



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

문학석사 학위논문

Spurting Blood and Mingling Tears:

Bodily Fluids in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*

터져 나오는 피와 뒤섞이는 눈물:

브램 스토커의 『드라큘라』에서 나타나는 체액

2023년 8월

서울대학교 대학원

영어영문학과 문학전공

인 하 은

Spurting Blood and Mingling Tears:

Bodily Fluids in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*

지도교수 김 혜 주

이 논문을 문학석사 학위논문으로 제출함
2023년 8월

서울대학교 대학원
영어영문학과 문학전공
인 하 은

인하은의 문학석사 학위논문을 인준함
2023년 8월

위 원 장 _____ 조선정 (인)

부위원장 _____ 한서린 (인)

위 원 _____ 김혜주 (인)

Abstract

This thesis explores Bram Stoker's *Dracula* focusing on the representation of bodily fluids. Taking one step further from the traditional perception that reads female bodies as porous, this thesis suggests that *Dracula* portrays all bodies as porous and channels for fluid flow. As blood and tears burst out of the body and mingle with other fluids, relationships and boundaries between species and gender are reorganized. The boundaries between human characters and nonhuman vampires become dismantled while new relationships between female characters and the vampire hunters emerge with overflowing blood and tears. By identifying where blood and tears are represented and omitted in the novel, this thesis attempts to demonstrate the human characters' futile attempts to control and contain bodily fluids.

The first chapter examines how physicians censor the depiction of blood in medical scenes while dramatizing the excessive nature of the blood-sucking vampires. The key element constituting the vampires' monstrosity is the vampires' consumption of human blood. Ironically, the physician's ghastly medical practices in the novel also eerily mirror the vampires' monstrous appetite. Focusing on the uneven representations of blood, this chapter discusses how the physicians anxiously attempt to control blood and differentiate themselves from the monstrous vampires.

The second chapter considers how the vampire hunters risk their masculinity through the representation of their tears and hysterical breakdowns. While tears were regarded as private emotions in the historical context, vampire hunters repetitively burst into tears amongst each other and in Mina's company.

This chapter also locates possible relationships that emerge from communal tears. Through tears, Mina is able to renew her disrupted marriage bond with her husband and form questionable relationships with other male vampire hunters.

Keywords: *Dracula*, bodily fluids, blood, tears, vampire, gender

Student Number: 2021-21034

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction: Representing Bodily Fluids in Dracula | 1 |
| I. Bloodless Doctors and Bloody Vampire Hunters..... | 12 |
| II. Uncontrollable Tears and Unexpected Relationships | 38 |
| Conclusion | 64 |
| Works Cited | 67 |
| Abstract in Korean..... | 70 |

Introduction: Representing Bodily Fluids in *Dracula*

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is known for its vividly graphic descriptions of blood. Starting from its blood-thirsty vampires to the bloodstained victims, Stoker's *Dracula* unfolds and flows alongside blood. When Jonathan Harker witnesses Count Dracula after the latter's bloodsucking activities for the first time, Harker is horrified. Harker observes that the Count's "mouth was redder than ever" with blood and that on the Count's lips were "gouts of fresh blood" that "trickle" down the Count's body (Stoker 51). Similarly, in another equally horrifying scene, the vampire hunters watch as Lucy Westenra sucks blood from a child. Here, Lucy's former suitors witness the deadly vampirization of their once beloved. Like the Count, Lucy's lips are "crimson with fresh blood" that she sucks from the child, and this "stream" of blood "trickle[s]" over her body and white robe (196).

Blood is, however, only one of the many bodily fluids represented in Stoker's *Dracula*. In the same way blood "trickle[s]" down the vampires' mouths, tears run down the vampire hunter's faces (196). When Mina offers her sympathy to Lucy's fiancée Lord Godalming, Godalming becomes so emotional that tears "rain" down from his face (214). This scene portraying Godalming's tears is followed by a similar scene in which Mina comforts Quincey Morris. Once again, when Mina comforts Quincey, we soon find Quincey's eyes also brimming with tears.

As these scenes suggest, Bram Stoker's *Dracula* drips with blood and tears. This representation of bodily fluids in *Dracula* starkly deviates from the Victorian era's emphasis on containing and concealing bodily fluids. Pamela Gilbert argues that the "masculinized" individuality in the nineteenth century depended on a

“contained” body that could contain bodily fluids within oneself and control them from leaking out (134). Accordingly, the body was also imagined as a “little human house” that must retain rigid boundaries (qtd. in Durbach 113). This obsession with containing fluids within the body also means that any fluid that escapes the body, such as blood or excretion, is deemed improper and even threatening to another body (Gilbert 57).

However, not all Victorian bodies were expected to be equally well-contained, and the discourse on bodily fluids has been gendered throughout history. Women’s bodies were generally thought to be “leaking” or “seeping,” especially in reference to menstruation and breastmilk. Therefore, in the Victorian context, the term “leaking” positions the female body as a faulty or, in this case, an incontinent body (Longhurst 2). Supporting this gendered aspect of bodily fluids, Gilbert observes that visible bodily fluids were understood as signs of “lack of self-control, femininity, and madness” (134). In the Victorian standard, leaking bodily fluids would indicate effeminacy.

No wonder many critics have long read bodily fluids, especially blood, in *Dracula*, alongside discussing male agency and female passivity. One of the most notable readings of *Dracula* concerns Lucy’s blood transfusion as a perverted sexual penetration of the female body (Kibbie 198, Craft 125), where blood substitutes semen (Zwart 25). By reading blood transfusion as a sexual penetration, many critics focus on the gender of the two participants: the penetrating male donor who injects the fluid and the helpless female recipient who passively absorbs the fluid (Kibbie 198). Craft further suggests that the gendered flow of bodily fluids, where blood is injected into and sucked out of the female body, relegates the female body as

helplessly passive under male control (116). Norbert Lennartz labels Lucy as the “passive and leaking vessel” that is “filled by male fluids” container (165). The female body becomes prone to leak bodily fluids due to its penetrable porosity and becomes a mixed container of male and female bodily fluids (Lennartz 165).

To follow up with the previous scholarship on gender and bodily fluids, this thesis further attempts to complicate the frame of gender by focusing on the uncontrollable fluidity of bodily fluids that disrupts the traditional boundaries of gender. This thesis argues that bodily fluids are represented as uncontrollable in *Dracula* and that characters repetitively fail to contain and control the blood and tears in and around them. To develop this argument, I primarily use the discourse of leaky body, which discusses the body as a porous container that naturally cannot contain bodily fluids. Beyond reading the female body as exclusively porous, however, I intend to expand the Victorian concept of the leaky body to suggest that all bodies in *Dracula* are mediums for fluid flow. I argue that this lack of agency over their bodily fluids further means that while certain characters try to control the representation of bodily fluids through various narrative censorship, blood, and tears still seep through and eventually reveal themselves. Analyzing the ways in which blood and tears are represented, omitted, and eventually revealed, I demonstrate how the various attempts to control bodily fluids are undermined. Fluids are penetrative, and boundaries are porous in *Dracula*.

Throughout *Dracula*, vampires like the Count and Lucy are represented as monsters that must be destroyed. Many critics locate the monstrosity in the vampires’ parasitical diet of feeding on human blood (Senf 75; Almond 229). *Dracula* repetitively accentuates the vampires’ monstrosity through their detailed and visible

representation of the vampires' "bloodstained" victims and "blood-dripping" mouths (Stoker 199; 262).

Reading the representation of blood in *Dracula* alongside the concept of monstrosity is significant because the vampires' consumption of blood is not the only representation of blood in the novel. *Dracula* also introduces physicians who constantly handle blood through their bloody medical procedures, such as blood transfusions and surgeries. Many critics have already discussed the questionable similarities between the monstrous vampires and physicians battling these vampires in their similar association with blood. Some critics suggest that the blood-sucking Count, for instance, can be read alongside Van Helsing, who performs a blood transfusion. In the same way that the Count sucks the blood out of the female body, Van Helsing injects blood into the female body (Jann 276). Ann Louise Kibbie even argues that the vampire and physician can be read as doubles similarly competing to control a female body (201).

Nevertheless, I would rather suggest that physicians and vampires are not always represented as doubles in *Dracula*. Although physicians also handle blood in *Dracula*, Seward's diary entries omit the visible representation of blood in scenes depicting the patient's sickbed and the physician's medical procedures. In his diary, Seward breezes through the blood transfusions and surgery by summarizing the procedures with no visible representation of the blood involved. In Seward's censored diary entry of the blood transfusion, there is no reference to how blood is taken from the donor's body and injected into the patient's body. Following established discourse on the similarities between the physicians and the vampires, I focus specifically on the bloodless medical scenes in contrast to the bloody vampire

scenes. I expand the argument that the vampires and physicians are doubles by suggesting that because they appear as doubles, Seward's diary frantically censors blood from the medical scenes to differentiate physicians from the blood-dripping vampires.

In addition to the omission of blood in medical scenes, I will also discuss the censorship of tears and emotions in *Dracula*. After listening to Seward's anguished grief through his phonograph entries, Mina offers to censor out his emotions by typewriting the diary entry. Shedding tears or expressing emotions in front of others was considered to be effeminate in Victorian society because men were expected to control their tears and emotions in order to maintain masculinity (Begiato 46). Out of sympathy for Seward's grief and masculinity, Mina offers to hide his agonized voice from others.

However, I argue that this fervent censorship and omission eventually fail in *Dracula* because bodily fluids cannot be fully controlled. Even when Seward tries to censor the blood and violence from his diary entries, his diary still betrays the blood-filled episodes where the vampire hunters, including the physicians, murderously behead Lucy and the vampire brides in the graveyard. By confessing the questionable practices, the physicians partake in as "butcher work," *Dracula* ultimately portrays the physicians to be as monstrous and violent as their vampire counterparts (Stoker 344). The omission and eventual representation of blood in Seward's diary entries expose the physicians' anxiety about the representation of blood.

Tears in *Dracula* are even less concealed and controlled than blood as characters constantly burst into tears to the point that some even portray symptoms

of hysteria. I read these moments of hysteria as an essential factor in understanding the uncontrollable fluidity because it is portrayed as a condition where patients lose control of their minds and bodies. Furthermore, I argue that when Van Helsing's mind fails to contain tears within his body, Van Helsing also fails to represent masculinity according to Victorian standards. Critics have long argued that female characters in *Dracula* threaten Victorian masculinity. Some argue that female vampires overturn gender norms by seducing English gentlemen (Swartz-Levine 147-148). Others focus on how Mina's man-like intelligence threatens the male vampire hunters' authority because she outsmarts them and becomes their ultimate leader (Prescott and Georgio 501; Winstead 322). I, too, argue that the collective journal entries and writings in *Dracula* challenge gender stereotypes and boundaries, but I explore how Victorian gender norms are undermined with specific reference to bodily fluids. With a close analysis of when and how tears unconsciously explode out of the characters' bodies, I demonstrate how the uncontrollable fluidity of tears reduces characters like the hysterical Van Helsing into a passive medium that displays these tears in public.

As the novel progresses, there are scenes where the representations of tears and blood are used to differentiate humans from vampires. In *Dracula*, tears are exclusive to humans. This exclusivity allows the representation of tears to define the vampire hunters as civilized, just as the representation of blood consumption labels the vampires as monstrous. Following the legacies of eighteenth-century sentimentalism, the appropriate display of emotions, including tears, signals a man to be of moral character (Kaplan 18). Thus, by displaying tears to each other and the

readers, the vampire hunters can distinguish themselves from the tearless, emotionless, and monstrous vampires.

Representation of tears and blood are also similar in that they are both signified as a form of sexual intercourse. As I have mentioned earlier, many critics have discussed how Lucy's transfusion can be read as sexual intercourse, where Lucy's passive female body becomes the medium for male penetration. Here, Lucy's body is a container for the various vampire hunters' blood to combine and mix within Lucy's veins. When the vampire hunters pledge their alliance to Mina, Seward confesses that "[w]e men were all in tears now" as they weep with and for Mina. As Mina, Harker, Lucy's former suitors, and even Van Helsing all cry, their tears mingle and mix as they unite against the Count (Stoker 287). Accordingly, blood and tears in *Dracula* can be read as the bonding substance that ties the characters together. Like Lucy's body during the transfusion, I read tears as a medium so that all the characters' bodily fluids can physically mix and create intimate and quasi-polyandric relationships amongst the vampire hunters. With this, we can note that the representation of tears in *Dracula* threatens Victorian gender norms in two ways. First, the collective journal entries emasculate the male characters by exposing the men's intimate tears and hysteria. Then, these emasculating tears create extra-marital and polyandric relationships and destabilize the Victorian ideology of marriage.

Another instance where tears redefine relationships can be seen when Mina finds herself stained with the blood of the Count and her own after their questionable blood exchange. Mina's "low wail" and "choking sobs" of sorrow are soon followed by Harker's tears as his eyes "blinked damply" (264). Not only does Harker cry together with Mina, but in this mingling of tears, Harker also reaffirms his love and

loyalty to his wife. By reaffirming their relationship through their tears, it may seem as if the reaffirmed tears-bound bond between Mina and Harker overpowers and breaks the recent blood-tied bond between Mina and the Count. However, I read these relationships created through blood and tears as evidence of Mina's porosity. The very porousness of Mina's body that allows her to be vulnerable and penetrated by the Count's scandalous blood also binds her to her lawful husband.

Consequently, Mina remains porous even after the Count's eventual death. After the vampire hunters destroy the Count, Mina's forehead becomes "stainless" as "snow" (330). However, Kuzmanovic suggests that the Count's blood continues to threaten the Victorian marriage bonds because the Count's blood remains in Mina and eventually flows into little Quincey, Mina's polyandric love child. (422). Others support this claim by arguing that in *Dracula*, "confused" bloodlines and affinities challenge Victorian monogamous patriarchy (Roth et al. 371). Therefore, the real threat of the uncontrollable bodily fluids in *Dracula* is that the attempts to control the bodily fluids are ultimately futile. The bodily fluids, against the characters' wills, constantly mix, mingle, and create non-traditional relationships that break the Victorian marriage ideology. In *Dracula*, bodily fluids flow uncontrollably, and characters become reduced to channels for the fluids to flow from one space to another.

