1930s¹. As David J. Skal, one of the leading scholars in Dracula adaptations, emphasizes in the introduction of his book, Dracula is in fact the most depicted character with an origin in literature, with a possible exception of Sherlock Holmes (5). One wonders why that is, why is Dracula, as a character, so influential. Indeed, the audience became so familiar with him over the years that he became almost clichéd.

When it comes to Dracula, even a child is able to give a sufficient description of the character: he has fangs, wears a black cape, he sleeps in a coffin, sucks the blood of the living, is afraid of a crucifix, repulsed by garlic, can be killed by a sun and so on (see Twitchell 110 for more information on the survey). Not only children but people in general are familiar with the concept of the vampire because he became a part of mainstream culture. Moreover, Skal claims that it is no longer necessary to read the novel or even watch a film to know how the character looks like and what his supernatural abilities are. Children know Dracula from television series such as *Count Duckula* or *Sesame Street*, TV commercials present the Count Chocula cereal and there are several Draculas wandering the town every year during Halloween. As Skal suggests: "We may not be able to identify the exact version of the film, or even the performers involved, but the primal image of the black-caped vampire has become an indelible fixture of the modern imagination" (4). Dracula, as a character, became an icon but it is essential to emphasize that this image is severely altered from the image in Stoker's novel. One has to realize that there are definitely more people watching films and going to the cinema than there are people who would read a book from 1897. This is applicable to not only the present day but the beginning of the film industry as well. This problematic will be covered later in the thesis, in the part dedicated to the first film adaptations of the novel.

Despite the fact that *Dracula* as a novel was not acclaimed by literary critics until the 1980s and, therefore, not considered significant in terms of literature studies, it presents several interesting aspects, especially concerning Dracula. The vampire character is understood as a monster, but the truth is that he is very different from other monsters. As Dr Tina Rath comments in a BBC documentary on vampires,

¹ The first film adaptation of the novel, despite the fact that it was unofficial, was *Nosferatu, A Symphony of Horror* (1922) yet *Dracula* (1931) was the first official adaptation in wide release.

vampires are more human than any other monster, because the originally were human. They became a blood sucker, but "deep down they are like us" (*Vampires: Why they Bite*). Even if Dracula, at least in the first decades in which he emerged, was essentially evil and the audience was terrified by him, he also has qualities to which the audience tends to aspire. These qualities are the ones which are the most emphasized in contemporary cinema. As this thesis is going to point out in its conclusion, this positive approach to the character molded the vision that Stoker presented in the novel and Hollywood created a completely different image. The fact that Dracula is immortal, has supernatural powers and is fairly sexually attractive, at least in the modern film adaptations, made him desirable to the audience. The lifestyle of the vampire character is appealing as well, as he is free from the restraints of the society. He is not bound by moral rules in terms of his sexuality, he is immortal and cannot be harmed. One may argue that there is a clash in the character of Dracula: "Outwardly, he is despised as a transgressor, an outsider who takes what he wants, a repellent, vicious, amoral being; but inwardly we admire him as a liberating force, someone who represents our yearning to be free of the restrictions of society, particularly in matters of sex" (Dunbar 6). The fact that Dracula has tendencies to become both a hero and a villain and can be shaped and molded according to the needs of the filmmakers and the demands of the audience, makes him very changeable.

Dracula's popularity has not ceased until today: "Dreaded and desired in equal measure, the vampire is always sexier, always more interesting, and always more commanding than the forces of cultural stability that seek to expel it, which in part is why we won't let it die" (Weinstock 9). Weinstock adds that the reason that vampire films never lost their popularity among the audience is because they present issues and themes that were and still are valid.

In conclusion, one now should understand the validity of the research. The following chapters are going to deal with the representation of Dracula in the novel and then in film. Several film adaptations are going to be examined thoroughly, especially the ones which introduced misconceptions and changes from the primal image of Dracula in the novel, especially because they helped to create the icon that

we know today. These misconceptions are going to be commented on in terms of how and why they occurred with relation to censorship, the expectations and preferences of the audience, the technology available at the time and the intentions of the film makers and actors.

2 Dracula in the novel

Before one is able to make a sufficient analysis of the character of Dracula in Hollywood adaptations, it is necessary to first focus on the novel's treatment of the character. This chapter is going to examine the character's appearance, personality, supernatural abilities and its metaphorical use. More in-depth characterization and examination will be presented in the following chapters, dealing with specific film adaptations.

2.1 The visual appearance of Count Dracula

The visual appearance of Dracula is fairly difficult to describe in just one paragraph since it is transformed numerous times throughout the whole novel. This part is, therefore, going to deal only with the more human-like form of the Count. The instances where he appears as an animal or as an unsubstantial entity, such as smoke or vapor, will be discussed in the part dealing with his supernatural abilities.

The appearance of Count Dracula in the novel is first described by Jonathan Harker. Dracula in his words is "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 18). After a closer examination, during a conversation with the Count, Harker notices several unusual features of Dracula's face and body such as "peculiarly arched nostrils," (Stoker 20) pointed ears, hairy palms with fingers that bear long pointy nails, unusually long sharp teeth and bright red lips that "showed astonishing vitality in a man of his years" (Stoker 20). All of these features are reminiscent of an animal, which Stoker uses in order to introduce the character's predatory tendencies. Similarly, as suggested in Susanna Clement's study on vampires, the issue seems to be the unnatural appearance of Dracula, which presents the character as rather inhuman. She claims that "the vampire here is not beautiful" (17) and his face does not have features to which the readers would aspire to. In addition, Dracula appears as a much younger man in London. Even if he grows younger, his youth does not make him handsome. Indeed, Dracula is not in any way sexually attractive, which is important to mention, while all the film adaptations

discussed in this work, violate this feature.

The passages in the book dedicated to the physical appearance of Dracula and the abnormality of his features are fairly long and thorough. As Skal points out, the way Dracula is described is reminiscent of the way a criminal would be described. Stoker's depiction of Dracula in his opinion is inspired by the work of Cesare Lombroso (1836-1909), whose "detailed description of a 'typical' degenerate gave Stoker a perfect, paint-by-numbers portrait" (Skal 51). In conclusion, all these traits are leading to the conclusion that Dracula is not quite human, bears resemblance to an animal and essentially a predator. As Skal notes: "Stoker's vampire, in short, is no elegant seducer alighting from the *Orient Express*, but rather a devoted rapist leaping unceremoniously from the animal brain" (51).

2.2 Dracula's Personality

The inhumanity of Dracula based on his appearance, which was discussed above, reflects in the character's personality as well. Most importantly, as *Dracula* is a novel in an epistolary form, it is essential to mention the fact that Dracula is the only character whose mind is not revealed to the reader. It is, therefore, difficult for the reader to empathize with the character, because there is no story behind him. Dracula's motivation is unclear, the reader never has a chance to understand how and why he became a vampire and why he chooses his particular victims.

It is undoubtedly true that the literary Dracula is a villain. As was already mentioned above, the way he is described is similar to a description of a criminal. In the book, Mina describes Dracula as "a criminal and of criminal type" (Stoker 317). Also, Dracula in the novel is essentially evil: "he is brute, and more than brute; he is devil in callous, and the heart of him is not;" (Stoker 221) as Van Helsing declares. He does not show many emotions, with a possible exception of him talking about the old battles and the fact that he comes from an old and powerful family. However, as he talks about his "weary years of mourning over the dead," (Stoker 26) Harker notices that the emotions do not reflect in his face. Similarly, in the scene where Dracula blames his brides for attacking Harker, one of them accuses him: "You yourself never loved. You never love!" (Stoker 40). Dracula claims the contrary,

trying to comfort his brides. It is unclear, however, whether he lies or tells the truth, because as was already mentioned, Dracula's life is a mystery to the reader.

An interesting aspect in the character of Dracula is his hunger for information. From how Harker describes the Count's rooms, it is apparent that Dracula spends hours and hours by studying maps and documents. Also, the level of his English is fairly high. The motivation for such devoted research can be explained by the following. Dracula decides to go to London to "go through the crowded streets of your mighty London, to be in the midst of the whirl and rush of humanity, to share its life, its change, its death, and all that makes it what it is" (Stoker 22). This hunger for information and the fact that Dracula is able to deceive Harker suggest that even if Dracula appears to be very animal-like, he is also very intelligent. The book does not provide a clear reasoning for the Count's motivation to move to England. The most probably version is Dracula's lust for power and more fresh blood. This claim may be supported by the fact that as the group of characters, Mina, Van Helsing and all the men prepare to destroy Dracula, they discuss his motivation and future plans, Mina points out that "he came to London to invade a new land" (Stoker 317). In addition, when talking to Harker about his family, Dracula states that it once used to be strong and powerful, ruling an immense amount of land. His motivation for going to London might therefore be to make more vampires and rule Europe. This lust for power is a very important feature of Dracula's personality, because of its symbolism (See 2.4).

In conclusion, Dracula's personality in the book is presented as fairly simple, that is: he is a villain. He is evil, lusting for power and blood and almost emotionless.

2.3 Dracula as a supernatural being

The supernatural abilities of Dracula are definitely worth mentioning because they are also severely altered in the film adaptations. As Nina Aubrach suggests in her book on vampires: "In 1897, *Dracula* provided a lexicon of vampirism for the twentieth century. Predators were identifiable by their fangs, victims by two little holes in their neck" (52). The description of a vampire that Stoker established is

significant not only in terms of the portrayal in films but for the inspiration for future vampire literature as well. It would be erroneous, however, to claim that Stoker invented the character of the vampire all by himself. He found inspiration in previous English vampire narratives, such as *Carmilla*.²

Dracula's powers are summarized at the end of the book, as Van Helsing gives a speech to the group, preparing for the quest to kill Dracula. Some of the facts that Helsing mentions are based on the statements of the witnesses, some he gained through research. Van Helsing refers to Dracula as "nosferatu" and claims that he is not in any way a human being but one of the un-dead. Indeed, when Harker comments on Dracula's extremely skin and cold hands, which, as Harker claims, are "more like the hand of a dead than a living man" (Stoker 18). Harker also mentions a horrible smell of Dracula's breath, which may also be associated with death and decay.

Among the supernatural abilities of Dracula, a 500-year-old vampire, the most significant are his ability to grow younger and more powerful when drinking fresh blood, the fact that he is immortal and cannot easily be harmed and the possession of extreme strength, described by Van Helsing as "strong in person as twenty men" (Stoker 220). Dracula is also able to vanish at an instance and change form at will. He changes his form several times during the novel, he may take the form of a mist, vapour, a bat, a rat and a wolf. Harker also describes the way Dracula is able to climb the wall upside down "just as a lizard moves along a wall" (Stoker 35). Apart from being able to transform into these entities, he can also command all animals which are meaner and can also effect the weather by creating a strong wind or storm.

