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ABSTRACT

Since Bacil Kirtley in 1958 proposed that Bram Stoker’s Count Dracula, the best known literary character ever, shared his historical past with the Wallachian Voivode Vlad III Dracula, an intense debate about this connection has developed and other candidates have been suggested, like the Hungarian General János Hunyadi – a proposal resurfacing in the most recent annotated Dracula edition by Leslie Klinger (2008). By close-reading Stoker’s sources, his research notes and the novel, I will demonstrate that Stoker’s narrative initially links his Count to the person of Vlad III indeed, not Hunyadi, although the novelist neither knew the ruler’s first name, nor his father’s name, nor his epithet “the Impaler”, nor the cruelties attributed to him.

Still – or maybe for this very reason – Stoker did not wish to uphold this traceable identity: In Chapter 25, shortly before the decisive chase, he removes this link again, by way of silent substitution, cloaked by Professor van Helsing’s clownish distractions. Like the Vampire Lord Ruthven, disappearing through the “vampire trap” constructed by James R. Planché for his play The Brides of the Isles in the English Opera House, later renamed to Lyceum Theatre and run by Stoker, the historical Voivode Vlad III Dracula is suddenly removed from the stage: In the final chapters, the Vampire Hunters pursue a nameless double.

Smoothly performed, this piece of stage magic has gone unnoticed for more than one hundred years now. As a consequence, most of the arguments related to the Count’s lifetime identity turn out to suffer from ignoratio delenchi (the fallacy of irrelevant conclusion). The “marriage” of Count Dracula and Vlad the Impaler needs no divorce, as filed for by Toronto Prof. Em. Elizabeth Miller in 1998: As Stoker revoked this bond before his book went to print, it was never consummated and can be annulled without much ado.
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INTRODUCTION

Bram Stoker’s notes, taken down since March 1890 while he was preparing and writing his novel Dracula (published 1897), offer us an unique chance to understand the development of the best-known fictional character of all time: Count Dracula. Despite his unparalleled celebrity, his personal antecedent is still shrouded by mystery and has given rise to intense debate among fans and academic experts, resulting in numerous books, articles and blog entries. Various historical figures have been proposed as the Count’s lifetime identity, the degree of their influence on Stoker’s literary portrait discussed. Especially the Wallachian Voivode Vlad III Dracula “The Impaler”, the Hungarian General/Governor János Hunyadi and Countess Elisabeth Báthory have been named as historical substrates of the Vampire Count. Both while literary creations like Lord Ruthven, mythical characters like werewolves and political rulers from a time completely unrelated to Stokers narrative, e.g. Nero, Herod, Vercingetorix or William of Orange, may theoretically qualify as role models, sharing evil or heroic qualities with Stoker’s protagonist, the Vampire’s lifetime identity must name a person, notional or historical, who – within the framework of the novel – shares his bodily existence with Count Dracula: He was Count Dracula, before the latter turned into a Creature of Darkness. For this reason alone, I will leave Elisabeth Báthory aside – I have heard no arguments yet that the transformation into a Vampire might involve a change of gender. For clarity’s sake, I stress that this paper is about a link which exists within Bram Stoker’s work of fantasy only – I do not believe in Vampires and hope my readers do no either.

Like in the case of searching – and finding – the exact site of Castle Dracula,¹ I will reconstruct the way Stoker treated the Count’s lifetime identity by close-reading the story’s text, Stoker’s notes and the sources he studied. Starting point was my suspicion that Stoker might have handled this central issue in a similar way like the Castle’s address, blurring its traces by deliberate vagueness and narrative discontinuity.

My first conclusion that Vlad III Dracula, later known as Vlad Ţepeş (the Impaler), not János Hunyadi fits the identification initially suggested by Stoker will be no great surprise to readers convinced of Vlad’s significance anyway. The assessment that Stoker actually knew very little about this historical Voivode is familiar as well in academic circles: For more than a decade now, this has been convincingly advocated by Toronto Dracula expert Elizabeth Miller. But other than suggested by Miller, Stoker was not completely indifferent about this national leader being connected to the story’s fiend.

In one of the final chapters, Stoker removes the initial identification with the historical Voivode Dracula from his text again, by means of slight substitution. Since the substitute resembles the original in many aspects, we can speak of a double. In Moldavia and the Transylvanian border area, the Vampire Hunters chase and finally exterminate a nameless phantom.