This lack of agency over their bodily fluids becomes even more critical in discussing the circulation of the narratives in *Dracula*. Numerous critics have already argued how Mina, as a typewriter, deviates from the conventions of seeing women as "the passive object of male interpretation" and, consequently, threatens traditional gender roles (Case 224). Case claims that Mina refuses passivity through

her aims to become a journalist who “actively seeks information” and “take[s] charge of the materials” (226; 231). Jennifer Wicke, likewise, notices Mina’s agency as a typewriter by reading Mina’s increasing participation in the novel’s narration as to what makes Mina “more and more the author of the text” and her typewriting as “no means strictly secretarial” (485).

On the other hand, Jennifer Fleissner reads Mina’s typewriting as a “secretary’s duty” and “service,” where she dictates the male voice into written text (426). Fleissner reads less active agency in Mina’s role as a typist, an argument that she further augments with the suggestion that clerical work was indeed regarded as an extension to the traditional domestic environment (418).

Expanding upon Fleissner’s argument that Mina lacks agency as a typewriter, I suggest that arguing for Mina’s agency overlooks the interplay between the fluidity of blood, tears, and the narrative in *Dracula*. Instead, this thesis argues that the narrations portraying these bodily fluids are equally uncontrollable as blood and tears. Mina does not deliberately choose the contents of the typewritten papers; instead, Mina only serves as a medium who unintentionally compiles different narratives that portray blood and tears. As Case rightly points out, *Dracula* is a novel “about collecting, collating and interpreting information” (223). Only when the different narratives come together does this collection of narratives betray the doctors for the violence they commit against the vampire and exposes the vampire hunters for their emasculating tears and hysterical breakdowns. Like uncontainable fluids, this collection of narratives eventually flows and circulates from one reader to another.

The main body of this thesis is divided into two chapters. In the first chapter, I will focus on how blood is represented and omitted in *Dracula*. Focusing on the scenes depicting the vampires' sucking on human blood and the violent yet bloodless surgical scenes, I intend to read vampires and doctors as ambiguous doubles. Furthermore, I argue that Seward's narrative repeatedly illustrates the medical environment as contained and bloodless to differentiate the doctors from the vampires' monstrosity portrayed through the blood's excessive fluidity. I demonstrate this argument by carefully investigating how blood is portrayed in detail when the vampire bites a human and then analyzing how all mentions of blood are omitted when the doctors treat their patients. I will further argue that despite these attempts to censor blood in medical scenes, Seward's narration ultimately represents physicians in blood-splattering scenes as they become vampire hunters who hunt, stake, and behead vampires. Here, the equally bloody scenes blur boundaries that differentiate vampires and physicians because Seward and Van Helsing's narration depicts doctors as dissectors seeking out cadavers rather than physicians seeking to heal patients. Therefore, eventually, the uncontrollable blood emerges from censorship, and the collective narration ultimately betrays and exposes the doctors to be as violent and monstrous as their vampire doubles.

In the second chapter, I closely trace the scenes where tears are represented in *Dracula*. By following the series of emotional breakdowns exhibited by the male characters and the scenes where Mina and the vampire hunters cry together, I intend to argue that the narrative in *Dracula* refuses the Victorian gender stereotype that women are more susceptible to their emotions and tears. I will further argue that tears, when overflowing and mixing, can form and redefine relationships,

consequently binding Lucy, Mina, and the vampire hunters physically and emotionally together. Finally, I argue that the greatest threat of the uncontrollable fluidity of tears is that even Mina, the compiler and secretary of the various narratives, cannot control the narrative circulation. Instead, just as blood flows from one body to another, the exposing compilation of the tearful narratives uncontrollably flows from the vampire hunters to eventually even *Dracula's* readers.

I. Bloodless Doctors and Bloody Vampire Hunters

A vampire tale cannot be complete without oozing blood. The narrators of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, accordingly, narrate a tale overflowing with bloody scenes, including bloodsucking, staking, and transfusing blood from one character to another. Blood in *Dracula* has also been widely discussed in various aspects. For example, several critics discuss blood in terms of a character's lineage or identity. Stephen D. Arata, for example, reads the Count's Szekely bloodline and his bloody-thirsty appetite as the key to the Count's identity. This is because the Count, as a vampire, searches for new bodies to quench his thirst for blood while simultaneously, as a Szekely warrior, conquers other nations (Arata 630). The Count's conquest for blood becomes a threat to the fictional Victorian British society because the Count "deracializes his victims" by interfering with the British bloodline (qtd. in Arata 630). In other words, the Count invades foreign bodies, drinks their victim's blood, and changes their blood to share his bloodline: the vampiric lineage. In this case, the hybridity of blood in baby Quincey at the end of the novel can be understood through Bardi's suggestion that the Count "infect[s] British nationality identity" by "creating hybridity like that of his native land" (79). Similarly, Kuzmanovic claims that "since Dracula's blood runs through Mina's—and perhaps Harker's—veins, Dracula is inside the boy as well," which supports Bardi's claim that the Count has succeeded in creating the ultimate hybrid to continue his bloodline (422).

Ann Louise Kibbie, on the other hand, discusses such anxieties of uncontrollable blood in a more literal sense with historical references to Victorian transfusion. In *Transfusion*, Kibbie discusses how anxieties about blood mixing were

becoming widespread in Victorian society, especially with the development of blood transfusion. This anxiety was embedded with the misconception that transfusion creates a new kinship between the donor and the recipient. Consequently, blood transfusion in Victorian society was usually operated between husbands and wives so that the newly formed kinship only “embodies” or “intensifies” the social and traditional relationships between the donor and recipient of the blood (Kibbie 10-11). Hence, the fear of contaminated or mixed bloodlines called for blood circulation and blood to be heavily monitored and controlled.

In my reading of blood in *Dracula*, I argue that blood is an uncontrollable fluid that human characters attempt to control and fail to do so. The graphic representation of vampires feeding on human blood in *Dracula*, portraying their blood-thirsty appetite, reflects the vampires’ monstrosity compared to their human adversaries. However, physicians in *Dracula* are also no strangers to blood. Throughout the novel, Van Helsing and Seward perform blood transfusions and bloody surgical procedures on their patients. As both physicians and vampires handle blood in *Dracula*, the differences between the vampires and physicians become disturbingly ambiguous and problematic. Accordingly, the Count, who sucks blood from female bodies, and Van Helsing, who injects blood into Lucy, are also read as doubles (Jann 276; Kibbie 201).

In response to these vague similarities between the physicians and the vampires, I suggest that Seward’s narration represents the Count’s consumption of blood in graphic details and censors blood from the doctor’s medical scene. In doing so, his narration differentiates physicians from their vampire counterparts and justifies the physicians in their bloody procedures. I further argue that although

Seward omits blood from his narration in an attempt to overwrite the violence they partake in, the physician's violence still emerges to the narrative's surface because the narrators, including Seward, unconsciously confess their violence. The collective narration of the novel eventually exposes the physicians as no less violent, questionable, and monstrous than the vampires they seek to destroy.

Throughout the novel, narrators like Seward describe vampiric blood consumption in grotesque detail. In one of *Dracula's* most provocative scenes, Seward witnesses the Count forcing Mina to drink his blood:

“his right hand gripped her by the back of the neck, forcing her face down on his bosom. Her white nightdress was smeared with blood, and a thin stream trickled down the man's bare breast which was shown by his torn-open dress. The attitude of the two had a terrible resemblance to a child forcing a kitten's nose into a saucer of milk to compel it to drink. (Stoker 262)

The first thing Seward notices entering the scene is that blood is being consumed aggressively. Seward notices the forceful nature of this blood consumption where the Count “forc[es]” Mina's face “down on his bosom” and likens this scene to “forcing a kitten's nose into a saucer of milk.” However, by emphasizing how Mina drinks the blood trickling out the Count's “bare breast” and using “milk” as his comparison, Seward portrays the blood transaction between the Count and Mina as a perverted representation of breastfeeding (262).

Mina also recounts her encounter with the Count in a way that emphasizes the violent nature of the Count's blood consumption. In Mina's narration, the Count threatens Mina to silence with a warning that he “shall take [Harker] and dash his

brain out” and then “place[s] his reeking lips upon [her] throat.” Mina identifies herself as a “victim” of the Count’s thirst for blood, accentuating the power imbalance between Mina and her violator (267). Mina further reveals that the Count had forced her to feed on his blood by “seiz[ing] my neck and press[ing] my mouth to the wound.” In Mina’s description of the blood transaction, Mina once again describes herself as a helpless victim who “must either suffocate or swallow” the Count’s blood against her wish (268).

However, unlike Seward, who describes blood consumption as a nursing scene, Mina paints the Count as a monstrous rapist who violates her in front of her husband. In Mina’s narration, the Count invades her bedroom, takes her blood, and injects his own blood within her against her wish. Mina even explains that when she initially tried to scream, she was “paralysed” and that the Count threatened to “take [Harker] and dash his brains out” if Mina should make a sound (267). Rather than a licentious liaison, the Count’s forceful nature and Mina’s inability to fight back define the Count as a violator and Mina as a helpless victim. In this disturbing blood transaction between the Count and Mina, the blood and violence in the scene grotesquely accentuate the Count’s vampirism and monstrosity. If we are to read the Count’s blood-sucking scenes as rape scenes, these scenes can also be understood as sexual intercours between two different species. When the Count presses his lips “upon [Mina’s] throat” and Lucy “ben[ds] down over” the baby, the scene is represented as especially grotesque because it is nonhuman monsters preying on and raping human characters (267, 196).

Blood consumption is later represented as monstrous when the vampire hunters witness Lucy’s trickling mouth for the first time. Once again, Seward, the

narrator of this scene, emphasizes the human blood trickling down Lucy's mouth as an indication of her monstrous change to a vampire. When the vampire hunters see Lucy at the graveyard, Seward "could see that [Lucy's] lips were crimson with fresh blood, and that the stream had trickled over her chin and stained the purity of her lawn death-robe" (196). The following night, Seward describes Lucy "like a nightmare of Lucy" as he notices "the pointed teeth, the bloodstained, voluptuous mouth" on Lucy's face (199). Thus, Lucy's bloodthirsty appetite and bloodied mouth are what influence Seward to classify Lucy as a nonhuman "Undead" or "The Thing" (201) that they must hunt and destroy. While the vampire hunters adore Lucy when she is human, they consider her a nonhuman monster once they witness Lucy's vampiric bloodsucking diet. Hence, the moment Lucy "bent down over [...] a fair-haired child" to suck its blood, Seward loses all affection for his former beloved and narrates that his "heart grew cold as ice" for Lucy (196).

Such graphic scenes that illustrate vampires feeding on human blood are also significant because this is what categorizes vampires as monsters in the novel. The vampire hunters define the Count as a "wild beast" not only because he is nonhuman but also because the Count's "blood-dripping mouth" trickles with human blood (262). Here, the Count's appetite for and consumption of human blood makes him a monster. In *Castle Dracula*, Harker watches in horror as the three vampire brides disappear with a "half-smothered child" in Harker's stead (40). Later, Harker also witnesses the Count sleeping after feeding on blood. Disgusted at the sight, Harker observes that "the [Count's] mouth was redder than ever, for on the lips were gouts of fresh blood, which trickled from the corners of the mouth and ran down over the chin and neck" (51). Here, the Count's bloodied mouth, once again, serves as a

visible mark of the Count's monstrosity and reduces the Count into an "awful creature" in Harker's eyes (51).

What is further significant is that Harker's perception of the Count drastically changes after seeing the blood. Before seeing the Count in this blood-filled state, Harker describes his horrific experiences in Castle Dracula with utter terror. His encounter with the vampire brides leaves him "aghast with horror" that he eventually "sank down unconscious" and at one point even fearfully prays, "Lord, help me" (40; 50). However, the moment Harker finds the Count "gorged with blood," Harker's emotions change from fear to anger and disgust, very much like Seward's cold reaction to the vampire Lucy (51). Harker reveals that the Count's "mocking smile on the bloated face [...] seemed to drive me mad," and the thought that the Count would "sate his lust for blood" in London "drove me mad" (50). Out of disgust at the vampiric appetite, Harker likens the Count to a "filthy leech, exhausted with his repletion" (51). Here, the human blood that the Count has consumed degrades the Count, whom Harker initially treated as a terrifying captor, to a "filthy leech" (51). Unlike the previous fearful encounters where Harker trembles before the Count, Harker gains courage. This courage emerges from the fact that the Count, a nonhuman monster, threatens humans like himself. Therefore, with this newfound duty to "rid the world of such a monster," Harker finds himself "seiz[ing] a shovel [...] and lifting it high, struck with the edge downward, at the hateful face" (51).

Carol Senf suggests that Harker's journal "establishes the opposition between humans and monsters" with emphasis "that monsters feed on humans" (69). Previously many critics located the Count's monstrosity on the Count's foreignness, such as his foreign nationality or foreign facial features like his "strong aquiline"

nose and “lofty domed forehead” (Stoker 262). Judith Halberstam, for example, notes that “[f]aces and bodies mark the Other as evil so that he could be recognized and ostracized” (338). The Count’s seemingly Jewish appearance becomes a crucial representation of the Victorian antisemitic sentiments that marked Jews as the racial other. It is even more telling that the monstrous vampire has a Jewish appearance because “[p]arasitism was linked specifically to Jewishness” in the late nineteenth century when Jews were labeled as to be living off of the English working class (Halberstam 341). Although the Count’s appearance appears foreign to Harker, such facial features are not the only constituents that establish the Count as a monster.