Another ability that Dracula possesses as a vampire is to create other vampires, which he manages by attacking the victims and biting them, usually on the neck. The bite is then apparent on the neck of the victim as a pair of small holes. When creating another vampire, the victim has to drink Dracula's blood in order to become in Dracula's words: "flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood, kin of my kin" (Stoker 267). When bitten, the victims are infected and they become mentally linked with Dracula who can control them. Dracula's mental powers also include hypnotism.

² A Gothic novella written by Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu and first published in 1872. Stoker also found inspiration in Eastern European folklore (see Holte for detail).

One might claim that hypnotism is not a supernatural ability due to the fact that it is scientifically explained, yet is important to understand that "in the 1890s, psychic splitting in trance was regularly associated with supernatural phenomena" (Luckhurst xxx). It was not until Sigmund Freud's theories that psychology became understood as a discipline of science. In the book, Dracula's hypnotism is closely associated with his eyes, bright red which, as Mina describes, "glared with the horrible vindictive look" (Stoker 349). The notion of the red eyes is present in the majority of the victims' description of the attack, usually being the only thing they can remember. Therefore, when the eyes are mentioned, the reader immediately associates the attack with Dracula.

Apart from his supernatural powers, there are several characteristics of Dracula as a vampire, which differentiate him from an ordinary human being. Dracula's physical body does neither reflect in a mirror nor does it cast a shadow. Several of the unusual traits are also fatal to the character or they at least limit his power. Garlic may be a good example or an encounter with holy objects such as the crucifix or Communion wafers. Dracula loses his powers during the day, yet the sun is not fatal to him. He cannot enter a house without the permission of its owner and he also cannot cross running water unless carried. He gains power in the soil of his native land and cannot rest without it which explains the fact that he sleeps in a box filled with it.

Last but not least, the way to kill a vampire is brutal. As suggested by Van Helsing one has to "cut off his head at once and drive a stake through his heart" (Stoker 311). Dracula is killed, however, in a different way. He is stabbed and his throat cut with knives by Quincey Morris and Jonathan Harker and he crumbles into dust. It is arguable, therefore, whether he dies or he only changes into another form. Skal speculates that it may have been an intention of Stoker to resurrect the Count in a sequel of another novels.

Lastly, one should notice that in the book, all the supernatural qualities of the vampire figure are given without stating the explanation of how and why the character gained them and why he has become a monster. Even if the reader is provided with the information on how a vampire is created, it is unclear whether

Dracula had even been human and what is his origin and motivation.

2.4 Dracula as a metaphor

Before the actual analysis of the metaphorical use of the character, one has to understand that not all the implications were intended by Stoker himself. Critics tend to have mixed responses in several accounts and they debate whether certain symbolism is present or not. Nevertheless, this chapter is going to introduce several of the metaphorical representations of the Count, which Stoker might have not included deliberately but are important in terms of the film adaptations, which will be discussed in this thesis.

To fully understand the symbolism of the character, it is necessary to establish the time period in which the book was published. As stated in the introduction of the current edition of the novel, "the book crystallized an image, dramatized a certain predatory menace in Queen Victoria's jubilee year, and evoked an authentic sense of Christian dread, embodying in one elusive figure everything that shiny modernity was at risk of forgetting about its blood-soaked history" (Luckhurst vii). The Victorian England of 1897 was rapidly changing and yet there were many issues by which the people were frightened, there were different opinions upon the role of women in the society, the technological progress was changing the way people lived and thought. Apart from the fact that Dracula is a blood-sucking monster, he is also terrifying, sometimes even more so, in a different context.

Firstly, during the Victorian era, sex was associated with death: "All sex was suspected to contain the seeds of insanity and physical degeneration" (Skal 53). Vampirism in *Dracula* is a connection between sex, disease and death. Even if the actual sexual act is not present, the interpretation of the penetration of fangs is indisputable. Moreover, there are hints of a possible intercourse between Lucy and Dracula, as she has blood stains on her white night-gown. Vampirism, therefore might be associated with a sexual disease, and in Victorian England, the most feared one was syphilis (see Dunbar 10). In addition to the sexual symbolism of the character, many critics see Dracula as a sexual liberator. "Dracula himself, representing unrestrained desires, functions to provide the means by which the same

base instincts are unleashed in the female characters" (Dunbar 23). The emancipation of women and woman's sexuality was understood as a negative thing in the primarily patriarchal society in Victorian England. Dracula attacks the women in the night, in their bed. Mina is a married woman and Dracula's attack here represents the attack on marriage. Dracula bites her on the neck, which is considered an erogenous zone. Indeed, the scene which Van Helsing and the other men witness when catching Dracula in Mina's bedroom, shows Harker, a male character and a husband as weak and powerless, who lies unconscious on the bed. This image mocks the patriarchal ideal of the time. Adding to the horror of a maniac killer lusting for fresh blood, Dracula presents a threat to a marriage where the male is the head of the family. Moreover, an even more extreme interpretation connected to sexuality might be also seen on the fact that Dracula drinks from a male as well, presenting a homoerotic tendency in the character, which seems to be a controversial issue among literary critics.

The other horrifying concept for the Victorian mind was the notion of invasion. "In the 1890s, a discourse of concern over the unregulated presence of 'aliens' and 'foreign undesirables' became an important political matter, leading up to the immigration controls of the Aliens Act in 1905" (Luckhurst xxiv-xxv). Dracula comes from Transylvania with the intention to conquer, kill and prey on the blood of young women. It may be argued that "Count Dracula is a representation of the barbarism of Eastern Europe (and beyond)" (Holte 25). Eastern Europe was considered to be the land of the unknown. The English were frightened by the strange, maladjusted newcomers and their intentions. The book describes Dracula's arrival quite dramatically, with a storm and Lucy's hallucinations and moon walking, preparing the reader for something terrible to happen. The notion of barbarism as a force that threatens modernity is visible as well, especially in Harker's description of the castle and the fact that Dracula almost seems to live in another century. It is also important to mention that Dracula in the book does not communicate with the outside world too much. As Wood notes: "The only intermediaries between Dracula and civilization are those upon whom he depends for transport: the Szgany, gypsies, traditionally regarded as outside civilization, deeply suspect and dangerous, and

possessors of magical powers" (179).

In addition, Dracula presents the clash between science and the supernatural. Dracula as a vampire figure "has always hovered in an uncertain zone between fictional fabrication and folkloric truth" (Luckhurst xv). However, it is science that helps to destroy him. Van Helsing uses research and methodology in this quest. "Once the Count is scientifically typed as a degenerate criminal, his threat is diminished, he never speaks again, and he is reduced to a habitual offender, fatally limited in his decision to turn and run for home" (Luckhurst xxix). The clash between science and the supernatural, however, still remains, because it is the character of Van Helsing who claims that Dracula is a vampire and of supernatural origin.

In her study on vampires in film, Stacey Abbot comments on the fact that the fight between Dracula and the vampire hunters is a clash between not only primitivism and science but modernity in general. She states that: "As the world continues to progress, a new form of modernity - the hypermodern world of electricity, hypnosis, telepathy, telecommunications, and the disintegration of time and space - gradually overturns the form of modernity exemplified by rational thought, scientific analysis, and bureaucracy" (17). In the novel, Harker states that "the old centuries had, and have, powers of their own which mere "modernity" cannot kill" (Stoker 37). It is no coincidence that Stoker chose to set the plot partially in London, which was considered one of the most modern cities at that time.

Furthermore, the fact that Dracula's power is lost when he is near a crucifix or another holy object demonstrates the symbolism of Christianity as a tool for combating evil. According to Susannah Clements, "the vampire - primarily Count Dracula himself - represents all of the forces that the cross must defeat" (15). She adds that the vampire figure represents something more than just a force of evil. She claims that Dracula actually represents sin as well as temptation. The physical description of Dracula, which was already discussed in 2.1 suggests several demonic traits, namely the pointed ears and hairy palms, another anti-Christian symbolism portrayed in the character. Apart from Dracula's fear of holy objects, the fact that he

presents his brides with a human baby has a connection with Judaism. "Murders of children were often blamed on local Jewish contingents, who were persecuted for this crime throughout the medieval period. The so-called 'blood libel' developed from divergent Christian and Jewish interpretation of of blood symbolism in their religions" (Luckhurst xxvii). Dracula, therefore, represents the enemy of Christian church. Similarly to his supernatural abilities, his hatred towards the church is never explained in the novel.

3 Dracula emerges on screen

This chapter is going to deal with the first film adaptations of the novel. The 1931 *Dracula* will be emphasized and described in more detail. Similar pattern used in the previous chapter will be used here as well, dividing the character's features into his appearance, personality, supernatural abilities and its metaphor, based on the social and historical background. This approach is going to be used in the following chapters as well.

3.1 Dracula in the 1920s

Even if the main concern of this thesis is to follow the development of the character on screen in Hollywood adaptations, it is necessary to mention also the films created outside of Hollywood. *Dracula's* film history does not start in Hollywood but in Germany. The 1922 *Nosferatu, A Symphony of Horror* was an unofficial adaptation, which had to be pulled from the market as the rights for the book were not obtained. This film is important to mention mainly due to the fact that even if the Count is not named *Dracula* but *Orlok* (due to the copyright), he is surprisingly the most similar depiction of the Count on screen when compared to the description of his appearance in Stoker's novel. *Orlok*, played by Max Schreck, is everything but beautiful: he is bold and has rat-like teeth which are peeking through his lips as they are unnaturally long. In the book, Harker provides a similar description of the Count's teeth.

The similarities with the novel are present in the film but the film itself also established several misconceptions, which were later assumed by subsequent vampire films. One of the most known scenes from *Nosferatu* is *Orlok's* shadow on the wall, as he climbs the stairs. Here, the film deviates from the book, while Van Helsing states that the literary *Dracula* casts no shadow. The reason why the shadow was used is probably due to the style used at the time. *Nosferatu* belongs to German Expressionism, which was based on an unnatural reality, extreme make up and the contrasts of light and shadow (see Dunbar 63). The way *Orlok* is killed is not only different from the book but it brings another misconception: the vampire can be

harmful and eventually killed by the sun.