It seems that this silent replacement has gone unnoticed for more than a century now – neither in the secondary literature I have at hand nor in the Internet I found any comment specifically addressing this mechanism: Bram Stoker’s vampire trap.

We do not know for sure which reason Stoker had for doing so. But as similar camouflage operations can be observed regarding the novel’s year of action and Stoker’s way of garbling addresses, this intervention must be based on a deliberate decision. Therefore, how much or how little Stoker really knew about Vlad III and how much (how little) of this information was transferred to the novel’s text in the end does not touch on the Count’s identity. As a consequence, all arguments pro and contra the Impaler’s influence put forward since 1958, when Bacil Kirtley first suggested Vlad III to represent the Count’s historical past, suffer from the “fallacy of irrelevant conclusion”:² Even if McNally and Florescu had discovered a secret room³ in Stoker’s house filled with books about the Impaler’s ferocity, this would not change the fact that Vlad III Dracula was not Stoker’s final choice for the Vampire Count’s lifetime identity. The “divorce” Prof. Elizabeth Miller has been filing for in her 1998 essay can finally be granted, or even better, the “marriage” can be annulled, as Stoker himself revised his novel’s initial link to Vlad III even before the book was printed: the unholy bond between Vlad & Drac was never consummated.

¹ The site Stoker had in mind, not the location of an actual building. See The Dracula Maps, 2012, part of The Ultimate Dracula, 2012.
² The equivalent expression ignoratio delenchi is used in the novel by Stoker’s character Renfield in a moment of unexpected lucidity.
³ The topic of a “secret room” in the Count’s house is mentioned several times in Stoker’s notes, but it does not appear in the novel, except for the crypt Harker discovers in the Castle’s basement.
I – FROM THE NAMELESS "COUNT_____STYRIA" TO "COUNT DRACULA"

Stoker's notes have been put in tentative chronological order by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller in their 2008 facsimile edition of the papers now owned by the Rosenbach Museum and Library in Philadelphia (Hereafter referred to as Notes). The first notes were taken down in March 1890. In or shortly after Stoker visited Whitby in summer 1890 and found Wilkinson's book in the public library there, the Count, who initially had no name or whose name was indicated by a horizontal stroke to be filled in afterwards, and later on is mentioned as “Count Wampyr”, received the name “Dracula”. A scene planned to take place in the Munich Dead House (mortuary) about a seemingly dead man coming to live again – a man apparently identical with the Count later spotted in London by Harker – is dropped from the plot altogether. In Rosenbach 38b, we read the Vampire is “only moved by relics older than own real date xxx – a man apparently identical with the Count later spotted in London by Harker – is dropped from the plot altogether. In A scene planned to take place in the Munich Dead House (mortuary) about a seemingly dead man coming to live again a horizontal stroke to be filled in afterwards, and later on is mentioned as “Count Wampyr”, received the name “Dracula”.

In this essential point, Stoker deviates from James R. Planché’s 1820 adaptation of Charles Nodier's The Bride of the Isles for the stage. In this play, Unda, the Spirit of the Flood, explains that Vampires essentially are discarnate: “Thou knowest, Ariel, that wicked souls/ Are, for wise purposes, permitted of/ To enter the dead forms of other men/ Assume their speech, their habits and their knowledge./ And thus roam o’ver the Earth; but subject still/ At stated periods, to a dreadful tribute”. The “dreadful tribute” consists in having to marry a virgin every year and drink her blood.

II – VAN HELSING AND COUNT DRACULA ON THE VAMPIRE’S IDENTITY

Other than Planché’s Ruthven, who after having deceased is possessed by the spirit of “Cromal, the Bloody” as the true moving factor of his weird behaviour, Stoker’s Count Dracula appears to possess a personal, bodily and mental continuity, which has survived natural death and centuries of isolation in the Carpathian mountains. In Chapter 18, Professor van Helsing lectures:

“I have asked my friend Arminius, of Buda-Pesth University, to make his record, and from all the means that are, he tell me of what he has been. He must, indeed, have been that Voiwode Dracula who won his name against the Turk, over the great river on the very frontier of Turkeyland. If it be so, then was he no common man, for in that time, and for centuries after, he was spoken of as the cleverest and the most cunning, as well as the bravest of the sons of the ‘land beyond the forest.’ That mighty brain and that iron resolution went with him to his grave, and are even now arrayed against us. The Draculas were, says Arminius, a great and noble race, though now and again were scions who were held by their coevals to have had dealings with the Evil One. They learned his secrets in the Scholomance, amongst the mountains over Lake Hermanstadt, where the devil claims the tenth scholar as his due. In the records are such words as ‘stregoica’ witch, ‘ordog’ and ‘pokol’ Satan and hell, and in one manuscript this very Dracula is spoken of as ‘wampyr,’ which we all understand too well. There have been from the loins of this very one great men and good women, and their graves make sacred the earth where alone this foulness can dwell. For it is not the least of its terrors that this evil thing is rooted deep in all good, in soil barren of holy memories it cannot rest.”

This suggest that the Voiwode Dracula may have been the tenth pupil claimed by the Devil as his servant. In Chapter 24, Van Helsing offers Mina an alternative explanation:

“All this have I told these others. You, my dear Madam Mina, will learn it in the phonograph of my friend John, or in that of your husband. I have told them how the measure of leaving his own barren land, barren of peoples, and coming to a new land where life of man teems till they are like the multitude of standing corn, was the work of centuries. Were another of the Undead, like him, to try to do what he has done, perhaps not all the centuries of the world that have been, or that will be, could aid him. With this one, all the forces of nature that are occult and deep and strong must have worked together in some wonderous way. The very place, where he have been alive, Undead for all these centuries, is full of strangeness of the geologic and chemical world. There are deep caverns and fissures that reach none know whither. There have been volcanoes, some of whose openings still send out waters of strange properties, and gases that kill or make to vivify. Doubtless, there is something magnetic or electric in some of these combinations of occult forces which work for physical life in strange way, and in himself were from the first some great qualities. In a hard and warlike time he was celebrate that he have more iron nerve, more subtle brain, more braver heart, than any man. In him some vital principle have in strange way found their utmost. And as his body keep strong and grow and thrive, so his brain grow too.”

4 See date 8/3/90 on Rosenbach #35 verso, Notes, p. 17f. Just like in the novel, Stoker used the day/month/year scheme.
Although the explanations vary, in both descriptions there is no doubt that Dracula, while passing from life to his existence as Un-Dead being, essentially has retained his identity. To understand more about this identity, we must start with the Count’s words to Harker in Chapter 3:

“When was redeemed that great shame of my nation, the shame of Cassova, when the flags of the Wallach and the Magyar went down beneath the Crescent? Who was it but one of my own race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground? This was a Dracula indeed! Woe was it that his own unworthy brother, when he had fallen, sold his people to the Turk and brought the shame of slavery on them! Was it not this Dracula, indeed, who inspired that other of his race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground? This was a Dracula indeed! Woe was it that his alone could ultimately triumph! They said that he thought only of himself. Bah! What good are peasants without a leader? Where ends the war without a brain and heart to conduct it? Again, when, after the battle of Mohacs, we threw off the Hungarian yoke, we of the Dracula blood were amongst their leaders, for our spirit would not brook that we were not free. Ah, young sir, the Szekelys, and the Dracula as their heart’s blood, their brains, and their swords, can boast a record that mushroom growths like the Hapsburgs and the Romanoffs can never reach.”

III – SZEKLER OR WALLACHIAN?

The most obvious disparity is that the Count speaks of the Draculas as if they were Szeklers. As the Vampire states so eloquently before he speaks on the Draculas, the Szeklers were descendants of the Huns and related to the Magyars; he claims the blood of Attila is in his veins. Stoker learned about the Szeklers from various books by Nina Elizabeth Mazuchelli, A. F. Crosse, Major E. C. Johnson and Charles Boner. Regarding the historical Voivodes of the Drăculești branch of the Basarab family, however, Stoker had but a single source documented in his notes: Wilkinson’s 1820 Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, reporting on the Wallachian leaders.