Instead, Senf suggests that monstrosity can be determined by what a character eats. The novel portrays the Count’s monstrosity through the Count’s grotesque diet of drinking human blood (Senf 75). Because humans become the Count’s food source, the Count reduces humans to mere “livestock” (73). Similarly, Barbara Almond labels Count as a “monster baby” who feeds on blood as if it is breastmilk and who vampirizes women into “bad mothers” or monstrous “vampire mother[s]” who feed on other children (222; 229). Thus, reading vampirism in *Dracula* as only an analogy for the racial other may reduce the critical element of the vampires’ monstrosity: the vampire’s diet.

Before we go further into vampires feeding on human blood, it is essential to note that eating is commonplace in *Dracula*. In fact, throughout the novel, even the human characters constantly dine and share meals with one another. One of the first things Harker mentions in his journal is his first meal in Transylvania: “a chicken done up some way with red pepper, which was very good but thirsty” (Stoker 5). The next day, Harker again writes that he “had for breakfast more paprika and a

sort of porridge maze flower [...] and an egg-plant stuffed with forcemeat” (6). Furthermore, the first thing the Count does when he welcomes Harker to his castle is to invite him to dine: “Come in; the night air is chill, and you must need to eat and rest” (19). Similarly, Mina and Van Helsing’s first meeting is a shared “lunch,” where Mina suggests that Van Helsing asks questions “whilst we eat” sandwiches (171). Seward, likewise, invites Mina to “[t]ake the cylinders and hear them [...] [d]inner will by then be ready” (206). With these dining scenes, we can note that *Dracula* is a narrative that does not omit the obvious, as dining scenes are often neglected in other novelistic representations. While eating is obviously considered natural in reality, the narrative repetitively emphasizes these everyday scenes as if they are special occasions or even abnormal.

Because consumption is such an important constituent to define an individual in *Dracula*, refusing to eat and having an abnormal diet also establishes the Count as a monster. Harker becomes suspicious of his vampire host when he realizes, “I have not seen the Count eat or drink.” Although Harker has yet to witness the vampires consuming blood in this scene, not eating human food with him is enough to label the Count as “a very peculiar man!” (28). Harker is even more perturbed when he finds the Count’s “lips were gouts of fresh [human] blood, which trickled from the corners of the mouth” because this is the first time Harker fully realizes that the Count is a vampire and that Harker himself can become the Count’s food (51).

It is also noticeable that the Count’s consumption of blood is reflected in Renfield’s consumption of blood. Van Helsing claims that the Count has “always the strength in his hand of twenty men” and that the Count has even absorbed “our

strength” through the blood he has sucked from Lucy (189). Likewise, Renfield fervently believes that “[t]he blood is the life! the blood is the life!” (132) Renfield, the mental patient in Seward’s asylum, similarly believes that he absorbs energy from what he consumes and systematically consumes as much energy as possible. Seward notes that “what [Renfield] desires is to absorb as many lives as he can, and he has laid himself out to achieve it cumulatively. He gave many flies to one spider and many spiders to one bird, and then wanted a cat to eat the many birds” (69).

To Seward and the asylum workers, Renfield’s diet alone is enough to determine Renfield as a mentally ill patient. Although Seward allows Renfield to form a colony of flies, spiders, and birds in his cell, Seward notably becomes worried when he finds “few feathers about the room and on [Renfield’s] pillow a drop of blood” and learns that Renfield “has disgorged a whole lot of feathers” (68). Like the Count, who is declared a monster due to his bloody diet, Seward declares Renfield a “lunatic” for his bizarre eating of raw animals (69). Furthermore, the cumulative process of eating larger animals causes Seward to fear impending cannibalism, a point when Renfield would eventually want to consume human blood. Hence, Seward even “invent[s] a new classification for [Renfield] and call him a zoophagous (life-eating) maniac” (68-9). Although Seward previously calls Renfield his “homicidal maniac,” Seward’s new classification emphasizes eating and consuming rather than killing (69).

Unlike Harker, whose dining practice during his travels reflects his curiosity for a foreign culture during his travels to a foreign country, or the vampire hunters who eat as a social activity, Renfield does not regard eating as a cultural practice. Instead, as a character who has more similarities to vampires than his human

counterparts, Renfield, like the Count, eats only to absorb energy. This also means that Renfield does not care whether his choice of food or way of dining is proper according to the social norms. Senf, too, argues that Seward is “disgusted” and “horrificed” at the fact that “Renfield eats animals not generally found in English kitchens” and that Renfield “devours his taboo food raw” (75). While Renfield’s abnormal appetite is already regarded as a mental illness, Seward’s anxiety lies in the uncertainty in “[w]hat would have been [Renfield’s] later steps” and “how many lives [Renfield] values in a man” (Stoker 69). In this unspoken uneasiness, Seward fears that Renfield’s systematic diet will eventually turn Renfield into a cannibal.

While blood in the scenes I have mentioned so far is in reference to the consumption of blood in *Dracula*, blood is also portrayed in the novel through the physician’s medical procedures. In the nineteenth century, blood transfusion became an increasingly popular medical treatment for women suffering from hemorrhages during childbirth (Kibbie 64; 66). Tapping into this contemporary medical development, *Dracula* features multiple scenes of transfusion: physicians perform blood transfusions on Lucy three times to replace the blood the Count has drained. What must be noted, however, is that compared to the previous scenes, where the narrators describe how blood trickles, spurts, and stains when vampires consume blood, these scenes of blood transfusions indicate no visible sign of blood. Seward recounts that when Van Helsing sees Lucy’s “ghastly, chalkily pale” face in which “the red seemed to have gone even from her lips and gums,” Van Helsing suggests a transfusion must take place (Stoker 113). With great urgency, Van Helsing informs his fellow physician Seward that “[Lucy] will die for sheer want of blood to keep the heart’s action as it should be. There must be a transfusion of blood at once” (114).

Accordingly, Lucy receives an immediate blood transfusion, and it is deemed a success, with Seward noting how “life seemed to come back to poor Lucy’s cheeks” as a direct result (115). Seward also anxiously observes how “the loss of blood was telling on Arthur” (116). In this scene, Seward infers the blood transferal through the color that has left Godalming’s face and the color that has returned to Lucy’s face with the new influx of blood. In this transfer of blood, Seward shifts the focus toward the miraculous results of the seemingly invisible blood rather than the actual blood flow.

In addition to this absence of blood from the transfusion scenes at the level of narrative representation, Seward portrays blood transfusion as a relatively harmless and sterile procedure. When describing the first blood transfusion, Seward observes that “with swiftness, but with absolute method, Van Helsing performed the operation” (115). In subsequent blood transfusions scenes, Seward follows the same pattern by concisely summarizing the procedures: “without a moment’s delay, we began the operation” (120) and “[a]gain the operation; again the narcotic; again some return of colour to the ashy cheeks, and the regular breathing of healthy sleep” (126). Instead of depicting the messiness or violence associated with the procedure, Seward focuses on the physician’s perfection and the procedures’ repeatability. Moreover, with more emphasis on the repetition of the transfusion, Seward effectively displaces the presence of blood in Lucy’s sick room from his narration. Even when Van Helsing briefly explains transfusion, he abstractly describes the transfusion as a procedure “to transfer from full veins of one to the empty veins which pine for him” (114-5) without reference to the blood that may be observed through the transfusion.

Consequently, Seward's portrayal of transfusion creates a wrong impression that transfusion in *Dracula* is bloodless and harmless.

However, historical records on nineteenth-century blood transfusion reveal how these procedures were anything but sterile and innocuous. According to Kibbie, blood was graphically visible in sickbeds for patients that needed a transfusion in the nineteenth century. This was because doctors usually performed transfusions on women suffering from hemorrhages during or after childbirth. Victorian physicians found patients exhausted with blood loss and that "the flooding [of blood] had been ever since copious and incessant" even before the physicians attempted to save her through transfusion (qtd. in Kibbie 75). Because of these hemorrhages, the sick beds were represented as drenched and soaked in blood (qtd. in Kibbie 192). Furthermore, medical records reveal how transfusion was not always successful and had its risks of being fatal to both the donor and recipient. In some cases, transfusion wounds "inflamed, discoloured, and [became] much swollen," while even worse circumstances led to death (Kibbie 83).

Returning to *Dracula* with this historical context in mind, we find it suspicious how Seward's journals repetitively emphasize the bloodlessness of the environment before and after the blood transfusions. When Seward first visits Lucy after her mysterious illness, he assumes "[Lucy is] somewhat bloodless" through her pale face (Stoker 105). However, he does not observe any indication of actual blood, such as blood stains or bite marks. Seward questions "how Lucy had made such a retrograde movement, and how she could have been drained of so much blood with no sign anywhere to show for it" (121). Because Lucy is not suffering from hemorrhage, like women in childbirth, but a vampire attack, it is natural that Seward

does not initially observe any blood on Lucy's sickbed. Nevertheless, we must further notice how Seward describes Lucy's sickbed as bloodless throughout the novel, even when she undergoes numerous transfusions. Not once does Seward mention blood trickling down the lancet or the transfusion apparatus, nor does he describe how the blood is transferred from the donors to Lucy. Instead, the readers are expected to assume that the blood, by some mysterious operation, transfers from donor to recipient and produces miraculous outcomes.

However, Seward's narration betrays the truth about the blood transfusion in *Dracula* when Seward acknowledges that the blood transfusions are more graphic and horrific than he tries to portray in his diary. When the fourth transfusion takes place, Seward admits:

Once again, we went through that ghastly operation. I have not the heart to go through with the details. Lucy had got a terrible shock, and it told on her more than before, for though plenty of blood went into her veins, her body did not respond to the treatment as well as on the other occasions. Her struggle back into life was something frightful to see and hear. (139)

While this scene also omits the visual portrayal of blood, this is the first time a transfusion practice in *Dracula* resembles real-life transfusions in the nineteenth century, with risks of complications and even possibilities of death. With this final transfusion, we finally learn that the transfusions are not as safe and sterile as Seward described in his narration. In fact, according to Seward, the operations have been repeatedly "ghastly," "terrible," and "frightful" that he "[has] not the heart to go through with details" and verbalize the event in his diary (139).

Interestingly, Seward repeatedly represents other medical procedures as equally bloodless as Lucy's transfusion. In the portrayal of Renfield's surgery, Seward once again questionably censors blood from his narration. When Renfield, Seward's patient in the asylum, is attacked by the Count, he suffers a deadly head injury and suffers from blood loss. Initially, when Seward describes the violence that the Count has inflicted on Renfield, Seward describes Renfield as "all covered with blood" and "lying on the floor on his left side in a glittering pool of blood" (255). Like the vampires' bloodthirsty diet that accentuates the vampires' monstrosity and justifies vampire hunting, Renfield's bloody injury also accentuates the Count's violent threats.

However, the blood disappears from this bloody scene as soon as the physicians begin to perform surgery on Renfield. When Van Helsing sees Renfield's severe head injury, he informs Seward that "We shall wait [...] just long enough to fix the best spot for trephining, so that we may most quickly and perfectly remove the blood clot" (257). Although Van Helsing makes the procedure sound simple, Renfield's brain surgery involves creating a hole in the patient's head to perform brain surgery. In no circumstances was performing an incision ever safe during the Victorian era. Consequently, because Renfield's surgery is performed in an underequipped and unprepared asylum cell, Renfield's brain surgery must be even more bloody and perilous. On the other hand, Seward omits the entire blood-spattering surgery and only mentions how "Without another word, [Van Helsing] made the operation. For a few moments the breathing continued to be stertorous [...] Suddenly his eyes opened" (248). Once more, like Lucy's transfusion, Seward focuses on the swift procedure and immediate effect rather than the bloodiness of the

procedure by omitting descriptions of blood from his narration. Therefore, unlike Seward's initial observation of the "glittering pool of blood" caused by the Count's attack, Seward's operation within the narrative remains spotless, harmless, and bloodless.

Likewise, in Seward's narration, not only are the medical procedures represented as visibly bloodless, but Seward infers that these procedures also leave no visible marks or traces on their patients. In the previous scenes, Seward does not mention any lancet marks on Lucy or surgical sutures on Renfield. There are no references to lasting evidence that may prove that a transfusion or brain surgery has taken place. On the other hand, throughout the novel, different narrators repetitively illustrate the vampire's trace of violence through visible "punctures" (116) from vampire bites and the victim's "nightdress [...] smeared with blood" (262). Mina writes in her journal that there were "two little red points like pin-pricks, and on the band of her nightdress was a drop of blood" on Lucy (88), while Seward also narrates that Van Helsing noticed a "red mark on [Lucy's] throat," and he found "two punctures, not large, but not wholesome-looking" (116). Seward is a narrator who narrates the most controversial scenes in detail. He narrates his love for Lucy, his fascination with his mental patient Renfield, and even the horrors of witnessing his once beloved turn into a cannibalistic monster. However, Seward still wholly omits to describe blood during Lucy's transfusions and Renfield's brain surgery.

The inconsistency in the representation of blood in *Dracula's* narrative, exceptionally well represented through Seward's omission of portraying blood in medical scenes, exposes the male physician's underlying anxiety that there are some similarities between professional medical practice and vampiric consumption. A

number of critics claim that *Dracula* is a novel in which boundaries are blurred so Van Helsing and Dracula can be read as doubles. The Count's bloodsucking diet can be read alongside Van Helsing's blood transfusions on Lucy and brain surgery on Renfield (Jann 276). When it comes to Lucy, Kibbie further reads these individuals as "perverted reflections" who compete over the female body (201). Significantly, Van Helsing himself reveals in *Dracula* that the difference between physicians and vampires may turn out to be even more ambiguous than Seward represents. In Van Helsing's first introduction to the novel, Van Helsing recounts a past incident where "[Seward] suck[ed] from my wounds so swiftly the poison" (Stoker 106). In order to suck the poison out of Van Helsing's wound, it is also inevitable for Seward to suck some blood out of Van Helsing. Although this specific blood-sucking procedure was not due to cannibalism, the likeness to vampires' blood-sucking scenes is disturbingly uncanny. This reveals how the physician's medical practices may not be as different from their mortal enemies as they wish.