Nosferatu, or Count Orlok, represents the animal-like repulsive creature that spreads disease. In his book on vampire film, Weinstock claims that he symbolically stands for a Jewish community, that "invades German borders and spreads disease," (119) namely plague.

Another important fact to mention is that before *Dracula* was adapted into a movie in Hollywood, it was already present in America as a theatre play. Even if this thesis is not primarily concerned with stage adaptations, it is necessary to mention them, while the first official film version of *Dracula* was influenced by them. There were two theatre plays: a 1924 version adapted by Hamilton Deane and a revised version of 1927, adapted by John L. Balderston. Apart from the fact that the actor Bela Lugosi portrayed *Dracula* on screen on 1931, the script for the novel was an inspiration for the film as well as *Dracula's* costume.

3.2 The 1931 Universal *Dracula*

The following part is going to deal with the 1931 Universal Studios adaptation called simply *Dracula*. This adaptation is vital for the research, as the look of the vampire established a vampire figure to the mainstream audience.

*3.2.1 The Significance of the Universal *Dracula**

Being the first sound horror film, *Dracula* also presented the character of *Dracula* to a larger audience. One has to realize that at that time, not that many people were familiar with the character of the vampire, especially in America. The movie industry in America in the 1930s was in its rise. As John Belton claims in his study on the history of Hollywood cinema, in the 1930s, 83 million Americans went to the cinema every week (19). When compared to the 1990s, when an average would be 19 million, the influence of the cinema in the 1930s was undoubtedly significant. It is also important to mention that cinema was open to all social classes, while it was fairly cheap (the term nickelodeon for the first cinemas was coined because of the fact that one was only asked to pay 5 cents to be able to enter).

Moreover, as there was vertical integration³ in the movie industry, each cinema showed only the films it was responsible for. The movies were shown all day long and one could watch one feature film as many times as he or she wanted. Therefore, the influence upon the audience was massive, considering the number of spectators and the amount and frequency of the screening. The vampire character had a free way to impress masses of people from all social classes which is one of the reasons why the current icon that we tend to associate with Dracula is dramatically different from the image in the book.

3.2.2 *The Look in the 1931 Film*

The role of Dracula in the 1931 version is portrayed by a Hungarian actor named Bela Lugosi. The image that Lugosi created has, by this day, become archetypal. Lugosi became associated with the character to such an extent that it basically ruined his career in Hollywood (*The Road to Dracula*). All subsequent versions of *Dracula* were influenced by his performance to a certain extent, which is something that all the film critics and literary scholars agree upon. When there is a Halloween party or the character of Dracula is mocked in some way, it is this image of Dracula, which is portrayed. Dracula's look in this film is definitely influenced by the stage adaptations. Apart from the fact that Lugosi's first portrayal of Dracula was actually on stage on Broadway, the script for the film was heavily influenced by both stage adaptations. Universal, the studio responsible for the production, was in decline in terms of financial profit and needed to re-establish its fame and so the rights to the stage versions were obtained as well as the rights to the book, while Dracula proved to be very successful on Broadway (*The Road to Dracula*). The influence of the stage adaptation might be seen on the costume of the character. Dracula remains the same with a single exception of when he is disguised as a coach driver. The book describes Dracula simply as "clad in black" (Stoker 18). The 1931 version adopted the "magician" look from Hamilton Deane's stage version, which introduced the vampire as an elegant aristocrat. The film updated the costumes to the

³ "A system of motion picture production, distribution, and exhibition in which these three sectors are controlled by a single economic entity, such as a studio, which both makes and distributes a product that is exhibited in its own theaters" (Belton 353).

current fashion of the 1930s. Critics refer to the look as "the lounge lizard". Dracula is wearing a black cape and an elevated collar and he rather seems to be leaving for an opera concert than to attack innocent women. The costume seemed to be one of the most prominent influences on the subsequent film adaptations. It may also be argued that the character is somewhat humanized by it. The fact that he is an elegant and polished man immediately makes him less monstrous. The cape has another function as well. Dracula uses it not only to envelop his victims but also as a shield.

When compared to the image of Dracula in the book, Lugosi presents a more humanized version of a monster, at least physically speaking. He remains very elegant throughout the whole film, there is not a single drop of blood left visible on his evening gown after an attack. Most importantly, the vampire here is "defanged". The book describes the teeth as extraordinarily long and sharp and the bite marks as two holes, yet there is not a mention of the two sharp fangs which have by now invaded all vampire films. Despite the fact that fangs were in the script, Lugosi refused to wear them, however, as he considered them uncomfortable and he was also aware of his accent and did not want the fangs to make it even more difficult for him to utter his lines properly (*The Road to Dracula*). Indeed, he disagreed with the script in several accounts and demanded to do his own make up as well (see Skal 186). The make up was toned down, which might not be that apparent from the film as it is black and white, but originally, on stage, he wore green make up in order to look more deadly. In the film, however, the make up is fairly limited to only white powder and a lipstick. This adds to the notion that Dracula's look in this film version is more human. Moreover, Dunbar suggests that if the character of Dracula was portrayed precisely according to the book, the audience would find it too repulsing and no one would be willing to go to see the movie.

When analyzing the appearance of Dracula, one has to consider censorship at the time as well. One may think that that was unnecessary especially in terms of the fangs or dripping blood, yet in the 1930s, violence and sexuality on screen was measured by completely different criteria. Motion Picture Production Code or the Hays Code, introduced in 1930 "in response to public concern about the 'immorality' of the film industry," (Dunbar 68) established what was not appropriate to be shown

on screen. The Code heavily limited the filmmakers in terms of what they were allowed to show. For that reason, the majority of violence, primarily connected to Dracula, is verbalized rather than shown. This might be also due to the stage origin of the script. Another possibility is the fact that Universal studios was already in a financial stagnation and the script had to be heavily edited and some scenes removed in order to save money (see Skal 175).

3.2.3 The Emotionless Count in the 1931 Film

In contrast to Dracula's very human-like appearance in the 1931 film, his personality is quite the opposite. Right at the beginning of the film, Dracula is described by the locals from the village as a vampire, who feeds on the blood of the living. Stoker's novel allows more space to mystery when it comes to the character. The 1931 Dracula film already prepares the viewer to what he or she might expect. Not only do the people talk about Dracula and they cross themselves and so on but also the first scene where Dracula appears as a character emphasizes the fact that he is unnatural, out of this world and evil. Dracula is first seen as he calls his brides from their coffins, the atmosphere is very dark and mysterious, one can see insect and rats trying to escape, which only adds to the fact that there is something wrong in the place, while these sorts of animals tend to be associated with sickness and decay.

When it comes to Dracula's personality in this particular adaptation, it does not differ too much from Stoker's novel. Dracula's motivation to kill is not clear again. This time, there is not even a mention of revenge or the desire to conquer a new land. Stoker took inspiration from a historical figure of Vlad Tepes for the character of Dracula and Tepes is often associated with Dracula nowadays. The 1931 Dracula does not provide any historical reference to such a character and there is actually nothing said or explained in accordance to the character of Dracula himself what so ever. The film lacks any plausible explanation, therefore, as to why Dracula wants to move to Carfax Abbey and he remains nothing more than a bloodsucking, evil, animalistic creature. In addition, the criminal tendency within the character, which is present in the novel is established in the film as well. Even if there are different

scenes in the novel, where Dracula seems to mystify Harker (or Renfield in the 1931 film), it is clear that Dracula is intelligent and capable of planning mischief. This might be seen on the scene where Dracula drugs Reinfield, which is an unexpected act from him while he is able to hypnotize all the other characters in the movie with an exception of Van Helsing.

Furthermore, there is something extra to the character in terms of his personality that the literary character lacks. Dracula seems to not only be willing to live withing society, he actually attends cultural events and he is welcomed in the house of Dr Seward. The literary Dracula remains a mysterious and unreachable throughout the novel and the reader is not quite sure what to make of him. He does not visit the family as a welcomed guest. The 1931 film, as Nina Auerbach explains in her book, changes the perception of the monster: "Vampires in the American century embody seditious urbanity rather than dangerous intimacy. Unlike their insinuating British counterparts, they gravitate to leadership, aping the tyrants they parody" (7). This is a great example of how the society shapes the monster.

In connection to the theatre, it is there, where Dracula first introduces himself to Dr Seward, Harker, Mina and Lucy. This scene also shows the only hint of emotion from Dracula. He claims that "there are far worse things awaiting men than death" and that "to die, to be truly dead must be glorious" (*Dracula*, 1931). This shift from the otherwise cold and emotionless Count may be attributed to the fact that the director, Tod Browning was often absent from set and the actors lacked guidance (see Skal 183). Indeed, many film critics agree upon the fact that the first half of the movie is better than the second one, which Browning actually did not really direct as he lost interest in the project (ibid).

There are instances in the film where Dracula actually seems to be joking. He enjoys the hidden meanings in his words. A good example may be his famous line: "I never drink," pause, "wine" (*Dracula*, 1931). There is also a scene where Dracula leads Renfield on the staircase through spiderwebs and he points out that the fly does not know it yet, but is about to be a victim of the spider, who is going to suck the fluid out of her body. There is definitely a subtle allegory in his words as to what he is intending to do to Renfield, by which he seems to be amused. Stoker's Dracula, in

contrast, is no joker.

When Dracula is first introduced to the women, Lucy in particular finds him fascinating. Both women are laughing at the fact that Dracula's speech is heavily accented. It is interesting, however, that the accent is not present in the script but it was Lugosi's Hungarian origin and the fact that he learned his lines phonetically, which caused it (*The Road to Dracula*). Despite it being unintentional, Lugosi's slow and heavily accented English became yet another archetypal feature of the image of Count Dracula that we know today. Similarly as Lucy, the moviegoers also became fascinated with Lugosi. In his notes on Dracula film adaptations, Dunbar declares that Lugosi had an "air of sophistication and urbanity - brought to the screen a presence of understated sexuality and exotic persona which was both dangerous and appealing to the audiences of the time" (8). With his overall performance, Lugosi proved to be a successful and memorable Count.

3.2.4 The Supernatural Dracula in the 1931 Film

When it comes to Dracula as a supernatural being in the 1931 film, there is not much to see on screen. As was mentioned before, the majority of violence is reported rather than shown. Apart from the fact that Dracula is defanged and his look polished as opposed to the character in the novel, some of his supernatural abilities are limited as well. To provide an example, the scene where Dracula crawls on the wall as if he was some sort of a lizard is missing from the film. This might be ascribed to the technical equipment available at the time and the fact that the budget was limited. In addition, the character was intentionally humanized mainly due to censorship. One has to emphasize the fact that *Dracula* was the first film to include a supernatural element that was not scientifically explained. The filmmakers aimed to spare the audience of horrific imagery when the concept of an unexplainable evil was presented to them. Dracula is claimed to be one of the undead. His grip does not seem to be repulsing or cold from Dr Seward's reaction though. Overall, "Tod Browning's film established a new film genre, one based on supernatural horror, and married expressionist techniques with the narrative drive of Hollywood, creating a template for horror films which would be influential for decades to come" (Dunbar

21).