As if to differentiate the physicians from the vampires, Seward avoids illustrating the medical procedures in graphic detail. Portraying medical scenes as bloody may risk positioning Seward and Van Helsing as equally violent, dangerous, and even monstrous as their vampire enemy. In order to avoid such questionable implications, Seward portrays the vampires as monstrous and gorging in blood while simultaneously portraying physicians as innocent and bloodless. This exaggerated difference in the depictions of blood becomes an attempt to reestablish the boundary between the vampires and physicians. With this set boundary, Seward can also justify bloody medical procedures, despite their unnerving similarities to vampire attacks, as moral and for their patient's good.

One striking parallel between Van Helsing and the Count is that their patients or victims are unconscious when blood flows in and out of their bodies. Whenever the Count sucks blood from Lucy, Lucy is described as unconscious. When Mina finds Lucy at the graveyard, Mina “could see that she was still asleep [...] I shook her more forcibly, till finally she opened her eyes and awoke [...] she did not realize all at once where she was” (87). Lucy mistakes the Count’s attacks and bites as an odd dream and remains oblivious to all the attacks inflicted on her body during her “sleep” (87). In essence, the Count takes advantage of Lucy’s unconscious mind to drain blood from the body she has no control over. This state of unconsciousness heightens the severity of the Count’s attacks, and it reduces Lucy into a more vulnerable victim, as she cannot resist or refuse the Count’s attacks.

During the vampiric attacks, Lucy’s unconsciousness and lack of consent eerily mirror Lucy’s drugged state during transfusions. Throughout the four transfusions performed on Lucy, Van Helsing does not inform Lucy of his diagnosis of her condition and prescribes and performs transfusion without Lucy’s consent or knowledge. When Van Helsing first decides to practice transfusion, Van Helsing “beckoned to [Seward] and we went gently out of the room” so they can discuss Lucy’s diagnosis beyond Lucy’s hearing (114). Van Helsing even excludes Lucy’s mother, her legal guardian, with the assumption that knowledge would be more harmful to the emotional woman: “Say no word to Madame [...] There must be no shock; any knowledge of this would be one” (115). Consequently, although Van Helsing suspects that a vampire is draining Lucy and later confirms this with the bite marks on Lucy’s neck, Van Helsing refuses to disclose this crucial information to the patient. This imbalance of information and knowledge creates an imbalance of

power when making medical decisions. Because Lucy lacks information about the cause of her blood loss and the treatments she must undergo, she, as a patient, cannot be vocal about her opinions and is given little choice but to follow what her physician prescribes.

Unfortunately for Lucy, there are even more dangerous concerns beyond Van Helsing's lack of communication with his patient. Lucy is constantly drugged and consequently unconscious whenever she is to undergo a medical procedure. Before Van Helsing begins transfusion, he first "mixe[s] a narcotic" and instructs Lucy to "[d]rink it off, like a good child" (115). Consequently, during the blood transfusion, Lucy "fell into a deep sleep" and became a silent, passive, and powerless recipient of the blood. Because she is drugged and unconscious, Lucy cannot resist blood from being injected into her body during the transfusion. Lucy, furthermore, loses the opportunity to speak and decide for herself. Because both Van Helsing and the Count assume control of Lucy's blood flow when she is unconscious, Lucy loses authority over her body when she loses the ability to control what goes in and out of her body.

Van Helsing's refusal to ask for Lucy's consent in the transfusion is particularly problematic when we consider how Lucy is not a passive individual who automatically submits to men's opinions. When conscious, Lucy has her fair share of speaking her mind and sometimes even refuses to obey men. At the novel's beginning, Lucy even questions Van Helsing's superstitious methods: "Whilst he was speaking, Lucy had been examining the [garlic] flowers and smelling them. Now she threw them down, saying, with half-laughter and half-disgust" (Stoker 123). Lucy is not afraid to question her physician's opinions and treatment methods when

given an opportunity. Here, Lucy's previous outspokenness reveals the interconnection between a conscious mind, an individual's voice, and bodily autonomy. To control her own body, Lucy must have a conscious mind to voice her refusal to others trying to interfere with her body. Nevertheless, when Lucy becomes unconscious, she loses her voice and authority over her body. When we consider this interrelation between the control of mind and body, Lucy's unconsciousness and lack of consent in the blood transfusion represent Van Helsing's medical procedure to be as problematic as the Count's vampiric attacks.

Professional medical treatment, on top of the vampiric attacks, forces Lucy into a position through which she unintentionally reproduces the Victorian stereotype that female bodies are porous and susceptible to leaking. In Victorian society, "incontinence," the inability to contain bodily fluids within oneself, was troubling to one's masculinity (Armston-Sheret 12). Robyn Longhurst further claims that while men's bodies were understood as "hard, disciplined, and sealed," women were "understood to be in possession of insecure (leaking, seeping) bodily boundaries" (2). If we read *Dracula* according to these Victorian stereotypes, it may initially seem as if Lucy is responsible for not sealing her female "leaky body" (Armston-Sheret 10). According to these stereotypes, Lucy's blood loss would be due to her faulty female nature, which cannot seal itself from leaking blood.

Contrary to the Victorian stereotypes that blame female bodies for bodily leakage, Bram Stoker's novel seems to shift the blame to individuals who exploit unconscious women in *Dracula*. Van Helsing and the Count's usage of hypnosis and narcotics challenges the gendered stereotype that women cannot control what goes in and out of their bodies. Rather than finding fault in the female body as an inherent

flaw per Victorian understandings, the novel invites us to examine the power dynamics between the (male) doctor and the (female) patient and the level of consciousness that manipulates the female body. When Lucy is drugged and hypnotized, she lacks physical power, consciousness, and even information to resist or regulate the blood flow within her body. In her memorandum, Lucy writes that when the Count visited her, “I tried to stir, but there was some spell upon me [...] and I remembered no more for a while. The time did not seem long, but very, awful, till I recovered consciousness again” (Stoker 135). Here, Lucy describes her helpless and unconscious state as a moment of physical and mental paralysis. During the transfusions and vampire attacks, the issue lies not in Lucy’s ability to control or contain blood within herself. Instead, the issue lies in the Count and Van Helsing denying Lucy the agency to control her body through drugs and hypnosis. In *Dracula*, female bodies, especially Lucy’s blood, do not leak because of their gender. Instead, Lucy’s blood circulation is invaded and disrupted by male characters who assume dominance over the flow of Lucy’s blood.

Furthermore, drugs and hypnosis establish a crucial connection between Lucy’s physical body and narrative authority. By inducing Lucy to sleep before blood is taken out or put into her body, Lucy is oblivious to all that happens to her body during her sleep. Consequently, drugs and hypnosis create gaps within Lucy’s narrative, leaving the gap to be filled by others. As previously discussed, Seward’s narration omits blood from scenes concerning medical procedures such as transfusion and surgery to erase traces of the physician’s violence. Similarly, the haziness caused by drugs and hypnosis yields more dangerous results than the

narratorial omissions. Because Lucy believes the events are only one hazy dream, it is as if she has not suffered any harm and her blood was never stolen.

These narratorial gaps pose a significant issue because these gaps are not left vacant for Lucy to fill when she becomes conscious. Instead, Seward fills in Lucy's narratorial gap. Unlike Lucy, who cannot remember what has happened, Seward witnesses and narrates Lucy's transfusions and even includes Lucy's hazy memorandum in his diary. As a result, Seward's narration fills in the blank spaces on Lucy's behalf. The physician's control over Lucy's unconscious body extends further into control over Lucy's narrative. Unfortunately for Lucy, Seward's narration is selective because Seward omits the violence exerted by the male physicians. Instead of providing an impartial account of Lucy's missed events, Seward's journal serves as a narrative that endeavors to vindicate physicians and their work.

Despite Seward's censorship of his narration, his narration still betrays the violent aspects of the doctors. We have already seen how physicians in *Dracula* fail to abide by their obligations to inform their patients with information so that they can make their own decisions. Regarding Renfield, Seward repeatedly shows interest in his patient's symptoms but not in treating mental illness. Seward admits that he "picked out one who afforded me a study of much interest" and questioned Renfield in a manner that was "something of cruelty" (59). More significantly, Seward further acknowledges that "I seemed to wish to keep him to the point of his madness" simply because he is fascinated by the fact that Renfield is "so unlike the normal lunatic" (59). As a physician, Seward must treat his patient and ensure their improvement, but here, we notice how Seward treats Renfield as a new toy to amuse himself with.

Furthermore, Seward also fails to retain professionalism in his relationship with Lucy. Although Seward is Lucy's physician, Seward blurs the boundaries between a professional physician and a private lover. Seward confesses that when it is his turn to donate blood: "It was with a feeling of personal pride that I could see a faint tinge of colour steal back into the pallid cheeks and lips. No man knows till he experiences [...] his life-blood drawn away into the veins of the woman he loves" (120). Despite Seward's claims that he is doing all he can, as a physician, to save Lucy, these vague hints of sexual attraction expose the transfusion as a mere fulfillment of his sexual desires. As a professional physician, Seward is obliged to regard Lucy as only his patient and Lucy's body as only a patient's. There are to be no feelings involved in his relationship with the patient. Foucault differentiates the physician's medical gaze from a voyeuristic observer and claims that this difference gives the physician power to make decisions, intervene and examine a body, even a female body, without controversy (qtd. in Gasperini 39). This unbiased medical gaze also allows Seward to stay alone with Lucy in her bedroom and even to watch her as she sleeps at night. However, Seward's confession in his diary reveals how he fails to engage with his patient as a professional physician but approaches her as a jilted lover. This also leads to the idea that rejected suitors like Seward can satisfy his unspeakable desires for Lucy through transfusion, like the Count quenches his thirst by sucking blood from Lucy.

One of the most controversial representations of the physician is their violent ways of destroying vampires. When the physicians visit graveyards to hunt for vampires, Seward and Van Helsing's narrations expose the physicians to be even more violent and bloody than the vampires they are out to destroy. If Seward is a

lover rather than a physician within the sick room, physicians become violent vampire hunters when they leave the sick room. Towards the end of the novel, Van Helsing confesses that staking vampires is “butcher work” and “murder” (Stoker 343). When Van Helsing stakes the three vampire brides in Castle Dracula, he leaves a confession for Seward in his memorandum:

Oh, my friend John, but it was butcher work; [...] Had I not seen the repose in the first face, and the gladness that stole over it just ere the final dissolution came, as realization that the soul had been won, I could not have gone further with my butchery. I could not have endured the horrid screeching as the stake drove home; the plunging of writhing form, and lips of bloody foam. (344-345)

Not only is staking no better than butchery because of the excessive blood and violence, but Van Helsing also no longer uses medical equipment and knowledge. In medical settings, Van Helsing and Seward utilize specific medical devices, such as lancets and injections, to inject blood and narcotics. The usage of medical equipment also allows Seward to distinguish physicians from vampires who use their fangs to bite into a victim’s body. However, when it comes to staking, neither science nor medicine is involved, and Van Helsing, instead, relies on superstitious methods. When Seward narrates the aftermath of Lucy’s staking, he describes that “the Professor and I sawed the top off the stake, leaving the point of it in the body. Then we cut off the head and filled the mouth with garlic” (202). Because Van Helsing relies on superstition rather than modern medicine in their hunt for vampires, Van Helsing appears to be an “exorcist confronting an enemy from a prescientific world” rather than a physician of modern medicine (Jann 275).

Hence, despite Van Helsing and Seward claiming the roles of physicians on a mission to perform a final operation on the vampiric Lucy, Seward's narration refuses to illustrate them as legitimate physicians during staking. In their hunt for vampires, Van Helsing and Seward are no longer physicians but merely vengeful and violent vampire hunters. Unlike the previous medical procedures, such as Lucy's transfusion and Renfield's surgery, Seward's narration does not omit the blood in the staking scenes. It can be understood that Seward's narration no longer feels the need to censor the presence of blood from the scenes, even as they meet their former 'patients' outside of the sick room. This change in the narration reflects Van Helsing and Seward's shift from medical professionals to hunters and represents how their ethical obligations become blurred in their vengeful pursuit of vampires. Accordingly, in Lucy's staking, one of the novel's bloodiest scenes, Seward observes:

Arthur placed the point over the heart, and as I looked, I could see its dint in the white flesh. Then he struck with all his might. The Thing in the coffin writhed; and a hideous, blood-curdling screech came from the opened red lips. The body shook and quivered and twisted in wild contortions; the sharp white teeth champed together till the lips were cut, and the mouth was smeared with a crimson foam. (Stoker 201)

In Seward's narration, Seward deviates from the violence that Arthur engages in and focuses on the blood exploding out of Lucy's unrestrained body. Seward carefully begins with descriptions of Lucy's "red lips," a recurring implication of her bloodthirsty appetite, then turns to how Lucy's "white sharp teeth champed together" to the point she starts bleeding (201). Here, Seward's narration uses the excessive presence of blood to accentuate Lucy's vampiric state and threatening presence.

Consequently, the shift in focus from the violent methods to the monstrous vampire suggests that even this cruel staking can be justified because vampires must be destroyed to save humans.

In addition to these appallingly violent methods employed to destroy vampires, the graveyard setting draws the vampire hunters back to their identities as physicians and surgeons. These graveyard staking scenes depict Van Helsing and Seward as lawbreakers who must be discreet and secretive to avoid being caught by others. Seward explains that “We got to the churchyard by half-past one, and strolled about, keeping out of official observation” and that the physicians must make sure that they “were alone and had heard the last of the footsteps die out” (199). Staking in the graveyard must be secretive and hidden from the public because graveyard activities align with those of Victorian resurrectionists. Resurrectionists were essentially grave robbers or body-snatchers who would secretly steal corpses from graveyards late at night to use in dissections (Knott 2). According to Ian Ross and Carol Urquhart Ross, because there was a high demand for cadavers, in some extreme cases, some people were even murdered and sold as cadavers for anatomy (117-118). Significantly, many resurrectionists were not mere black-market dealers but were often members of medical institutions ranging from “dissecting-room staff, graveyard labourers, medical students and teachers” (Ross and Ross 112).

With the historical resurrectionist in mind, if we are to return to Lucy and the vampire brides’ graveyard, the narrative betrays the physicians by portraying them as resurrectionists who unethically dissect and operate on the vampires. Although Seward does think he needs to control the representation of blood anymore because they are no longer in the sickroom, the context of resurrectionists enables us

to understand that the medical scene and setting are not confined within the sickroom. Instead, the graveyard becomes another medical setting, and the vampires are reduced to cadavers for anatomy experiments. In this aspect, the boundaries between the surgeon who operates to cure the patient and the resurrectionist who illegally violates cadavers become ambiguous. If we return to Renfield's brain surgery before his death, Van Helsing and Seward do not treat Renfield as a patient to be cured. Instead, the doctors incise Renfield's brain just enough to Renfield to confess that he has invited the Count into the asylum and leave him to die after this confession. In this surgery, Renfield's identity is ambiguously neither a patient nor a subject for dissection.

Despite constant efforts to differentiate themselves from the vampires, the representation of physicians as resurrectionists, therefore, depicts physicians as equally violent and monstrous as their vampire counterparts. Therefore, in the graveyard, where their identity as a resurrectionist and physician merge, Van Helsing and Seward cannot narrate these graveyard scenes without unconsciously confessing to the violence they partake in. Outside the realms of their controlled sick room, physicians transform into illegal trespassers, body snatchers, and mad scientists.

II. Uncontrollable Tears and Unexpected Relationships

When the band of vampire hunters comes together in Stoker's *Dracula*, Mina consoles her male peers as they mourn Lucy's death. With Mina's soothing words of sympathy, the men soon find themselves in tears. Mina narrates in her diary that Godalming "cried like a wearied child" (Stoker 214), and later, she also notices how "tears rose" in Quincey's eyes (215). The sentimentality of these teary scenes suggests that the men in *Dracula* are emotional and teary. Some men sob in fear, others weep in grief, and some break down in hysterical tears. Due to these male characters repetitively displaying excessive tears, tears are widely read as the substance that complicates the Victorian notion of masculinity and femininity in *Dracula*. Alison Case, for example, reads Harker's tears in Castle Dracula as a sign of his emasculating vulnerability in the face of Dracula and the Count's vampire brides who threaten his life and sexuality. According to Case, in this first part of the narrative, Harker resembles a vulnerable and threatened female protagonist of a captivity narrative who can do little but cry in helplessness. Even after Harker's escape, Harker remains "crucially unmanned" through this experience (Case 229). Karen Winstead notes that by portraying Harker's nervous breakdown and Van Helsing's hysterical outburst, Stoker contradicts Van Helsing and Seward's prejudice that only women are heavily influenced by their emotions. Winstead suggests hysteria is "not a female malady" in *Dracula* and that the novel refuses to portray women as more susceptible to hysteria and needing to be shielded from the vampire hunt (326). Instead, Winstead argues that Van Helsing makes Mina anxious and emotionally distressed to exclude her from his vampire hunt. In this case, Van

Helsing, consequently, influences Mina to become overwhelmed by her emotions to prove that his prejudice against women's emotions is justifiable (Winstead 326-7)

This does not necessarily mean that traditional gender roles are reversed in *Dracula*. Instead, Carol Senf suggests that Mina takes on a traditional female role by sympathizing with male vampire hunters' grief and tears (Senf 45). Here, Senf turns the focus from the men's tears to Mina's reaction to the tears. Mina narrates that she "felt an infinite pity for him" and that "the mother-spirit is invoked" by the men's tears (Stoker 214). To Senf, this sympathetic reaction is only natural because Mina "believes in women's traditional role as a mother" and takes on this role as a "social responsibility." As a mother figure, Mina nurtures the vampire hunters with her emotional support (Senf 46). In this case, it is possible to read *Dracula* as a novel that perpetuates the Victorian gender roles that require women to become emotional laborers and sympathize with the men's tears and emotions.

Defining masculinity and femininity according to whether a character breaks down into tears helps us understand the traditional relationship between gender stereotypes and emotions in Victorian society. Traditionally, tears and emotional breakdowns were considered exclusively a woman's condition. However, I argue that *Dracula* is a novel that uses tears to blur the boundaries between genders and bonds to renew and even revise relationships within characters. The male characters are presented as emasculated because they lose self-control and cannot control their bodies and minds from displaying excessive tears and emotions in public. On the other hand, the novel also questions and dismantles the stereotype that women are more emotional and sympathetic by turning Mina's sympathy into her unintentional power source. This is because Mina's role as a female sympathizer in *Dracula* also

allows her to threaten Victorian traditional masculinity and marriage ideology by witnessing the men's tears and unintentionally circulating the men's emasculating stories. Senf suggests Mina's passive acceptance of traditional motherhood by sympathizing with the men's tears; I further suggest that her role as a motherly sympathizer allows her to witness the men's hysteria. Furthermore, the uncontrollable fluidity of the tears means that tears overflow out of the characters' bodies and bond the characters together to form a quasi-polyandric relationship between Lucy, Mina, and the vampire hunters.

One of the interesting things about Stoker's *Dracula* is that the male characters have a series of emotional breakdowns. When Mina first meets Lucy's former fiancée, Lord Godalming, she consoles him for his loss. As Mina sympathizes that "I know you loved my poor Lucy," Godalming bursts into hysterical tears (Stoker 214). The scene that follows details Godalming's breakdown:

Here he turned away and covered his face with his hands. I could hear the tears in his voice. [...] In an instant the poor dear fellow was overwhelmed with grief. It seemed to me that all that he had of late been suffering in silence found a vent at once. He grew quite hysterical, and raising his open hands, beat his palms together in a perfect agony of grief. He stood up and then sat down again, and the tears rained down his cheeks. I felt an infinite pity for him, and opened my arms unthinkingly. With a sob he laid his head on my shoulder, and cried like a wearied child, whilst he shook with emotion. (214)

The moment Godalming's previously suppressed tears and emotions find a "vent," tears and emotions break out of his body like an uncontrollable force (214). Initially, Godalming tries to hide his emotions by covering his face, but Mina still senses the

suppressed tears as she explains that she could “hear the tears in his voice” (214). When these tears break loose and become visible, the tears do not simply flow out of his body but become an emotional explosion. Notably, Mina finds the emotions and tears so excessive that she thinks of Godalming as “hysterical” as she watches as tears “rain[s] down his cheeks” and he “sh[akes] with emotion” (214).

Even after Godalming’s surprising hysterical breakdown, we see numerous more occasions where male characters break down into tears in *Dracula*. In another scene, Seward watches as Van Helsing breaks into sobs after realizing that Mrs. Westenra has removed the garlic flowers:

Then, for the first time in my life, I saw Van Helsing break down. He raised his hands over his head in a sort of mute despair, and then beat his palms together in a helpless way; finally he sat down on a chair, and putting his hands before his face, began to sob, with loud, dry sobs that seemed to come from the very racking of his heart. Then he raised his arms again, as though appealing to the whole universe. (125-126)

Like Godalming in the previously mentioned scene, Seward notices that Van Helsing also cannot control his emotions and help himself from expressing his emotions. Furthermore, although Van Helsing also initially tries to hide his tears from his protegee Seward by “putting his hands before his face,” this does not stop Van Helsing from eventually letting out “loud dry sobs” (125). What is further interesting about Van Helsing’s breakdown is that it is tearless and “dry” (125). Seward notices how Van Helsing “raised his hands over his head” or “beat his palms” together” to exhibit his extreme emotions. And when it comes to crying, Van Helsing is so overwhelmed with emotions that he rather falls in “mute despair” (125). Despite their attempts to

hide their emotions from view, Godalming and Van Helsing's excessive emotions escape from the "very racking of [Van Helsing's] heart" and become visibly displayed for others to see (125).

Historically, Van Helsing and Godalming's emotional breakdowns show visible symptoms of what Victorian physicians would have deemed hysteria. According to Stephen Heath, in the nineteenth century, "[a]nything excessive, however slightly, anything wayward in respect of the given conventions of expected behaviour, is the sign of the female" and even further signs "of hysterical behaviour" (27). Elaine Showalter further argues that nineteenth-century physicians diagnosed hysteria through "visible symptoms" like "the seizure, and the globus hystericus, or sensation of choking" and that "[a]t its height, the victim alternately sobbed and laughed; she might have convulsive movements of the body, heart palpitations, impaired hearing and vision, or unconsciousness" (130). If we are to return to *Dracula*, Mina's observation that Godalming is "hysterical" is very fitting because he and Van Helsing exhibit these extreme emotions and behaviors. When Godalming becomes "hysterical," he exhibits strange behaviors and excessive emotions such as "raising his open hands, beat his palms together in a perfect agony of grief [...] the tears rained down his cheeks (Stoker 214). Van Helsing also exhibits his grief with movements as Seward witnesses how "He raised his hands over his head [...] and then beat his palms together in a helpless way" (125). In another one of Van Helsing's hysterical moments, Seward watches in shock as Van Helsing exhibits the key visible symptom of hysteria: "[Van Helsing] cried till he laughed again; and laughed and cried together" (163).

From this historical perspective, Van Helsing and Godalming's hysterical outbursts are noteworthy because hysteria was traditionally considered a woman's disorder. Stephen Heath introduces the gender stereotype of hysteria by suggesting that signs of "hysterical behavior" in the nineteenth century were synonymous with the "sign of the female" (Heath 27). Showalter similarly emphasizes this gendered aspect of hysteria by noting that the hysterical "victim[s]" were women (Showalter 130). In 1866, Dr. Isaac Ray argued that "[w]ith women, it is but a step from extreme nervous susceptibility to downright hysteria, and from that to overt insanity" (qtd. in Poovey 146-147). Taking Dr. Ray's argument, Mary Poovey further claims that in Victorian standards, hysteria was considered "the norm of the female body" and what simultaneously makes the female body "inherently abnormal." The assumption that women were naturally inclined to become hysteric further represented women as "needing control," eventually leading to physicians controlling and watching women. According to Poovey, the gendered doctor-patient relationship is inseparable from the assumption that women cannot control themselves (147).

In *Dracula*, however, hysteria is not an exclusively female sickness. In this narrative, we see instances where male characters also cannot control their bodies and emotions to have hysterical fits. Winstead claims that most of the novel's male characters have moments when they exhibit "the textbook symptoms of hysteria, including lethargy, wild gesticulations, and the abrupt alternation of laughter and weeping" (Winstead 326). Then, *Dracula's* portrayal of hysteria dismantles the Victorian stereotype of hysteria because hysteria in the novel represents failed masculinity.

The representation of hysteria and failed masculinity through hysteria in *Dracula* unnerves characters like Seward. After Lucy's funeral, Seward becomes self-conscious about Van Helsing breaking away from the gendered understanding of hysteria:

The moment we were alone in the carriage he gave way to a regular fit of hysterics. He has denied to me since that it was hysterics, and insisted that it was only his sense of humour asserting itself under very terrible conditions. He laughed till he cried, and I had to lest anyone should see us and misjudge; and then he cried till he laughed again; and laughed and cried together, just as a woman does. I tried to be stern with him, as one is to a woman under the circumstances; but it had no effect. Men and women are so different in manifestations of nervous strength or weakness! (Stoker 162-163)

According to Seward, unlike weak women, men should have "nervous strength" to control their minds to further control bodies from shedding tears or exhibiting wild emotions in public (163).

Moreover, previously in the novel, both physicians conclude that the "man's brain" makes men rational, while the "woman's heart" influences women to be dictated by their emotions (218). Therefore, according to these claims, rational men should be able to control their minds to further control their bodies from shedding tears and exhibiting such wild emotions in public.

We need to examine the notions of masculinity and self-control that Seward draws on this scene of Van Helsing's hysterical breakdown in the context of Victorian standards of masculinity. The practice of self-control was a key facet of the performance of masculinity in Victorian Britain. According to Hugh Stowell

Brown's *Manliness: A Lecture*, manliness meant "control of your thoughts, feelings, words, and deeds" (qtd. in Begiato 46). Masculinity, thus, depended on one's management and control of his own body and feelings (Begiato 46).

Van Helsing fails to control himself from falling into a hysterical fit. Instead, he exhibits the key symptom of hysteria where "the victim [of hysteria] alternatively sob[s] and laugh[s]" (Showalter 130). The idea that Van Helsing "gave way" to these emotions further reveals how Van Helsing's emotions take control of his body, whereas Van Helsing becomes the victim of his emotions. Van Helsing's hysterical breakdown represents how male bodies can be emasculated and vulnerable.

Later in the novel, when Godalming breaks into tears, Mina observes that the only time a man can "express his feelings [...] without feeling it derogatory to his manhood" is in the presence of a woman (Stoker 214). This is because a man's display of excessive emotions in public and even in front of other men indicates the crying man's vulnerability and lack of self-control. Consequently, Van Helsing must verbally deny being hysterical to save himself from being shamed as unmasculine. As physicians, Van Helsing and Seward must be very aware of the symptoms of hysteria and must also know that Van Helsing exhibits these symptoms. Seward records this event in his diary as Van Helsing's "regular fit of hysterics" (162). Yet recognizing hysteria and admitting to hysteria is an entirely different matter when Van Helsing's masculinity is at stake. In this circumstance, admitting or apologizing for hysteria would brand Van Helsing as unmanly. To avoid such disgrace, Van Helsing must consciously "deny" the unusual outburst of hysteria and "insist" that this was only due to "his sense of humour asserting itself under very terrible

conditions” (165). Van Helsing cannot control the symptoms of hysteria and consequently needs a verbal denial to reaffirm his masculinity.