It would be erroneous, however, to claim that there are no traces of the supernatural in the film whatsoever. The importance of Dracula's look was already explained in the previous part on his appearance. In addition, the look is also vital for Dracula's ability of hypnosis. Apart from the fact that he envelops his victims with his cape, there are twelve shots dedicated to his famous stare. Dracula's eyes are even more emphasized by the lighting. It varies from two points of light to a streak, depending on the scene and it is actually missing towards the end of the film. Dunbar claims that hypnosis is the most sophisticated trick in the film. Other than that, there are only bats on wires, which seem almost laughable to the contemporary audience. Therefore, hypnosis seems to be Dracula's most powerful supernatural ability.

As for Dracula's ability to influence the weather or change into an animal, it is fairly limited in this film version. In one scene, Harker reports that there is a huge dog running across the lawn. Similarly, as Mina describes the attack, she mentions that there was a heavy fog. There is a scene on the sea, where Dracula looks at the sailors who battle the roaring waves, which might be understood as his commanding the weather. As for the ability to become an animal, this is achieved by simple cuts. At one instance, there is a bat, vividly on a string and after a cut, there is Dracula standing in the room.

Dracula's fear of crosses is demonstrated numerous times throughout the film. Similarly, he does not have a reflection in a mirror. In contrast to the book, where garlic is mentioned, wolfsbane is effectively used not directly on Dracula but on Mina and Renfield, both inflected by vampirism. One is not sure how vampirism as such is transmitted. As for the effective way to destroy Dracula, here the film agrees with the novel by Van Helsing's claim that he has to drive a stake through his heart. Dracula's death on screen, however, differs from the book, while he is killed by Van Helsing and precisely by staking. The act is not shown on screen, as one may already expect, but the camera focuses on Mina, and the audience only hears Dracula's moans and then Mina awakens from her hypnotic state and it is clear that Dracula is destroyed. As Weinstock claims in his study on vampire film, "the film's

real energy is the contest between Dracula and the men who pursue him" (53). It is important to mention that it is Van Helsing who kills Dracula and that it is also him who, scientifically, proves that Dracula is a vampire, even if by only a simple test in a testing tube where an unknown liquid changes its color. It is the strong male and science who are able to resist the hypnosis and eventually destroy the evil. As Van Helsing himself declares, "the vampire's biggest power is that people don't believe in him" (*Dracula*, 1931). This proves to be fatal to Renfield, who claims that vampirism is a mere superstition. As Dunbar points out, "in 1931, the film uses the theme of good versus evil as a structuring device" (33). Dracula's identity is revealed thanks to Van Helsing and his weaknesses are demonstrated in the little battles between the two, that is when Helsing tricks the Count with the mirror.

3.2.5 The monster in Hollywood in the 1930s

As Nina Auerbach proposes in her study: "Vampires go where power is: when, in the nineteenth century, England dominated the West, British vampires ruled the popular imagination, but with the birth of film, they migrated to America in time for the American century" (6). America became the center of the film industry and Hollywood was on its rise. As for *Dracula*, not only was it based on a successful stage play but it also brought a new sensation to Hollywood. The promotion of the film, mainly the theatrical trailer clearly present Dracula as a monster, emphasizing his mischievous intentions.

As for the metaphorical representation of Dracula as a monster, one has to consider the cultural and historical background of the time. 1931 was a year when America only began to realize that it is in a huge economic crisis. Despite the Depression, enormous and richly decorated Movie Theaters were built, providing an experience of luxury. With the Art Deco movement and the Harlem Renaissance, the notion of the exotic became fairly desirable. Lugosi's exotic looking Dracula fits this image perfectly. Many critics, including Skal, claim that the character of Dracula actually represents the Great Depression. Indeed, as mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, the audience enjoys to watch horror films because it provides social catharsis. Skal argues that "*Dracula* has always been a lightning rod for prevailing

social anxieties" (195). The audience seemed to forget its unhappiness watching the bloodsucking monster on screen and enjoyed the fact that, thanks to wisdom and science, it can be defeated.

Similarly as with the novel in 1897, immigration was also an issue in the 1930s: "The vampire is an invader, a mysterious other who comes from elsewhere to prey upon the populace, while the film in turn plays upon all the racist and xenophobic fears of the audience" (Weinstock 96). The hostility toward incoming immigrants, mainly from eastern Europe and Asia was definitely significant at the time, resulting in Immigration Acts. Peprník comments on immigration in his script on American Studies and points out the fact that the hostility towards the new immigrants was not only caused by the foreign workers to 'steal' jobs from the Americans, but as there were more men than women who would come, the newcomers also tended to marry American women (see Peprník 70-76). Dracula as well comes to 'steal' the women and literally making them his wives.

As for sexuality, one might expect that its representation on screen in the 1930s was fairly limited due to the Code. Several scenes from the book are completely missing from the film. There are several instances, however, which one might associate with sexuality, mainly the fact that Dracula still attacks the women in the bed. When Van Helsing interrogates Mina about the attack, he asks her whether Dracula's lips, not teeth, had touched her. Also, as Mina refuses to touch Harker, because she feels impure, she mentions that he must never kiss her. The kiss is therefore a representation of spreading vampirism. In addition, intentional or not from Browning, the homoerotic element is present in the film, as Dracula drinks from Renfield at the beginning of the film. The novel leaves this deed to the three vampire brides. Nonetheless, the sexuality connected to Dracula is not as vivid in the film as it is in the novel, mainly due to the omission of the significant scenes, such as the one where Dracula forces Mina to drink his blood.

Dracula in the 1931 represents the supernatural, the mysterious, by which the 1930s audience was fascinated. One scene in particular shows Dracula's superiority. Dracula can walk through a spiderweb without disturbing it, whereas Renfield cannot. Dunbar comments on this particular scene: "the castle and Dracula are

established as in the realm of the supernatural. They have the power here while moral men have none" (30). Similarly, Dracula first appears at the top of the stairs, photographed from a low angle.⁴ This technique is used intentionally, since "as a result, our impression of that character's power or stature is thereby magnified" (Belton 45). Again, this shows Dracula's superiority and power.

Many critics agree upon the fact that the 1931 *Dracula* is targeted at women as the main audience. The film's subtitle speaks about 'the story of the strangest passion the world has ever known'. This is a bit contradictory in a sense, because the films made in the 1930s were not necessarily aimed at a particular group. The purpose was to make everyone want to see the film and attract as many spectators as possible. Moreover, as the studio was afraid of the reaction of the ladies, a nurse was present at the screening, as if the women were expected to faint of such horror. Despite all these precautions, women loved *Dracula*, mainly because of Bela Lugosi, who became a star (*The Road to Dracula*).

As Dunbar points out: "Such is the influence of Lugosi's performance in creating an undying icon that he is always there, whether in the voice, the hair or the costume" (8). The 1931 *Dracula* is considered to be the first vampire film. As a consequence, all the following films which present a vampire character are aware of themselves as vampire films and would therefore try to differentiate from the Lugosi's portrayal. The film helped to establish the genre and started a boom of similar films, which ensured Universal's status of the leading studio in producing horrors (see Hutchings 21). The influence of the film did not end with the coming of television. Quite the contrary, the films produced by Universal were shown and became the classics. They were among the first films that premiered on television in the 1950s.

⁴ "When the camera looks up at the character, it (and we) occupy an inferior position in relation to the character" (Belton 45).

4 Dracula in Color

This chapter is going to deal with Terrence Fischer's *Horror of Dracula* (Hammer Film Productions, 1958). The film was made in Britain, yet it was financed by Universal Studios (See Skal 259). Despite the fact that it is not an actual Hollywood adaptation, it is definitely important to mention it in this thesis, while similarly as Bela Lugosi, Sir Christopher Lee also became a prototype of Dracula, portraying him no less than six times on screen. Before the actual analysis, one has to understand that "by the time the Hammer film-makers turned to the story of the vampire in the late 1950s, Dracula was yet more familiar to audiences, and the disparity between the audience's knowledge of vampires and the fictional characters' knowledge was even more marked than it had been for the Universal *Dracula* in 1931" (Hutchings 43). As a consequence, the film makers aimed to differentiate the new Dracula from its predecessor. "In 1957, Universal 'expressly forbade' any imitation of the Lugosi character or set designs" (Kane 43). Moreover, Christopher Lee said he wanted to differentiate himself from the Lugosi version as well, claiming that he had never really actually seen the film.

4.1 The appearance of the 1958 Dracula

Hutchings suggests that the most important scene when it comes to establishing the character of Dracula is the scene where he first appears. Dracula's first actual appearance in the 1958 film reminds one of the the 1931 film at first sight, that is he is standing at the top of the stairs. Hutchings claims that the audience probably expected a laughable character with fangs, which they saw on the poster promoting the film. Moreover, the audience was almost over-familiar with the 1931 film, which premiered on TV in the 1950s. In the 1931 film, the audience is being slowly prepared for what is about to come. In contrast, he 1958 Dracula runs briskly down the stairs. He appears suddenly, he actually startles Harker and he keeps appearing unexpectedly throughout the whole film.

Dracula's costume definitely bears resemblance to that of Bela Lugosi with the exception of the elevated collar. A black cape is still present, however, and is used in

order to envelop a victim in a scene. It was already mentioned in the previous chapter, that the character remains almost the same through the whole movie in 1931. That said, the 1958 version even lacks the scene where Dracula is disguised as a coach driver. The 1958 Dracula, therefore, literally stays the same.

There is one thing connected to vampirism, which this film introduced to the audience for the first time ever and which has now penetrated into the popular culture is now included in the majority of vampire films: fangs. One may argue that sharp teeth were already introduced in *Nosferatu*, they looked rather like the teeth of a rodent than the two sharp fangs we now tend to associate with vampires. At the beginning of the 1958 *Horror of Dracula*, Dracula does not have fangs as mentioned above. Film critic Kim Newman explains that that was mainly due to the practical reasons. It is impossible to speak with such prop because "you either limp or you spit them out" (*Vampires: Why They Bite*). The fangs are clearly visible when the Count attacks. They are decorated with streams of blood, which is vividly red as the film was the first Dracula adaptation made in color. As was already mentioned above, the fangs also served as an advertisement in promoting the film. In addition, Dracula's eyes are red as well when he attacks and his look, especially when he is furious, is definitely more scary than the image of Bela Lugosi.

4.2 A dualistic personality of Dracula in the 1958 film

In connection with Dracula's first appearance in the 1958 film, there is another notion that may startle the audience and which differs from the previous adaptation. Dracula is not an elderly hairy man lurking in the shadows as in the book, nor is he an accented and constantly staring caricature like Lugosi. Christopher Lee portrays a Dracula that runs briskly from the stairs and introduces himself in an unexpectedly polite way and in impeccable British English. He seems very straight forward and capable. The screenwriter of the film, Jimmy Sangster, explained his intention to humanize Dracula as an attempt to actually make him more frightening (*100 Years of Horror*). As a consequence, the audience is rather startled, as such introduction is considerably different from the already established one in the 1931 version.

The 1958 *Horror of Dracula* seems to abandon the Gothic vibe of the 1931 film.

Dracula does not live in a ruined castle anymore, this time he lives in a lofty, polished house. One may be startled at the fact that his tomb is no longer situated inside this house but in a cellar outside and he is, therefore, sleeping no longer protected by its walls. Dracula also prefers a more luxurious method of transport. The 1931 film is truthful to the novel in this respect, as Dracula travels in boxes filled with soil. The 1958 Dracula, however, travels in a white, heavily decorated coffin. Similarly to the 1931 film, his past remains hidden. The only notion of his age is based on Van Helsing's research, claiming that he is 500 or 600 years old. The historical reference to Vlad Tepes is missing as well. Dracula's tomb shows only his first name and does not reveal any extra information.

In contrast to both Lugosi and the image from Stoker's novel, the 1958 Dracula is very physical. The audience not only hears about his strength. Dracula actually demonstrates it by grabbing the vampire bride's shoulder and violently throwing her away. Dracula becomes truly monstrous after the audience witnesses his first attack. From that moment, he does not speak but only acts. In the book about this version of Dracula, the author comments on the fact that Dracula represents "sudden outbursts of energy and rapid metamorphoses" (Hutchings 77). Dracula uses physical strength rather than hypnosis. In contrast to the conversational encounter between Dracula and Van Helsing in the 1931 film, Hammer Dracula never speaks to his enemy. Even if he seems to be a bloodthirsty maniac, however, he still proves to be fairly intelligent. An example might be the scene where Dracula invites Mina out of her house into the Mortician's place pretending he is her husband.

As a consequence to Dracula's rather violent nature, violence is also more vividly portrayed than in the 1931 film, mainly due to the fact that the censorship had relaxed. Rating system was introduced in Britain in 1951 and the USA followed with replacing the Hays Code with a similar system (See Kane 43). Despite the relaxation in terms of censorship, some scenes were still not explicitly portrayed, such as when Dracula's bride dies: we only hear her screaming and the camera focuses on Dracula's face filled with panic. Similarly, one never discovers what Dracula does to Harker, as this scene is cut in a middle. Hutchings suggests that this was also not only because of the overly explicit imagery but also because the

filmmakers were not sure about Dracula's possible homoerotic tendency.

In his book, Kane divides vampire films into several categories as to how the vampire figure looks like, how he attacks and what his supernatural abilities are. According to him, the 1958 *Horror of Dracula* belongs to the Erotic Cycle (dating from 1958 to 1985), which is significantly different from the preceding film in "sensual scenes of vampirism" (Kane 44). Sexuality has more space on screen than it did in the 1931 version. Dracula no longer has wives but just one bride, whose death Dracula wants to revenge by making Mina his new one. Not only does this show his desire for companionship, but it also explains Dracula's motif for leaving his home: a notion that was never explained in the 1931 film. Even if the attack is not romantic in the true sense of the word, when Dracula prepares to suck Mina's blood, he touches her face and kisses it almost gently. Overall, as Dunbar points out: "Christopher Lee's version for Hammer in 1958 kept most of the physical similarities, but made Dracula taller and the sexuality less subtle" (Dunbar 8). In addition, a new element in the vampire-victim relationship is established. Before the attack, Lucy actually seems to be willing to undergo Dracula's sucking her blood. She opens the windows and pulls down the collar of her nightgown to reveal the neck. She also removes the crucifix from her chest. This is later explained by Van Helsing, who claims that a victim becomes addicted to the Dracula's attack as to drugs. The metaphor associated with vampirism is, therefore, no longer present as a sickness, as in the novel, where it stands for a venereal disease.

In conclusion, Dracula in the 1958 is evil but intelligent, polite and even passionate. It was already mentioned that Dracula does not have fangs in the scenes where he talks to Harker. The fangs seem to have another function. Kane suggests that the vampire has a dualistic personality, divided into a polite vampire and the bloodthirsty vampire: "The demarcation of the social vampire from the predatory vampire has a new semantic element: fangs" (Kane 46).

4.3 Supernatural Dracula in the 1958 film

Even if the 1958 Dracula is more violent and sexual, he is also less supernatural. The supernatural abilities of Dracula are very limited indeed. Vampirism is

explained, described and eventually destroyed by a representative of science. Kane notes that the combination of horror and science fiction proved to be successful in the 1950s. Apart from the fact that Dracula is very strong, he does not have the ability to change forms or command animals, which as Van Helsing declares is "mere superstition" (*The Horror of Dracula*). In contrast to the 1931 film, probably to differentiate itself from it, Dracula here is repulsed by garlic and crucifixes, which actually have the power to burn the vampire's or the infected victim's skin.

Hypnosis, as mentioned above, is substituted with addiction and brutal violence of the attacker. There is, however, a reference to the 1931 Dracula in the scene where he stands at Lucy's patio. A stream of light highlights his eyes similarly as the lighting was used in the 1931 film. What differentiates *Horror of Dracula* from both the novel and the 1931 film is the fact that the vampire can be killed by the sun. Hannah Abbot comments on this scene as following:

In Hammer Studio's *Horror of Dracula* (1958), Dracula's death by sunlight is presented as a painful attack upon the vampire's body. It is less of a confrontation between the light and a creature of the night, and more the burning of the vampire's skin to ash, introducing a new element to the genre that has subsequently become an accepted generic convention (Abbott 59).

In contrast to his death in the novel, Dracula crumbles into dust and it is Van Helsing, who causes his death. As Hutchings suggests: "The destruction of the vampire becomes in this respect not so much triumphant victory of good over evil as it is a temporary suspension of activity into dynamic, transformative world" (Hutchings 77). Indeed, the vampire is no longer a monster defeated strong men armed with crucifixes but rather a sexually a violent maniac whose disease is healed and diminished by science.

4.4 The 1958 Dracula as a metaphor

As for the symbolic representations of the vampire, one element is eliminated

from the 1958 as opposed to the 1931 film and the novel. Dracula is no longer an invader from a foreign country. The frightening force is domesticated in this version, especially in the scene where the men realize that Dracula is actually hiding in Dr. Seward's own house. The trend in the 1958, especially in terms of science fiction movies, was to include topics linked to the Cold War. Such films aimed to emphasize the fact that the enemy: the communist, might be hiding anywhere. Films such as *I Married a Monster from Outer Space* (1958, Dir. Gene Fowley jr.) were made, which, as the title suggests, presents a member of the family as a threat. The fear of communism may be seen in *Horror of Dracula* as well, and Dracula himself may be understood as a metaphor for communism, spreading its, indeed, very red disease. Moreover, as the officer at the border reads the list, one notices that Dracula seems to sign in as J. Marx and the name under is no other than K. Marx. It is interesting that Marx actually used the term vampire in *Das Kapital*. He used it, however, in a completely different sense: the term actually stood for the capitalists.

Another symbolic representation of Dracula was omitted in the 1958: is the clash between the old world and modernity. The story is firmly set to the past and both Dracula and the other characters share the same social status. This may again be due to the fact that the screenwriter aimed to make the character domesticated. "Dracula himself becomes a more disturbing figure, disturbing not despite his being closer to home but rather because of it" (Hutchings 45). Gone is Dracula's motif to invade the land, which is otherwise present in both the 1931 film and the novel. Dracula does not want to move to England, he does not take numerous boxes with him. His only aim is to find a replacement for his dead bride and return back to his comfortable house. As Hutchings suggests: "far from being the alien invader he is in Stoker's novel and to a certain extent in the 1931 Universal-Lugosi film, this Dracula emerges as someone whose major crime is a lack of respect for property rights" (Hutchings 76).

Dracula still is in a sense a sexual predator, yet the women whom he attacks are willing to undergo the act of him sucking their blood. In addition, as they change, they seem to act differently. In the novel, when Mina is bitten by Dracula, she considers herself unclean. In the 1958 film, both Lucy and Mina try to mystify the

men trying to protect them: "the Count also bestows on these woman an ability to dissimulate, to play the role of 'good woman', with these deceptive performances directed primarily at men" (Hutchings 65).

4.5 The 1979 Handsome Dracula

Before this thesis is going to deal with another significant adaptation of the novel, one also has to acknowledge an earlier film. *Dracula* (Universal, 1979) introduced several features of Dracula's personality, which were later developed in the 1992 film.

Dracula's look in this version remains similar to the already established one of Bela Lugosi. As for the supernatural elements, the animalistic side of the character is present, unlike the 1958 Hammer version, as there is a scene where Dracula is changed into a wolf. Hypnotism is portrayed as well, with a change from the side of Langella, who no longer uses his eyes in order to do so but raises his hand as a form a command. For the first time ever, a fairly effective scene of the Count crawling like a lizard upside down the castle wall is presented. What the character lacks, similarly as in the 1931 film, are fangs. Langella also refused to wear them, because he wanted the character to be less monstrous (*The Revamping of Dracula*).