However, this verbal reaffirmation has limits because Van Helsing’s hysterical fit still alters Van Helsing and Seward’s relationship. Throughout *Dracula*, Van Helsing is always the individual to instruct and correct Seward as his mentor. Interestingly, the moment Van Helsing portrays symptoms of hysteria, there is an inversion of this mentor-mentee relationship. In this reversed relationship, Seward positions himself as the masculine mentor to Van Helsing’s feminized mentee, who must be reprimanded for his stereotypically feminine emotions. Seward’s attempts “to be stern with him” suggest that Van Helsing has transgressed as a man by exhibiting such excessive emotions. Furthermore, Seward’s earlier use of the term “break down” to describe Van Helsing’s emotions represents Van Helsing’s nervous breakdown as a malfunction in both the body and the mind (125). Van Helsing’s excessive emotions cause Van Helsing’s body to malfunction so that he can neither contain his emotions nor shed visible watery tears. Seward assumes the role of Van Helsing’s physician and caregiver that must protect Van Helsing’s reputation by “draw[ing] down the blinds” and must return the latter back to sanity. At the same time, Van Helsing is reduced to a patient that must be controlled (163).

While Van Helsing denies he is having hysterical symptoms because his masculinity is at stake, Godalming instead offers an apology to Mina:

After a little bit his sobs ceased, and he raised himself with an apology, though he made no disguise of his emotion. He told me that for days and nights past—weary days and sleepless nights—he had been unable to speak with anyone, as a man must speak in his time of sorrow. There was no

woman whose sympathy could be given to him, or with whom, owing to the terrible circumstances with which his sorrow was surrounded, he could speak freely. (214-215)

Godalming's apology here performs two related tasks. The first is that as a gentleman, Godalming feels the need to excuse himself from showing such excessive emotion in front of others. Godalming firmly insists that he could not help but cry because "he had been unable to speak with anyone, as man must speak in his time of sorrow" (214). By excusing his hysteria, Godalming suggests that his excessive grief can be excused, given the exceptional circumstances. Furthermore, Godalming also suggests that now that he has spoken of his grief to somebody, he can now overcome this grief. Interestingly, Mina also accepts this excuse because she later narrates that "a cry does us all good at times—clears the air as other rain does" (169). However, it is further noticeable that Godalming uses this apology and excuse as a platform to reassert the gender hierarchy between Mina and himself. Godalming claims that "a man must speak" and a woman must provide sympathy (214). By mentioning there was no woman to comfort him, Godalming confirms that it is the woman's task to sympathize with men because they are naturally more emotional. Godalming uses this as an opportunity to perpetuate the traditional female labor of sympathy.

What Godalming needs to realize, however, is that his assumption that Mina must sympathize with him because she is a woman allows her to witness his most vulnerable and emasculated moments. Senf argues that Mina "adopts a very traditional role" as a wife and mother after marriage (46). Hence, Senf reads scenes where Mina comforts the weeping Godalming as an acceptance of this labor of

sympathy and suggests that Mina nurtures the vampire hunters as their new-found mother figure (46).

To further build on Senf's reading, we must understand the historical context where emotions and tears are strictly reserved for private environments. Crying was regarded as a private and intimate affair in Victorian society. The private home was the place for a Victorian man "to develop the emotional side to his personality" because emotions were to be domesticated (Schneider 149). Because emotions were only to be seen in private atmospheres, tears were only reserved for the most intimate people within the home or one's social boundaries. When Seward witnesses Van Helsing's hysteria, his reaction is to "draw down the blind lest anyone should see us and misjudge" (Stoker 162). Seward fears that Van Helsing may be exposed to the public as unmanly and, out of loyalty, ensures Van Helsing's hysteria remains a private affair. Similarly, before Van Helsing breaks down after learning that Mrs. Westenra has tampered with his garlic flowers, Seward witnesses how Van Helsing tries to "retain his self-command whilst the poor lady was present" but ends up in tears the moment Mrs. Westenra leaves the room (125). In Van Helsing's case, Seward is the only one allowed to witness Van Helsing's tears because these two characters share an intimate bond of trust and loyalty. All other characters, including women like Mrs. Westenra, are excluded from this homosocial bonding of tears.

Likewise, Mina observes how Quincey leaves the room when he witnesses Godalming's tears. Mina narrates that Quincey "with instinctive delicacy, just laid a hand for a moment on his shoulder, and then walked quietly out of the room" when Quincey senses Godalming's grief (214). Not only does Godalming suppress his emotions in front of Quincey, Mina narrates the scene as if Quincey understands that

Godalming is restraining himself and leaves the room out of consideration. On the other hand, Quincey reacts differently to tears than Seward. While Seward hides his mentor's tears from the public, Quincey chooses not to witness the tears due to his respect for Godalming's masculinity. Rather than offering verbal or physical consolation, Quincey's exit expresses his nonverbal sympathy for his friend.

On the other hand, Mina witnesses Godalming's tears when even Quincey, a friend, does not because it is only "when Lord Godalming found himself alone with [Mina]" that he "gave way utterly and openly" (214). As Senf suggested, it is Mina's femininity that allows her to gain access to this homosocial circle:

I suppose there is something in woman's nature that makes a man free to break down before her and express his feelings on the tender or emotional side without feeling it derogatory to his manhood; for when Lord Godalming found himself alone with me he sat down on the sofa and gave way utterly and openly. (214)

Unlike Van Helsing and Seward, who have a mentor-mentee relationship to form an emotional bond and trust, Mina and Godalming do not initially have an intimate relationship. At this point in the narrative, Mina and Godalming are yet to become friends and are only acquaintances through the now-deceased Lucy. Unlike Lucy, who is exposed and punished for her intimate desires for her suitors, Mina's motherly identity enables her intimacy with men who are not her husband. As a result, although Quincey exits the room out of respect for Godalming's pride, Mina is allowed to stay alone with a man and witness his private and incriminating tears.

When critics analyze the female threats to masculinity in *Dracula*, the focus is usually on how female vampires, including Lucy, threaten the patriarchal society.

Numerous critics suggest that Lucy's polygamous desires and vampiric appetite threaten patriarchal society because it disrupts the traditional family unit and refuses the maternal role of Victorian women as Lucy feeds on children (Roth et al. 369). Swartz-Levine similarly discusses how vampire hunters seek to destroy female vampires like Lucy because they blatantly seduce English men with their monstrous hypersexuality and, ultimately, threaten traditional masculinity (347-348).

Other critics claim that Mina, while being a less obvious threat, still challenges Victorian masculinity through her intelligence. Prescott and Giorgio argue that Mina's possession of a "man's intelligence" is an underlying threat and what makes her the "most dangerous nascent vampire" in the novel (501). Karen Winstead, likewise, reads Van Helsing as a character who understands Mina as a threat to his traditional masculinity and old-fashioned way of perceiving women. Van Helsing, Winstead argues, knows that Mina's intelligence and leadership far exceed his own and feels threatened that Mina repetitively questions his judgments and arguments about Count Dracula (322).

The female threat also lies in the fact that Mina's private and sympathetic encounters with the vampire hunters threaten the Victorian marriage ideology. If we return to the scene where Mina consoles Godalming out of motherly affection, Mina "[strokes] his hair" like a child on her bosom and "[sits] down beside him and [takes] his hand" (Stoker 214). Godalming's blind assumption that Mina should perform the female labor of sympathy leaves her to console Godalming in a strangely physical and perhaps even sexual manner.

More importantly, Godalming is only one of the many men Mina sympathizes with. After she leaves Godalming, Mina approaches Quincey claiming,

“I wish I could comfort all who suffer from the heart.” Once again, physical contact becomes the medium for sympathetic consolation as Mina “impulsively [...] bent over and kissed him” (215). Mina admits that the kiss was impulsive, making this an outburst of her sexual desires. Although Mina plays the role of the traditionally sympathetic mother, as Senf suggests, this role also blurs the emotional and physical boundaries between Mina and the vampire hunters. The traditional role of sympathy transforms Mina into Lucy’s replacement, allowing the men to seek sexual and sympathetic intimacy with Mina as they once did with their deceased lover. The stereotypical expectations for feminine sympathy dismantle the monogamous marriage boundaries set by Victorian society.

Mina’s threat to Victorian marriage ideologies can also be found in Mina’s ambiguously sexual intimacy with the vampire hunters, which is left unpunished in *Dracula*. Indeed, Mina participates in the polyandric relationship that Lucy only privately wishes for. Dejan Kuzmanovic, for example, reads the scene in which Mina sucks blood from the Count as a perverted marriage consummation and suggests that Mina has formed a polyandric relationship with Harker and Count Dracula. Mina’s child, born at the end of the novel, is then the love child of this polyandric relationship and consequently inherits the Count’s blood because the Count’s blood remains in Mina’s “and perhaps Harker’s” body (Kuzmanovic 422). Even Jonathan admits, in the novel's ending, that Mina “holds, I know, the secret belief that some of our brave friend's spirit has passed into this baby” and that little Quincey’s “bundle of names links all our little band of men together” (Stoker 351). Little Quincey inherits Mina, Jonathan, and Dracula's blood, Quincey’s spirit, and becomes the symbolic link between Mina and the men who declared their love and loyalty to her.

This claim is also supported by critics who also notice how “Little Quincey’s birth is one that quietly challenges the traditional monogamous patriarchal family structure in the same moment it seems to uphold it” (Roth et al. 371).

Most of the readings discussing Mina’s threat to Victorian patriarchal society emphasize the polyandric relationship and the eventual birth of baby Quincey as the relationship’s product. However, I intend to take this argument further by suggesting that the men’s emotional breakdowns and the expectation of Mina’s sympathy are the factors that construct this quasi-polyandric relationship. If we are to return to the scene where Mina comforts Godalming and Quincey, we can notice that Mina is always the one who initiates intimate moments of sympathy. When she begins to speak to Godalming, Mina tells him, “I know you loved my poor Lucy,” which immediately brings Godalming to tears (Stoker 214). Here, Mina influences Godalming to become vulnerable and only watches as he falls into a hysterical fit. Later, when she initiates this same bond with Quincey, she again introduces herself as a “friend” willing to comfort him (215). Mina plays the given role as the stereotypical sympathetic woman and gains access to their vulnerabilities. While Lucy only wishes to marry the three suitors, Mina, through sympathy, becomes physically intimate with all the vampire hunters. Mina’s desires are so well veiled that the vampire hunters cannot see Mina beyond the expected role of a sympathetic sister and a mother figure. It is not that Mina does not threaten the men and their masculinity with her sexuality, but that the men are unaware of the veiled threat that comes with sympathy.

This is not to say Mina does not cry in *Dracula*. Yet, unlike the male characters who cry uncontrollably in front of Mina, Mina is conscious of who witnesses her tears:

There now, crying again! I wonder what has come over me today. I must hide it from Jonathan, for if he knew that I had been crying twice in one morning—I, who never cried on my own account, and whom he has never caused to shed a tear—the dear fellow would fret his heart out. I shall put a bold face on, and if I do feel weepy, he shall never see it. (239)

Like the men, Mina is in tears, overwhelmed with unknown emotions. Because tears are uncontrollable fluids in *Dracula*, Mina also sheds unexpected tears. The thought that something has “come over” Mina also suggests that she has temporarily lost control of her body to her emotions, making her cry twice. However, what makes Mina different is that despite being unable to control her tears at all times, Mina’s tears are private, and she ensures the event stays private. Mina is adamant that Jonathan “shall never see” her tears because she knows that the men, especially the prejudiced Van Helsing, will hold her tears against her (239).

Van Helsing repetitively tries to exclude Mina from his mission to destroy Count Dracula because he believes Mina is susceptible to emotions. Van Helsing argues, “We men are determined—nay, are we not pledged? –to destroy this monster; but it is no part for a woman. Even if she be not harmed, her heart may fail her in so much and so many horrors; and hereafter she may suffer—both in waking, from her nerves, and in sleep, from her dreams” (219). Because Van Helsing considers Mina’s “woman’s heart” as her fragile weakness, Mina’s display of tears will only solidify his claim. Mina makes sure none of these men witness her tears. By hiding her

emotions in public, Mina performs according to Victorian standards of manliness rather than the stereotype that women cannot control their emotions. While she cries alone, she does not allow these emotions to be visible to others and in public and puts on “a bold face” for the men (239). This is unlike how Seward feels the need to “draw down the blind lest anyone should see us and misjudge” when Van Helsing fails to control and hide his tears in public (162). By putting “a bold face” and hiding her tears from the men, Mina is able to invert the stereotypical relationship between femininity and tears and save herself from appearing too vulnerable (239).

Mina’s ability to hide her tears becomes even more noteworthy when compared with Lucy’s inability to do so. Instead, Lucy reveals her desires through tears. We have already discussed how many critics suggest that Lucy is destroyed in the narrative because, as a vampire, she cannot control her excessive sexuality and threatens the monogamic, patriarchal Victorian society with her sexual desires. Nevertheless, sexuality is not the only thing Lucy cannot hide. Lucy fails to hide her tears from her suitors throughout her letters to Mina. Lucy writes in her letter to Mina that when she rejected Seward’s proposal, “he saw me cry” (56) and that “I burst into tears” (58) as she refused Quincey. Furthermore, Lucy continues to cry as she writes these letters and leaves her letters illegible: “Oh, Mina dear, I can’t help crying; and you must excuse this letter being all blotted” (56). To Lucy, tears are uncontrollable. They “burst” out of her body, and she cannot help or stop herself from revealing these tears to others (58).