A major change, however, lies within the personality of the character. As Langella explains in a documentary film about the shooting of the film: "I understood him as a Gothic hero" (*The Revamping of Dracula*). Dracula in this version does not seem to be happy with his fate. In the scene where he comments on the wolf's howling, the script adds an extra word, which establishes the character as rather lonely and isolated: "the children of the night, what sad music they make" (*Dracula*, 1979). The 1979 Dracula's motivation is to find a companion. He is, unlike Lugosi and Lee, very romantic. He invites Lucy to have dinner with him and before he bites her, he almost seems to comfort her stating: "I need your blood" (*Dracula*, 1979). The bite is hidden from the audience's eyes and the act of sucking the blood is referred to by critics as "vampire wedding". It is no longer a violent act but a rather passionate encounter, where Dracula undresses himself as if he was a passionate lover in a romantic film. The erotic atmosphere is even emphasized by

red lighting. Langella represents a vampire who wants to be loved. "Lugosi was anomalous and unmateable; the sympathetic Langella flows into mortal women. He and Lucy first explore their attraction by dancing together, a communion unimaginable in 1931" (Auerbach 141). Auerbach also comments on the fact that, in contrast to Hammer's vampires, Langella is somewhere between an angel and an animal, "emotionally complex and stealing from Van Helsing the role of knower but adding a tenderness and ineffable sorrow human beings have become too monstrous to comprehend" (Auerbach 131).

As a consequence, very little violence is portrayed in the 1979 film. The only instance in which Dracula appears to be evil and severe is in the destruction scene. The 1979 version introduced the character as a historical figure as well, connecting him to his heritage in the scene where he speaks his native language. The historical connection with Vlad Tepes was used probably due to a book on his life, published in 1972 and titled *In Search of Dracula* (See Skal 266), which stimulated the interest of the public. As for the reasoning of such treatment of the character, the symbolic representation of the vampire should be considered. In his book on vampire film, Weinstock claims the following: "the vampire in twentieth-century cinema generally acts as a sort of generic metaphor for social otherness or outsiderdom" (Weinstock 119). Indeed, the modern Count is understood as one who is isolated from the society and who desperately seeks companionship.

This film version did not prove to be successful in the end. The audience was not ready for such concept yet, that is Dracula as a romantic lover. Critics claim that it was also due to the fact that Dracula was not frightening enough, a feature that the audience seemed to appreciate most. As suggested in *The Revamping of Dracula*, the film started to attract the contemporary audience, however. This may be due to the fact that contemporary cinema often shows the vampire characters as the positive ones⁵ and the audience is used to see a vampire as a protagonist.

⁵ One may think of Louis in *Interview with the Vampire* (1994), Selene in *Underworld* (2003) or the most current and rather controversial Edward in *Twilight* (2008).

5 A Modern Vision

This chapter is going to deal with the more or less current film adaptations of Dracula. Francis Ford Coppola's 1992 version is actually called *Bram Stoker's Dracula*. The name is quite misleading, since this adaptation differs significantly not only from the previous version but from the novel as well. The name *Dracula: The Untold Story*, which was the name of the original script (see Skal 277) might have actually been more fitting, while several changes were made concerning the character of the Count. Despite the fact that the screenwriter James V. Hart based the film primarily on the novel, several scenes were added to the plot in order to present a new and different Dracula. According to a documentary film dealing with the shooting of the film, however, the book was read aloud by the actors prior to shooting in order to familiarize with the character as described in the novel. Gary Oldman, who portrayed Dracula in this version, similarly as the other actors, was allowed to suggest changes to the script. He is also being described as quite rebellious when it comes to his acting, which may be also attributed to his performance and the changes within the character of Dracula.

5.1 Dracula of Many Faces in the 1992 Film

Similarly as in the previous chapters, Dracula's look in the 1992 film will be covered first. The novel presents Dracula as an old man, who grows younger and is able to shift forms into an animal or an entity. It was already mentioned in the previous chapter that all the 1931, 1958 and 1979 versions violate this by narrowing down the number of his looks. In contrast, *Bram Stoker's Dracula* presents Dracula of many different faces. The look is very important in this version of Dracula. It presents a character that is no longer narrow as Lugosi but actually quite complex. In addition, as Dunbar notes: "The designs of Dracula's costumes were intended to emphasize his androgynous quality. He is a complex character who has many sides mentally and physically. His true self is not easily revealed, and we are unsure whether he is male, female, animal, devil or angel" (48). Dracula's look varies from an old man with a very female-like hair, a young, mustached warrior or a young

attractive gentleman to a wolf, an actual mist or a mass of rats. Moreover, the character becomes something in between those two: half human, half monster. Coppola definitely aimed to differentiate Dracula from the previous versions. As Dunbar suggests: "Coppola liked the way the script stuck to the novel, but they agreed that a compelling theme was needed to engage audiences who were tired of period horror and familiar with traditional images of Dracula to the point of boredom" (58).

The variation of costumes and the overall appearance of the character allowed him to change and secondly, as Dunbar suggests: "the colours were significant. Dracula was given the color of scarlet, white, black and gold" (45). Indeed, in the 1992 film, costumes were essential to Coppola, who actually invested the majority of his finances into them. The costumes were designed by a Japanese designer named Eiko Ishioka. Ishioka aimed to make costumes which reflected the dualism of the character and were heavily symbolic. In a short extra on the DVD, Eiko claims she had never seen a Dracula film before, which is probably why she gave up the lounge lizard look completely in this film. She also points out that she understands Dracula as a creature that is not quite out of this world. "Is he a man or a woman? Is he young or old? Is he a beast or human? What is this one?" (*The Costumes are the Sets: The design of Eiko Ishioka*).

To set an example of the symbolism of the costume, the long red gown which Dracula is wearing as an old man floats behind him and reminds one of floating blood. Similarly, as Dracula dies with Mina next to him, he wears a gold gown that was inspired by a Gustav Klimt painting called "the Kiss". Another costume that emphasizes Dracula's androgynous quality is his armor, which looks like human musculature but has a helmet in a shape of a dog's head. Ishioka claimed that she wanted to show a Dracula who is extraordinary even if he is still human.

Throughout the whole film, despite the fact that the filmmakers aimed to make it either truthful to the novel or bring innovations, there are several references to earlier vampire films or horror films in general. Dracula again has an accent in this version, an undoubtable reference to the 1931 film. He has red eyes in one of the shots, similar to those of Christopher Lee. The historical character of Vlad Tepes and

the motif of reincarnation was also already used in a 1978 BBC television adaptation. Oldman's dandy look in London is fairly similar to the vampires in *The Hunger* (MGM/United Artists, 1983). Here, one has to realize that Coppola as a director comes from a new generation. He studied university in order to become a director and even if he aimed to create something new and different, he knew all the previous versions. Indeed, critics agree upon the fact that Coppola aimed to pay homage to previous films that he liked. The influence of the previous films on *Dracula* were, therefore, more a of a tribute than copying.

5.2 The Complex Character in the 1992 Film

Dracula's numerous looks are tightly connected to his personality and the effect it casts on the audience. The more human version is clearly sympathetic to the audience and the more distorted, animal-like image is rather making the audience uncomfortable, repulsed or even horrified. It was already mentioned that Coppola wanted to introduce a new image. As a consequence, several elements were added to the story. The film remains truthful to the novel when it comes to Dracula's evil side. He rapes and he kills without mercy. Coppola actually encouraged Oldman to frighten the fellow actors in unexpected situations. Dracula's lust for blood in this version is, however, still fairly limited, as his primary motif is to find love. As Skal suggests that the innovation of the character lies in the struggle between love and hate.

One of the most important changes in terms of the character is the fact that the audience first meets him when he is still human. For the first time ever, Dracula's past is revealed to the audience, explaining why, how and when he became a vampire. Dracula is no longer a blood thirsty monster but a wronged man, whose beloved wife committed suicide as she thought he was killed in the war. "By showing how Dracula's wife died and his subsequent rejection of God, we are prepared for the ending where he finds his lost love and is therefore redeemed" (Dunbar 36). As a consequence, Kane places the film into the 'Sympathetic Cycle' which differs it from *The Horror of Dracula* and the 1979 *Dracula*. As for the reasoning, he contrasts the film's establishing shots. As mentioned above, the 1992

film was based on the novel in which the Count is not sympathetic. The establishing shot in it, however, presents Dracula as a human as opposed to the 1979 version where Dracula is a half wolf who violently murders the crew of a ship. Similarly, Dracula becomes a repulsive creature as he dies in the 1979 version. In contrast, he changes into his human form again in Coppola's version in order to show that he was redeemed through love, was forgiven and can die in peace.

Dracula in the 1992 is also sympathetic to the audience, because there are scenes in which he seems to oppose his animal urges as a vampire. He expresses regret over his curse, considers himself damned and seems reluctant to feed from Mina and change her into a vampire. Coppola's Dracula loves, is capable of love and is loved back. It is no coincidence that the film's subtitle states: "Love never dies." Similarly as in the 1979 film, a line was added to the script, which suggests a shift from the character in the novel. In the scene where one of the brides mentions that Dracula never loved and never loves, Dracula answers: "Yes, I too can love. And I shall love again" (*Bram Stoker's Dracula*). In fact, the love story between Dracula and Mina was added because the studio pushed Coppola into that direction. With the success of Disney's *Beauty and the Beast* (1991), the audience seemed to be responding well to such concept. Moreover, the love story also functions as a structuring device of the film. Dracula's quest to England is no longer that of revenge but of love, his actual becoming of a vampire is because of love to Elisabeta, who reincarnates as Mina. He is redeemed through love not faith as in the book, and it is Mina who kills Dracula in the film.

As a consequence, the love story and the sympathetic tendency within the character of Dracula allows him to express emotions. For the first time in a *Dracula* adaptation, he cries, even if his tears are made of blood. He acts tenderly towards Mina, being polite to her, asking her to accompany him into a cinematograph. He does not hypnotize her to do so. Similarly as in the 1979 version, it is Mina's will to be with him. Moreover, in the scene where Dracula attacks a man in a shape of a wolf, the audience literally watches the attack through his eyes. As was already mentioned in the chapter dedicated to the novel, Dracula is the only character whose mind remains hidden. Coppola's Dracula not only lets the audience to sympathize

with the character but also understand what he feels. Similar theme is present in a 1976 novel, written by Anne Rice called *Interview with the Vampire*, which established a completely new vampire figure. The central character in the book named Louis tells a story of him becoming a vampire. The innovation that Rice brought to the plot is the fact that Louis does not want to be a vampire and does not want to prey on human beings. Similarly, as Gary Oldman describes his portrayal of Dracula: "he is a fallen angel" (*Blood is the Life - The Making of Bram Stoker's Dracula*). Vampirism in the film is, similarly to Rice's novel, understood as a curse. Rice's book, an international bestseller, undoubtedly served as an inspiration for Coppola's film. Louis, however, never wants to kill anyone, whereas Dracula only does not want to hurt Mina and other characters do not seem to be significant to him. Lucy serves as his revenge, as he kills her when he hears the news of Mina and Jonathan's wedding.