When we read Lucy’s tearful letter carefully, we can notice Lucy’s tears reveal her desire to accept all three suitors. In this same letter, Lucy reveals her secretive desire for polyandry as she questions, “Why can’t they let a girl marry three

men, or as many as want her and save all this trouble?" (58) Although Lucy quickly adds that such polyandric desires "[are] heresy," Lucy's tears still reveal how strong her tabooed desires remain within her. Her desires become so strong that they become visible through her uncontrollable tears (58).

Furthermore, Lucy's tears betray her desire to accept her suitors despite her verbal refusal. After Seward is rejected, he initially tries to convince Lucy to accept him. However, his persistence only agitates Lucy to the point that she cries. Seward "was going to tell [Lucy] how unhappy he would be if I did not care for him" but notably stops "when he saw [her] cry" (56). While Seward only focuses on the fact that he made Lucy cry and calls himself "a brute," Lucy's tears reveal how she, too, is "unhappy" because she does care for him but cannot accept him due to Victorian monogamous ideologies. Here, Lucy's tears convey how her verbal rejection of the marriage proposals is only verbal and that her heart and body desire otherwise. Thus, Lucy's tears become a representation of Lucy's body conflicting within itself where her voice refuses, but her tears accept the suitors.

Even after Lucy's verbal refusal, the suitors refuse to break their relationship with Lucy. Rather than pushing the men away with her rejection, Lucy's tears bring her closer to the suitors as they promise their loyal friendship. Lucy explains to Mina, "though I was crying, I was able to look into Mr Morris's brave eyes, and I told him out straight:— 'Yes there is someone I love'" (58). To this confession and rejection, Quincey exclaims "in a hearty way [...] 'That's my brave girl'" (58). Similarly, Seward also promises that "if [Lucy] ever wanted a friend [Lucy] must count him one of my best" (56), and Quincey admits that Lucy's "honesty and pluck have made me a friend, and that's rarer than any lover" (58). This promise of friendship means

that although Lucy rejects her suitors in marriage, through her tears, Lucy can retain an intimate relationship with her potential lovers. Therefore, although Lucy rejects her suitors verbally, she emotionally and physically accepts them through tears. Moreover, it is Lucy's flowing tears that bond each suitor closer to Lucy and allows them to figuratively come together and consummate their love to form the polyandric relationship that Lucy desires.

Tears and sympathy are not always represented as emasculating or feminine weaknesses in *Dracula*. Instead, as seen with Lucy's tears, the narrative portrays tears as an overflowing fluid that brings characters together. After Mina requests that the vampire hunters kill her if she ever becomes a vampire, Seward narrates, "We men were all in tears now. There was no resisting them, and we wept openly" (287). If the vampire hunters tried to hide their tears from one another in the previous parts of the narrative, here, they weep together. The crucial difference between Mina and Lucy in their relationships with men is that the suitors try to look "strong and grave" when they are with Lucy (56). On the other hand, the vampire hunters fail to masquerade their true emotions from Mina. Rather than pretending to be masculine, the tears become the medium for a homosocial bond between vulnerable men. Unlike their proposals to Lucy, where Lucy was the only vulnerable individual crying and betraying her feelings, everyone cries and becomes equally vulnerable here. This communal vulnerability through their tears undermines traditional stereotypes and gender norms because these tears expose men as being as susceptible to their emotions as women.

We can also see the tears as a literal exchange of bodily fluids. In this collective weeping, the tears overflow out of each character's body and mix to renew

and form alternative relationships bonded through tears. After one of *Dracula*'s most iconic scenes of Mina sucking the blood out of the Count's chest, Mina's tears redeem her from punishment. When Mina sees that she has stained Harker's white robe with the Count's blood, Seward notices that Mina makes a "low wail, and whispered, amidst choking sobs" while crying out, "Unclean, unclean! I must touch him or kiss him no more" (264). Interestingly, Harker's immediate reaction to Mina's cries is to deny her uncleanness and to "put out his arms and fold[ing] her to his breast" while "she lay there sobbing" (264). Rather than judging or ostracizing Mina for this transgression, Mina and Harker's tears restore her from her misconduct and bond the couple with their tears. Harker assures Mina that "[m]ay God judge me by desires and punish me [...] if by any act or will of mine anything ever come between us!" (264). Here, the tears become an opportunity for the husband and wife to reaffirm and renew their marriage vows and strengthen their marriage bond.

However, even these renewed marriage bonds are not entirely stable, and order is yet to be restored. Although this scene portrays Mina and Harker's vow renewal to overwrite Mina's previous licentious liaison with the Count, this is soon followed by scenes of communal tears. Seward reveals that when the "men were all in tears," Mina "wept too," while her husband "hid his face in the folds of her dress" (287). Here, the tears merge Mina and the vampire hunters emotionally and physically, which thus, forms another polyandric relationship like Lucy shares with her suitors. This collective weeping, an exchange of uncontrollable bodily fluids, represents the consummation of the polyandric relationship between Mina and the vampire hunters. The communal tears once again dismantle Mina and Harker's

marriage bond, and instead, through these tears emerges the unexpected polyandric relationship among the vampire hunters.

As threatening as these communal tears may be to the Victorian marriage ideology, tears are not regarded as monstrous in *Dracula*. Through the differentiation between “unclean” bloodstains and redemptive tears, Seward’s narrative rather explores how blood is understood as monstrous while tears are civilized in *Dracula* (264). Vampires do not cry or exhibit sympathetic or sorrowful emotions throughout the novel. Instead, the human narrators describe vampire Lucy as “adamantine, heartless” (196), the Count as a “devil in callous,” and vampires as “without heart or conscience” (221). Here, the Count is labeled a “brute” and a “foul thing” because of his lack of gentle emotions that the vampire hunters deem humane (221). Unlike blood, tears are bodily fluids exclusive to humans, and the visibility of tears in *Dracula*’s human characters differentiates the tearless and, thus, monstrous vampires from the vampire hunters. Unlike blood which Seward constantly tries to hide and censor out of the physicians’ narrative, tears are safer to exhibit in *Dracula* and, consequently, less controlled and, at times, even dramatized at the narrative level.

This idea of a civilized bodily fluid can be understood alongside the discourse of eighteenth-century sentimentality. David Hume and Adam Smith argued that sentiments were inherent feelings that gave moral guidance and became moral standards (qtd. in Kaplan 17-8). Through this concept of sentimentality emerged the notion of a “man of feeling” who acted according to such moral sentiments (Kaplan 18). Emphasis on moral sentiments also led to the development of sentimental novels, with the rise of Richardson’s novels, where “moral didacticism” was a key constituent (Mullan 58-59). Mullan notes that in

Richardson's *Pamela*, the heroine's bodily gestures, such as her "sighs and tears," signal her "ability to feel and display sentiments" (61). While inner and hidden moral sentiments dictated one's thoughts and actions, displaying these sentiments through tears was also crucial to proving their existence. Interestingly, an important condition for these sentiments was that they should not be "an excess of feeling [...] self-destructive or socially harmful" (Kaplan 18). This meant that while tears were regarded as civilized and essential to a certain extent, the vampire hunters' hysterical breakdowns would be regarded as excessive.

Understanding tears as a humanizing and exclusively humane bodily fluid is also crucial when understanding the vampirization of female characters because Mina and Lucy lose their tears and sympathetic emotions as they turn into vampires. When Seward describes the vampire-turned-Lucy, he first notices "how changed" Lucy has become and how her previous "sweetness" has now "turned" to her new "heartless" state (Stoker 196). After Mina drinks the Count's blood, Van Helsing and Seward also notice Mina is "greatly changed." Although Mina is a character who constantly engages and sympathizes with her fellow male comrades throughout the novel, the more she turns into a vampire, Seward notices physical changes such as excessive "lethargy" (312). At the same time, Van Helsing admits that he is "afraid" of the fact that Mina continues to "sleep [...] and sleep" (338). Through vampirization, Mina and Lucy lose their "sweetness" and tears, two key constituents composing the stereotypical Victorian femininity. In this case, understanding Van Helsing and Seward's fear of female vampires as simply being afraid of blood-sucking monsters oversimplifies this anxiety. Instead, behind this fear lies the anxiety that Victorian women are abandoning their social duty to perform emotional

and sympathetic labor for men, disrupting the Victorian ideology of femininity and feminine roles. With this correlation between tears, femininity, and vampirization in mind, if we are to return to where Harker and Mina's tears reaffirm their marriage bond, Mina's tears are the prerequisite for this marriage bond to last. Because Mina sheds tears, unlike the heartless Lucy, Mina proves that she is still humane and capable of feeling and exhibiting human emotions. And it is this human capability that also allows Mina to remain as Harker's lawful wife in front of God and the vampire hunters.

The necessity of tears in this scene also reveals the key element of bodily fluids in *Dracula*: bodies need to circulate bodily fluids to survive. Bodies need to contain and protect their blood to survive and save themselves from becoming "unclean" vampires, but it also needs to exhibit just enough tears to be regarded as human (264). Characters must also consume and drink only what is socially accepted and release bodily fluids only when it is socially accepted. Thus, to survive in *Dracula* as a human, characters must always circulate and regulate their bodily fluids because that is the only way they can be maintained.

The problem that arises in *Dracula*, however, is that characters cannot regulate and maintain their tears in this systematic manner. Instead, emotions and tears are portrayed as so uncontrollable that characters continuously find themselves vulnerable to their excessive bursts of emotions and tears. Notably, the narratives of *Dracula* are equally as uncontrollable as are tears and emotions in the novel. After Mina listens to Seward's diaries through his phonograph, Seward finds Mina "very sad, and her eyes were flushed with crying" (207). To which Mina replies:

I have been more touched than I can say by your grief. That is a wonderful machine, but it is cruelly true. It told me, in its very tones, the anguish of your heart. It was like a soul crying out to Almighty God. No one must hear them spoken ever again! See, I have tried to be useful. I have copied out the words on my typewriter, and none other need now hear your heart beat, as I did. (206)

Although Mina does not physically witness Seward's grief, as she does with Godalming, Mina can still empathize with Seward through the voice recorded on the phonograph. Mina believes the phonograph is "cruelly true" because Seward's voice exposes all of his emotions. Mina assumes the position of an editor and volunteers to censor and omit these emotions from Seward's narrative by transcribing his diaries into written text (206). On a certain level, Mina's voluntary service makes her appear to be doing Seward a favor by hiding his secretive emotions, just as Seward closes the blinds to hide Van Helsing's tears from being seen. This is because by transcribing Seward's diary, it seems that others will only have access to her edited version, which contains no emotions that may deem Seward feminine or unmanly.

However, the problem with Mina's sympathetic gesture is that by transcribing and copying Seward's diary, Mina turns Seward's private and vulnerable episode into public knowledge. Before this scene, Mina begs Seward, "you had better let me copy it out for you on my typewriter" (206). To access Seward's emotions, Mina must first have Seward's permission. Nevertheless, after Mina finally does copy Seward's diary, it is no longer Seward's exclusive privacy or writing. Although Mina insists that "[n]o one" and "none other" but herself must hear Seward's anguish-filled voice, saying this with such emphasis ironically draws

more attention to Seward's grief. The narrative in *Dracula* integrates singular private moments that betray the men's emotions and combines them into one publication.

What further threatens male characters is that the compilation of writings that Mina assembles is not read privately but repetitively circulated. Initially, only the vampire hunters circulate and exchange teary narratives amongst themselves. When Mina first meets Van Helsing, Mina gives him Jonathan's journal in typewritten form. She tells him, "I shall give you a paper to read. It is long, but I have typewritten it out. It will tell you my trouble and Jonathan's" (173). When Harker and Mina marry, Harker explicitly requests that Mina not read his diary because it contains his experiences of extreme terror and sorrow to the point of tears and mental breakdowns. These diary entries are moments of Harker's emasculation where Harker admits that "horror overcame me, and I sank down unconscious" (40) or when Harker "covered [his] face with [his] hands to hide [his] tears of bitter disappointment" (50). Although these scenes may be emasculating to Harker, Mina shares these diary entries with a stranger like Van Helsing and later with the other vampire hunters. Like tears that cannot be restrained, the teary and emasculating narratives flow from one hand to another until everyone reads of each other's most vulnerable breakdowns.

Although these typewritten papers exposing their tears are emasculating to the vampire hunters, Mina's writing cannot be censored or controlled because Mina's typewritten papers are still invaluable in the vampire hunters' search for Count Dracula. When the vampire hunters come together, Van Helsing hands Seward a copy of these papers and tells him to "study them well. When I have returned, you will be master of all the facts, and we can then better enter on our

inquisition” (204). Van Helsing calls Mina’s papers “the facts,” a description Seward later reiterates as he, too, refers to these papers as containing “the answer” (237). However, the writings these men call facts are a compilation of their tears and emotional breakdowns. Mina scarcely records her vampire attacks, claiming that she has a hazy memory and that these events felt like a dream. On the other hand, the episodes of the male characters’ tears are recorded to the last detail. If Mina’s papers are considered facts, Mina’s typewritten papers suggest that men are as emotional as women despite Victorian stereotypes.

The circulation of Mina’s typewritten papers does not end with the vampire hunters. Instead, these texts are further transferred and circulated to *Dracula’s* readers if we consider the circulation of the novel itself. The greatest threat that tears bring in *Dracula* is that the vampire hunters are repetitively exposed to their emotional breakdowns and that the vampire hunters cannot stop or control this circulation. The irony is that even in moments when Mina tries to protect the vampire hunters’ masculinity by offering to censor Seward’s emotions out of the writings, the narrative refuses such censorship and remains uncontrollable. Thus, the uncontrollable narratives flow beyond the vampire hunters to the readers so that the readers can also witness the vampire hunters’ vulnerabilities. As a result, Mina’s sympathetic act only ensures that these teary episodes remain a part of the circulated text. Immortalized within *Dracula*, these male tears and emotions are exhibited for all to see even centuries after its first circulation.