Violence and sexuality is openly pictured in the film and Dracula not only sucks the blood from the victim, he also has a sexual intercourse with Lucy when he does so. The film shows everything violent and sexual, which is present in the novel. In contrast to the previous films discussed in this thesis, the film shows the act of sucking the blood and the actual penetration of the fangs. Moreover, the possible interpenetrations introduced by the critics in the 1980s are portrayed as well, such as the already mentioned intercourse with Lucy. There is also scene where Dracula lures Mina and Lucy into a park during the storm he creates. When they run in the garden, they actually kiss each other. Sexual liberation is, for that reason, an obvious reference in the film as well. In Coppola's film, blood and sexuality are intertwined: "In spite of sexual metaphor of thirst for blood, Dracula's desires are more closely aligned with progenitive lineage than romantic sexuality. In Coppola's Dracula, sex is blood, blood is lineage, and lineage is romantic love." (Campbell, Corbin 43)

5.3 The Modern Dracula in the 1992 Film

When it comes to supernatural abilities and the vampire figure as such, the film remains truthful to the novel. Similarly as the 1979 version, Dracula's lizard-like crawl on the wall is portrayed as well as him becoming a mist or various kinds of

animals: a wolf, a bat and rats. In some instances, Dracula actually seems to be even more powerful than he is in the book, for example when he makes the cross to catch fire. Hypnotism is preset as well, this time only more subtle. One scene displays Dracula's eyes shining in the sky, another an erotic scene in a cinematograph portrays a hypnotized Mina, drinking absinthe and having a vision. There is also an addition to the character as Dracula vividly casts a shadow, a feature that is not present in the novel. Not only that Dracula seems to cast a shadow, the shadow itself seems to have a life of its own. In the scene where Harker shaves himself, the shadow seems to strangle him with its long hands. Dunbar suggests that Coppola uses it in order to establish the character as a master of dark (see Dunbar 41). The shade is also an obvious reference to Murnau's *Nosferatu*.

It is interesting that the supernatural abilities in the 1992 version are the most explicit and truthful to the novel when, as Coppola wanted to make the film low-budgeted, the tricks used were fairly basic and no computer technology was used. Coppola invested the majority of the money into the costumes, which proved to be successful in creating the terrifying atmosphere. One should also consider the censorship in this version, as it relaxed considerably since the 1950s. The rating system prevailed and the film was rated an "R", which, ironically, excluded the aimed audience. It is no coincidence that not only Dracula but the whole crew is considerably younger than in the previous films, right because the aimed audience was younger as well. In contrast to the 1931, which was not particularly aimed at any special group and the 1979 version which was aimed at women, the 1992 version was aimed at both sexes and those between the age of 15 - 24, which proved to be the biggest group of cinema goers (see Dunbar 288 for detail). In another words, Coppola and the studio created the film which would please everyone. This might be seen at the character of Dracula, while he is not only younger but attractive as well. Indeed, the dualism of the character and the fact that he is almost a hybrid seems to work in the sense that at least some aspect of him will be appealing to the audience. Dracula is a passionate and caring lover but he is also a strong, brave warrior, who is immortal but lethal. Indeed, the audience of the 1990s was "raised on a diet of anti-heroes" (Dunbar 75). The combination proved to be a successful

formula, while in contrast to the 1979 film, the audience loved it and *Bram Stoker's Dracula* is by this day the most successful and the most earning vampire film in the history of Hollywood.

Another topic associated with youth culture and one that was probably adapted from *Interview with the Vampire*, is the symbolism of vampirism as a sexual disease. As was already mentioned in the previous chapter, the metaphorical representation changed from film to film, originating in the novel itself as a metaphor for syphilis. The 1992 film shows a scene where Dracula drinks the blood and as he does so, imagery of blood cells are intercut into it. It is undoubtedly a reference to a sexual disease: AIDS.

The 1992 film shows Dracula as an invader and remains truthful to the novel in that aspect. Immigration was and actually still is an issue in the USA, mainly from Mexico and other southern American countries during the 1990s (see Dunbar 72). This tension crystallized into an Immigration Bill of 1995, which limited the number of immigrants from 800,000 to 500,000 a year (ibid). It is important to mention that for the first time in the history of Dracula adaptations, Coppola decided to introduce all the characters which are originally in the book. Dunbar argues that this is a significant reference to an eastern tyrant named Saddam Hussein, while the film presents a Dutch scientist, a British gentleman and an American adventurer working together against the evil from the East.

The discussion of the novel in the second chapter already established the fact that Dracula stands for the barbarian and the foreign and clashes with the modern world. Coppola introduces a new perspective on such symbolism. Dracula comes from the natural world and he masters it. In the establishing scene, where Dracula is in the battlefield, he "speaks in ancient tongues and receives visions telepathically, suggesting that the premoderns possessed mysterious supernatural powers" (Campbell, Corbin 42). Science is an effective tool against Dracula in the novel. In contrast, it is no longer an effective weapon in the 1992 film. Van Helsing himself suggests that science is of no help and remains rather skeptical. One of the scenes in Dracula's castle in Transylvania shows his cabinet filled with chemicals, where liquid drops upside down, which suggests that Dracula himself knows more about the

world of science than the men in London do. In terms of science, Dracula seems to be immune. "The blood of three men cannot save Lucy, just as their three ideologies of modernity - scientism, capitalism, and colonialism - cannot conquer nature" (Campbell, Corbin 44).

The film shows Christianity as both part of Dracula's past and present self. In contrast to the book, Dracula's hate towards the church is explained. In a scene where Mina sucks blood from Dracula's chest, he spreads his hands in a crucified-like manner. This might be understood as reference to baptism. Coppola shows imagery that reflects the Holy Communion. Through blood, Mina is accepted into Dracula's world as are Christians, through wine, welcomed to Christianity.

It is undoubtedly true that the 1992 Dracula is very different. As Dunbar notes: "Although Gary Oldman felt obliged to keep the heavy accent made famous by Lugosi, everything else has changed" (32). Oldman's performance and Coppola's vision created a Dracula for the young audience, one that grows more powerful and more beautiful, who changes tears into diamonds and lets you stroke a wolf's head, whose love is eternal and who will never die.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the character of Dracula changed immensely during the century. The image present in the original novel written by Stoker in 1897 does not fully correspond with the current idea of what a vampire character looks like. This thesis showed that the original physical appearance of Count Dracula was altered in the 1931 version with Bela Lugosi, who was the first Dracula to wear the famous cape on screen. Lugosi also changed the character as opposed to the novel, as his English is accented. It was also due to the massive spectatorship and success of the film, which made this particular image of Dracula so familiar to the audience. It was not only this version, however, which helped to establish the icon that we know today. The 1958 Hammer film named *Horror of Dracula* was also very influential. As this film was not as limited in terms of depicting violence, this film is the first one to show fangs on screen. The 1958 film presents Dracula as much more physical and passionate, which was later adopted in the 1979 *Dracula* and the 1992 *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, where the character becomes a romantic hero. The 1992 film, in addition, presented a dualistic Dracula, half human, half animal, both damned and loved.

The thesis also showed that the character of vampire is very changeable and may metaphorically represent several things. In the novel, sexual liberation and the fight against the barbaric should be mentioned. The novel presented the Count that the reader despises. Similarly, Dracula in the 1931 film is also essentially evil. He is not as animalistic anymore and definitely less supernatural. The audience seemed to be attracted by a glamorous persona, which provided social catharsis during the Great Depression. The somewhat humanized appearance is present in the 1958 film as well. In this version, Dracula is no longer a foreign invader. He is domesticated, mainly due to the fear of communism during the Cold War. The audience was advised to be aware of the treat that may be hiding in their own house. By 1992, the audience was almost bored with the over familiar image of the Count in the black cape. Francis Ford Coppola presented the Count of many faces and, similarly to the 1979 *Dracula* with Frank Langella, the audience tends to sympathize with him. Coppola's *Dracula* was altered in this respect also because the film aimed to attract as many viewers as possible. The fact that the character's past is revealed and his

motivation explained makes him less evil. The modern Dracula is emotional, he is lonely and isolated. The quest for blood in the novel becomes a quest for love.

7 Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá postavou hraběte Drákuly a jejím zobrazením v románu Brama Stokera z roku 1897 a v několika filmových adaptacích. Jejím cílem je zkoumat příčiny nesrovnalostí a změn ve filmových adaptacích, které ovlivnily současnou všeobecnou představu o tom, jak postava Drákuly vypadá a jaké má povahové vlastnosti.

V první kapitole byla čtenáři vysvětlena vhodnost takového výzkumu. Drákula je považován za jednu z nejzobrazovanějších postav na filmovém plátně. V současnosti žijeme s určitou představou o tom, jak Drákula vypadá. Každé dítě, i přes to, že nevidělo film ani nečetlo knihu, ví, kdo je Drákula, ví, že spí v rakvi a sají krev dlouhými tesáky. Drákula pronikl do populární kultury, známe ho z reklam, seriálů a Halloweenských masek. Postava upíra v sobě skrývá vlastnosti, které jsou pro čtenáře či diváka jak přitažlivé, tak odpudivé. Drákula je, alespoň tedy v románu a v prvních adaptacích, záporná postava. Jako předtavitel netvora je jeho zničení symbolem překonání divákovy strachu. Má však také vlastnosti, které divák ocení: nesmrtelný život, věčné mládí a nadpřirozené schopnosti. Díky těmto vlastnostem je postava Drákuly náchylná ke změnám a nejen jeho podoba ale i povaha se tak v každém filmovém zpracování liší.

V druhé kapitole byla čtenáři předtavena postava v knižní předloze. Ve čtyřech částech byl postupně popsán jeho vzhled, povaha, nadpřirozené schopnosti a co představuje metaforicky. Čtenáři bylo objasněno, že na rozdíl od současné představy o muži v černém obleku s kápí, je Drákula v knize bezcitný, ne příliš atraktivní tvor se zvířecími rysy. Je zlý a touží po čerstvé krvi a moci. Má mnoho nadpřirozených schopností. Je třeba zmínit, že v knize pro Drákulu nejsou sluneční paprsky nijak škodlivé a jeho tělo nevrhá stín, a to z toho důvodu, že ve filmu byly tyto vlastnosti změněny. Metaforicky představuje Drákula v románu hlavně hrozbu pro patriarchální společnost. Zmíněn byl také fakt, že přichází jako barbarský cizinec z východu, který se rozhodl dobýt moderní Londýn. Drákula je v románu představen jako nepřítel křesťanství, jehož lze porazit vírou a pevnou mužskou rukou.

Třetí kapitola se věnuje již prvním filmovým zpracováním. Hlavní důraz je kladen na film *Dracula* z roku 1931. Kapitola je opět rozdělena na části, které se

zabývají podobou, povahou, nadpřirozenými schopnostmi a metaforickým zobrazením. Čtenáři je objasněn fakt, že podoba Drákuly, jejímž hereckým představitel je maďar Bela Lugosi, je ovlivněna divadelní hrou. Drákula se mění v elegantního muže se znatelným akcentem. Na ten je upozorněno z toho důvodu, že se stal jednou z typických vlastností v dnešní představě o Drákulovi a ve velké většině následujících adaptací. Co se vymyká dnešní představě o postavě upíra je fakt, že Drákula v tomto filmu nemá tesáky. Dále pak film značně ovlivnila cenzura, jež nedovolovala zobrazení jakéhokoli násilí. Jedinou nadpřirozenou vlastností, která je vcelku efektivní je Drákulova schopnost hypnotizovat. Výsledkem je potom pro současného diváka nepřiliš strašidelná či odpuzující postava. Zde je také upozorněno na to, že *Dracula* byl prvním hororem, jež obsahoval nevysvětlenou nadpřirozenou stránku, a tak byl pro diváka ve třicátých letech děsivý už z tohoto důvodu. Stejně jako v knize představuje Drákula hrozbu z východu. Mnoho kritiků se shoduje, že také představuje samotnou finanční krizi. Diváci si postavu oblíbili, hlavně proto, že je jeho exotický vzhled a persona dokázaly odpoutat od každodenních starostí.

Čtvrtá kapitola se zabývá adaptací z roku 1958 s názvem *Horror of Dracula*. Zmiňuje změnu v chování Drákuly a co se týče vzhledu, poukazuje na to, že kostýmy byly jasně přežaty z verze s Belou Lugosim. Tvůrci samotní se snažili u této adaptace od zavedeného ztvárnění odlišit. Diváci již byli s Lugosihou verzí dobře obeznámeni, jelikož film byl mezi prvními, které v 50. letech začali dávat televizi. *Horror of Dracula* představuje Drákulu, který je mnohem víc energický a namísto hypnózy využívá fyzické síly. Většina nadpřirozených schopností, kterými Drákula disponuje v knize v tomto filmu nejsou zobrazeny. Tvůrci totiž usilovali o to, aby byl Drákula jistým způsobem domestifikován. Diváci jsou zaskočeni jeho perfektní angličtinou a dobrým vystupováním, ale jakmile Drákula poprvé zaútočí, mění se v běsnící monstrum, které do konce filmu nepormluví. *Horror of Dracula* je také prvním filmem, který přestavil tesáky, které se od té doby objevují ve skoro každém filmu o upírech. Metaforicky pak Drákula v této adaptaci hlavně představuje hrozbu komunismu, během studené války často zobrazovaném tématu ve filmu, především sci-fi. Drákulovy ženské oběti jsou odhodlány se mu dobrovolně poddat a jakmile jsou infikovány vampirismem, na rozdíl od románu i předchozí verze s Lugosim se

necítí být poskvrněny. Drákula už nefiguruje jako osvoboditel ženské sexuality, ale jako šířitel závislosti. Ke konci kapitoly je ještě zmíněna adaptace s názvem *Dracula* z roku 1979, zejména pro romantické elementy, jež byly plně rozvinuty v pozdějších adaptacích.

Náplní páté kapitoly je film s názvem *Bram Stoker's Dracula* z roku 1992. I přes jméno autora v názvu filmu se i tato adaptace liší od knižní předlohy. V tomto filmu nemá Drákula na rozdíl od předchozích adaptací jen jednu tvář. Jeho podoba se mění několikrát během filmu. Coppolovým cílem bylo předtavit nového Drákulu, takového, kterého je těžké zařadit. Jeho podoba je čistě lidská a přitažlivá, ale ve scénách, kde útočí je naopak zvířecí. Co se týče nadpřirozených schopností, Coppolův film je jako první věrný knižní předloze. Drákula je komplexní postavou a mění se pro účely příběhu, v němž je hlavní zápletkou milostný vztah. Vztah Drákuly a Elisabethy či její inkarnace v podobě Miny je pojátkem k pochopení Drákulovy minulosti a příčiny jeho prokletí. Poprvé divák poznává Drákulu v době, kdy je ještě člověkem a po jeho smrti z rukou jeho milované je spasen. Barbarství v knižní předloze je v Coppolově filmu oslavováno. Drákula ovládá divoké vlky, slzy mění v perly a se svou láskou se dorozumívá telepaticky. Věda a patriarchální nadvláda již proti němu nejsou účinnou zbraní. Tvůrci filmu se snažili přilákat do kin diváky, kteří do kina chodí nejčastěji a proto je Drákula předatven hercem mnohem mladším než byli jeho předchůdci. Celkově postava funguje tak, aby se zalíbila široké škále publika. Je to nesmrtelný milenec jež nabízí věčnou lásku, ale i silný a nebojácny bojovník.

8 Abstrakt

- *Autor:* Hana Zámečníčková
- *Název fakulty a katedry:* Filozofická fakulta, Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
- *Název práce:* Proměna postavy hraběte Drákuly během století
- *Vedoucí práce:* PhDr. Libor Práger, Ph.D
- *Počet stran:* 51
- *Počet znaků:* 76 977
- *Počet příloh:* 0
- *Počet titulů použité literatury:* 16
- *Klíčová slova:* Drákula, Bram Stoker, adaptace, proměny postavy, Hollywood
- *Popis:* Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá postavou hraběte Drákuly v románu Brama Stokera z roku 1897 a jeho ztvárněním v několika filmových adaptacích. Cílem této práce je nejenom tato ztvárnění s románem porovnat, ale také vysvětlit jak a proč se liší od současné obecné představy o tom jak Drákula vypadá, kterou diváci získali z reklam či Halloweenských masek. Každá Drákulova inkarnace představuje několik nových nebo odlišných vlastností, které souvisí s cenzurou, požadavky diváků a záměry filmových tvůrců. Tyto změny jsou také ovlivněny historickým a společenským pozadím doby, v níž byl film natočen. Jelikož je Drákula jednou z nejméně zobrazovaných postav s kořeny v literatuře, je možné jeho proměny sledovat během celého posledního století.

9 Abstract

- *Author:* Hana Zámečníčková
- *Faculty and Department:* Philosophical Faculty, Department of English and American Studies
- *Title:* The Metamorphosis of the Character of Count Dracula during the Century
- *Supervisor:* PhDr. Libor Práger, Ph.D
- *Number of pages:* 51
- *Number of characters:* 76 977
- *Number of appendices:* 0
- *Number of references:* 16
- *Keywords:* Dracula, Bram Stoker, adaptation, character metamorphosis, Hollywood
- *Description:* This bachelor thesis is concerned with the character of Count Dracula in the 1897 novel written by Bram Stoker and its portrayal in several film adaptations. The aim of this thesis is not only to compare the portrayals with the novel but also to explain how and why they differ from the iconic image of Dracula that one knows from television commercials or Halloween celebrations. Every incarnation of Dracula presents new or different features of the character, which are altered due to censorship, the demands of the audience and the intentions of the filmmakers. It is also influenced by the historical and social background of the specific era. As Dracula is one of the most depicted characters with an origin in literature, one is able to trace the character through the whole century.

10 Works cited

- Abbott, Stacey. *Celluloid Vampires: Life after Death in the Modern World*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 2007. Print.
- Auerbach, Nina. *Our Vampires, Ourselves*. London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. Print.
- Belton, John. *American Cinema /American Culture*. Taunton: Quebecor-Book Press, 1994. Print.
- Campbell, Robert A., and Corbin Carol. "Postmodern Iconography and Perspective in Coppola's Bram Stoker's Dracula." *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 27 (1999): 40. JSTOR. Web. 28 Jul 2013.
- Clements, Susannah. *The Vampire Defanged: How the Embodiment of Evil Became a Romantic Hero*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2011.
- Dunbar, Brian. *York Film Notes: Dracula*. London: York Press, 2000. Print.
- Holte, James C. *Dracula in the Dark: The Dracula Film Adaptations*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1997. Print.
- Hutchings, Peter. *The British Film Guide: Dracula*. London: I. B. Tauris & Co., 2003. Print.
- Kane, Tim. *The Changing Vampire of Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Growth of a Genre*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2006. Print.
- Luckhurst, Roger. Introduction. *Dracula*. By Bram Stoker. New York: Oxford

University Press, 2011. Print.

Pepřík, Jaroslav. *A Guide to American Studies*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2003. Print.

Skal, David J. *Hollywood Gothic: The Tangled Web of Dracula from Novel to Stage to Screen*. New York: Faber and Faber, 2004. Print.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.

Twitchell, James B. *Dreadful Pleasures: An Anatomy of Modern Horror*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. Print.

Weinstock, Jeffrey. *The Vampire Film: Undead Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012. Print.

Wood, Robin. "Burying the Undead: The Use and Obsolescence of Count Dracula." *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*, vol. 16 no. 1-2. (1983): 175-187. JSTOR. Web. 28 Jul 2013.

11 Films cited

100 Years of Horror: Dracula and his Disciples. Dir. Ted Newsom. Youtube. Web. 12 August, 2013.

The Blood is the Life - The Making of Bram Stoker's Dracula. Dir. Kim Aubry. Youtube. Web. 12 Aug 2013.

Bram Stoker's Dracula. Dir. Francis Ford Coppola. Perf. Gary Oldman, Winona Ryder, Anthony Hopkins. Columbia Pictures, 1992. DVD.

The Costumes are the Sets: The design of Eiko Ishioka. Dir. Kim Aubry. Youtube. Web. 12 Aug 2013.

Dracula. Dir. Tod Browning. Perf. Bela Lugosi, Helen Chandler, David Manners. Universal, 1931. DVD.

Dracula. Dir. John Badham. Perf. Frank Langella, Laurence Olivier, Donald Pleasence. Universal, 1979. DVD.

Horror of Dracula. Dir. Terence Fischer. Perf. Christopher Lee, Peter Cushing, Michael Gough. Hammer Film Productions, 1958. DVD.

The Revamping of Dracula. Dir. Laurent Bouzereau. Youtube. Web. 12 Aug 2013.

The Road to Dracula. Dir. David J. Skal. Universal, 1999. DVD.

Vampires: Why They Bite. Dir. Ray Easmon. British Broadcasting Corporation, 2010. Television documentary. Web. 11 Aug. 2013.