Conclusion

By the last chapter of *Dracula*, the long battle between the Count and the vampire hunters comes to an end as Quincey “plunge[s]” his knife into the Count’s heart, and the Count’s body “crumble[s] into dust” (Stoker 350). By representing the Count’s death as a disappearance to “dust,” Mina presents the Count’s demise as an arid image (350). When Godalming stakes Lucy, blood “well[s] and spurt[s]” out of her body (201). Nevertheless, no blood oozes out of the vampire’s body during the Count’s death. The lack of bodily fluids leaves no possibility for blood contamination nor further risk of vampirization.

Just as the Count’s flesh and bodily fluids vanish from sight, all evidence of the Count’s existence disappears. In Harker’s final note, Harker notes that “[e]very trace of all that had [happened] was blotted out” (351). While Harker blames the Count for leaving “hardly one authentic document” to prove these “wild” adventures, the lack of evidence also contributes to the seemingly and supposedly neat ending (351). With the Count’s death, Mina’s forehead turns “stainless” as “snow,” and the vampire hunters rejoice in her restoration from vampirization (350). At a glance, all ends well in *Dracula*. The monstrous enemy is defeated, the heroine is saved by her heroes, the heroes are each rewarded with marriage, and finally, the heroine gives birth to a new generation: a symbol of hope for humanity.

However, I question this seemingly happy ending by focusing on bodily fluids in *Dracula* rather than on the characters. The Count’s story may end with his death but *Dracula* and bodily fluids within the novel flow beyond this scene. In fact, the vampire hunters’ preoccupation with destroying the Count and his fellow

vampires causes them to overlook a more significant leakage within their band of vampire hunters. In Stoker's *Dracula*, human characters trickle blood and tears even in the Count's absence. In the same scene that the Count turns to dust, and Mina becomes "stainless," blood "gushes" out of Quincey's body (350). Quincey's stabbed and bleeding body oddly mirrors the staked vampire brides' bodies. In other words, Quincey's bloody death substitutes for the Count's unusually dry and neat death. Although the Count's excessive bodily fluids disappear from the novel, bodily fluids continue to leak amongst the human characters.

The most significant evidence of the vampire hunters' leaking and mingling bodily fluids is the birth of little Quincey. In the novel, Harker conveys that the baby's "bundle of names links all our little band of men together" (351). What Harker fails to notice is that the band of vampire hunters is linked through the mixture of bodily fluids, which eventually flows into and through this baby. Kuzmanovic notes that the Count's blood remains in Mina's veins even after his death and eventually flows into Mina's child (422). However, the Count's blood is not the only treacherous blood that threatens Mina and Harker's marriage bed. Because the Count sucks blood from Lucy, including transfused blood out of the other vampire hunters, blood from the Count, Lucy, the vampire hunters, and her husband mingle together within Mina to create little Quincey. In the novel's finale, Harker tries to represent the "link" as a symbolic bond between Mina and the vampire hunters, but it is a link created by the constant mixing of blood (Stoker 351).

Furthermore, the consistent flow of tears among the vampire hunters further solidifies the polyandric relationship for the birth of little Quincey. Harker and Mina's marriage bond is initially renewed by their mutual tears even after Mina

drinks the Count's blood. Mina's wails that she is "unclean" are soothed by Harker's tears that confirm that nothing can "ever come between us" (264). By uniting themselves with tears and the term "us," Harker tries to solidify their marriage.

However, as the vampire hunters pursue the Count to Castle Dracula, the other vampire hunters join the couple in tears of love and break this renewed marriage bond. Soon after the scene mentioned above, Mina calls the vampire hunters "friends who love me," and these men all "we[ep] openly" for her as a sign of their love and loyalty for her (286-287). The love that blossomed amid tears lives on long after Mina and the band of vampire hunters return to England. As the love child of the circulating blood within Mina's veins and the mingling tears that bonds the men to Mina, little Quincey lives on as the living evidence of the uncontained, uncontrollable, and unleashed bodily fluids that mingle within the vampire hunters.

The final image of *Dracula* is little Quincey on Van Helsing's knee as the latter proclaims how the "boy" will eventually learn of "how some men so loved [his mother]" (351). The novel does not immortalize Mina as the restored wife and mother whose bodily fluids are finally controlled within Victorian society. Instead, it reintroduces Mina as the character who reproduces another uncontrollable channel (little Quincey) where bodily fluids mingle and flow through and consequently continue to disrupt and threaten Victorian society. Rather than a happy ending that represents the renewed regulation of bodily fluids, then, *Dracula* offers an ending where the Count's bodily fluids ironically appear contained while human bodily fluids cannot be controlled. Traces of the Count's blood can no longer be found. However, the vampire hunters' trickling blood and mingling tears continue to flow, stain, and drench their narrations in *Dracula*.

Works Cited

- Ablow, Rachel. "Victorian Feeling and the Victorian Novel." *Literature Compass*, vol 4, no. 1, 2007, pp. 298–316.
- Almond, Barbara R. "Monstrous Infants and Vampiric Mothers in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 88, 2007, pp. 219–235.
- Armston-Sheret, Edward. "Leaky Bodies: Syphilitic Incontinence on the Jackson-Harmsworth Expedition." *Victorian Review*, vol. 45, no. 1, 2019, pp. 10–14.
- Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 33, no. 4, 1990, pp. 621–645.
- Bardi, Abby. "'Labours of Their Own': Property, Blood, and the Szgany in *Dracula*." *Bram Stoker and the Gothic: Formations to Transformations*, edited by Catherine Wynne, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 78–91.
- Begiato, Joanne. "Punishing the Unregulated Manly Body and Emotions in Early Victorian England." *The Victorian Male Body*, edited by Joanna Ella Parsons and Ruth Heholt, Edinburgh University Press, 2018, pp. 46–64.
- Case, Alison. "Tasting the Original Apple: Gender and the Struggle for Narrative Authority in *Dracula*." *Narrative*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1993, pp. 223–243.
- Chez, Keridiana. "'You Can't Trust Wolves No More Nor Women': Canines, Women, and Deceptive Docility in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Review*, vol. 38, no. 1, 2012, pp. 77–92.
- Craft, Christopher. "'Kiss Me with Those Red Lips': Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Representations*, no. 8, 1984, pp. 107–133.
- Demetrakopoulos, Stephanie. "Feminism, Sex Role Exchanges, and Other Subliminal Fantasies in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1977, pp. 104–13.
- Durbach, Nadja. "Vampires, Vivisectors, and the Victorian Body." *Bodily Matters: The Anti-Vaccination Movement in England, 1853–1907*. Duke University Press, 2005, pp. 113–149.
- Fleissner, Jennifer L. "Dictation Anxiety: The Stenographer's Stake in *Dracula*." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, vol. 22, no. 3, Jan. 2000, pp. 417–455.
- Gasperini, Anne. *Nineteenth Century Popular Fiction, Medicine and Anatomy: The Victorian Penny Blood and the 1832 Anatomy Act*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

- Gilbert, Pamela K. *The Citizen's Body: Desire, Health, and the Social in Victorian England*. Ohio State University Press, 2007.
- Groom, Nick. *The Vampire: A New History*. Yale University Press, 2018.
- Halberstam, Judith. "Technologies of Monstrosity: Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1993, pp. 333–352.
- Heath, Stephen. *The Sexual Fix*. The Macmillan Press, 1982.
- Hurley, Kelly. *The Gothic Body: Sexuality, Materialism, and Degeneration at the Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Jann, Rosemary. "Saved by Science? The Mixed Messages of Stoker's *Dracula*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1989, pp. 273–287.
- Kaplan, Fred. "The Moral Sentiments." *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*. Open Road Media, 2013, pp. 12–33.
- Kibbie, Ann Louise. *Transfusion: Blood and Sympathy in the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. University of Virginia Press, 2019.
- Kuzmanovic, Dejan. "Vampiric Seduction and Vicissitudes of Masculine Identity in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2009, pp. 411–425.
- Knott, John. "Popular Attitudes to Death and Dissection in Early Nineteenth Century Britain: The Anatomy Act and the Poor." *Labor History*, no. 49, 1985, pp. 1–18.
- Law, Jules David. *The Social Life of Fluids: Blood, Milk, and Water in the Victorian Novel*. Cornell University Press, 2010.
- Lee, Michael Paris. *The Food Plot of the Nineteenth-Century British Novel*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Lennartz, Norbert. "Far from the Madding Romantic Crowd: The Anti-Porous Turn in the Victorian Age." *Tears, Liquids and Porous Bodies in Literature Across the Ages: Niobe's Siblings*, Bloomsbury Academic, 2022, pp. 127–180.
- Longhurst, Robyn. "Bodily Openings." *Bodies: Exploring Fluid Boundaries*. Routledge, 2001, pp. 1–8.
- Mullan, John. "Richardson: Sentiment and the Construction of Femininity." *Sentiment and Sociability*. Clarendon Press, 1990, pp. 57–113.

- Prescott, Charles E., and Grace A. Giorgio. "Vampiric Affinities: Mina Harker and the Paradox of Femininity in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 33, no. 2, Sept. 2005, pp. 487–515.
- Poovey, Mary. "'Scenes of an Indelicate Character': The Medical 'Treatment' of Victorian Women." *Representations*, no. 14, 1986, pp. 137–168.
- Roth, Jenny, et al. "'Your Girls That You All Love Are Mine Already': *Dracula*, Mormonism and New Women's Degenerate Polygamy." *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, vol. 12, no. 2, June 2016, pp. 353–372.
- Ross, Ian, and Carol Urquhart Ross. "Body Snatching in Nineteenth Century Britain: From Exhumation to Murder." *British Journal of Law and Society*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1979, pp. 108–118.
- Schneider, Ralf. "The Invisible Center: Conceptions of Masculinity in Victorian Fiction—Realist, Crime, Detective, and Gothic." *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*, edited by Stefan Horlacher, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 147–168.
- Senf, Carol A. "'Dracula': Stoker's Response to the New Woman." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 26, no. 1, 1982, pp. 33–49.
- Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*. Penguin, 1987.
- Spencer, Kathleen L. "Purity and Danger: *Dracula*, the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis." *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1992, pp. 197–225.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*, edited by Roger Luckhurst. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Straight, Alyssa. "Giving Birth to a New Nation: Female Mediation and the Spread of Textual Knowledge in *Dracula*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2017, pp. 381–394.
- Swartz-Levine, Jennifer A. "Staking Salvation: The Reclamation of the Monstrous Female in *Dracula*." *The Midwest Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 4, 2016, pp. 345–361.
- Winstead, Karen A. "Mrs. Harker and Dr. Van Helsing: *Dracula*, *Fin-de-Siècle* Feminisms, and the New Wo/Man." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 99, no. 3, 2020, pp. 315–336.
- Wicke, Jennifer. "Vampiric Typewriting: *Dracula* and Its Media." *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 2, 1992, pp. 467–493.
- Zwart, Hub. "Vampires, Viruses, and Verbalisation: Bram Stoker's *Dracula* As a Genealogical Window into Fin-De-Siècle Science." *Janus Head*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2018, pp. 14–53.

국문 초록

본 논문은 브람 스토커의 『드라큘라』를 채액의 재현에 초점을 맞추어 분석한다. 여성의 몸을 다공성으로 보는 전통적인 인식에서 한걸음 더 나아가 본 논문은 『드라큘라』에서 나오는 모든 몸을 다공성으로 그리고 채액 흐름을 위한 매체로 제시한다. 피와 눈물이 몸 밖으로 터져 나와 다른 채액과 섞이면서 종과 성별의 관계와 경계가 재편된다. 넘쳐 흐르는 피와 눈물로 인간 인물들과 비인간 뱀파이어 사이의 경계는 모호해지고 여성 인물들과 뱀파이어 사냥꾼 사이의 관계는 새로 형성되는 것으로 나타난다. 본 논문은 소설에서 피와 눈물이 어디에 나타나고 생략되었는지를 확인함으로써, 인간 인물들이 채액을 통제하려는 헛된 시도를 알아보고자 한다.

첫 번째 장에서는 의사가 피를 빨아들이는 뱀파이어를 과도하게 묘사하면서 의료 현장에서 피의 묘사를 검열하는 부분을 살펴보고자 한다. 흡혈귀의 괴물성은 구성하는 핵심 요소는 흡혈귀의 인간 피 소비이다. 아이러니하게도, 소설에서 드러나는 의사의 끔찍한 의료 행위는 뱀파이어의 괴물 같은 식욕을 섬뜩하게 반영한다. 불균등한 피의 묘사에 초점을 맞추어, 본 1 장에서는 의사들이 어떻게 피를 통제하고 괴물 같은 흡혈귀로부터 자신들을 차별화하려고 애타게 시도하는지 논의한다.

두 번째 장에서는 뱀파이어 사냥꾼들의 눈물과 히스테리 발작의 묘사를 통해 눈물의 재현이 이들의 남성성을 위협하는 방법을 고려한다. 눈물이 사적인 감정으로 간주되는 역사적 맥락에서 뱀파이어 사냥꾼들은 반복적으로 미나와 서로 앞에서 눈물을 터트린다. 본 2 장에서는 또한 함께 눈물을 흘림으로써 생기는 새로운 관계 형성의 가능성을 포착한다. 눈물을 통해 미나는 남편과 흐트러진 혼인관계를 새로 맺게 되면서 다른 남성 뱀파이어 사냥꾼들과는 의심스러운 혼외관계 형성의 가능성도 열린다.

주요어: 『드라큘라』, 채액, 피, 눈물, 뱀파이어, 젠더

학 번: 2021-21034