Considering that the majority of his research notes on Hungarian, Transylvanian and Wallachian history deals with the different origins and contrasting geo-political interests of the mentioned tribes or races, I conclude that Stoker was very well aware that a Szekler would not call for throwing off “the Hungarian yoke”. Curiously, the original manuscript speaks of the “Austrian yoke”, changed to “Hungarian yoke” in the published book. “Austrian yoke” harmonises with the perspective of the Szeklers, while “Hungarian yoke” matches the Wallachian point of view. Stoker, after haphazardly mixing his information about the Wallachian Voivodes with his freshly acquired knowledge about the Szeklers, in the end obviously opted for the Wallachian, not the Szekler interpretation of political relations, in order to restore some consistency to his Voivode Dracula.

IV WILKINSON’S ACCOUNT ON THE PRINCIPALITIES OF WALLACHIA AND MOLDAVIA

I summarise from Wilkinson; the complete text of the relevant passage is found on the next page. I have added colour coding:

In 1444, the son of the Wallachian “Voïvoide Dracula” supported the Hungarian King Ladislas with 4,000 men against the Turks. After the Hungarian leader Hunniades (Hunyadi) lost the Battle of Varna, the Voivode feared the Sultan’s revenge and kept Hunyadi prisoner. Once released, Hunyadi with a Hungarian army defeated this Dracula and had him beheaded in his presence. Hunyadi’s ally, the new Voivode Dan, was defeated by the Turks at Cossova in 1448 and had no choice but paying tribute. A new opportunity arose only in 1460, when the Turks were occupied in the Archipelago. Again, the name of the Voivode was Dracula. He crossed the Danube to attack the remaining Ottomans. But Sultan Mahomet II mobilised his army and drove him back to Wallachia. The Voivode escaped to Hungary, his brother Bladus was installed in his place and made a treaty with the Turks, binding the Wallachians to a “perpetual tribute”.

There can be no doubt that the Voivode Dracula first mentioned by Wilkinson was Vlad II Dracul, member of the Order of the Dragon. Vlad II was the illegitimate son of Mircea cel Bâtâran (Mircea the Elder), mentioned by Wilkinson as “Voivode Mirtza”, who already in 1391 had started an anti-Turkish campaign, but was defeated by Sultan Bajazet.6

---

6 As Vampires have no heartbeat and no blood running through their veins at all, this can only be meant in the figurative sense.
7 See Notes, Typed Research Notes, pp. 199-243.
8 Noted by Klinger, 2008, p. 70f., note 32.
9 Wilkinson, 1820, p. 17. Since this essay is about Stoker, not about history, I will not specify sources for all single historical events here.
WILKINSON, 1820, P. 16-19

Frequent hostilities against the Hungarians, arising from the claims of sovereignty of the latter, accustomed the Wallachians to war; and in 1391 the Voïvode Mirtza collected a numerous force, and attacked the neighbouring possessions of the Turks with the view of rescuing them from their hands. The Sultan Bajazer being at that moment employed in Asia (...), had left his conquests near the Danube without the means of defence. But when the news of their invasion reached him, he suspended his operations in Asia, and returned to Adrianople, from whence he sent a numerous army to Wallachia. The Voïvode marched to meet the Turks; and, after a bloody battle, he was defeated, and compelled to become tributary to the Sultan. The annual tribute was fixed at three thousand piasters.*

Wallachia continued to pay it until the year 1444, when Ladislas King of Hungary, preparing to make war against the Turks, engaged the Voïvode Dracula to form an alliance with him. The Hungarian troops marched through the principality and were joined by four thousand Wallachians under the command of Dracula’s son.†

The Hungarians being defeated at the celebrated battle of Varna, Hunniades their general, and regent of the kingdom during Ladislas’s minority, returned in haste to make new preparations for carrying on the war. But the Voïvode, fearful of the Sultan’s vengeance, arrested and kept him prisoner during a year, pretending thereby to show to the Turks that he treated him as an enemy. The moment Hunniades reached Hungary, he assembled an army and put himself at the head of it, returned to Wallachia, attacked an defeated the Voïvode, and caused him to be beheaded in his presence; after which he raised to the Voivodate one of the primates of the Country, of the name of Dan.

The Wallachians under this Voïvode joined again the Hungarians in 1448, and made war on Turkey; but being totally defeated at the battle of Cossova, in Bulgaria, and finding it no longer possible to make any stand against the Turks, they submitted again to the annual tribute, which they paid until the year 1460, when the Sultan Mahomet II. being occupied in completing the conquests of the islands in the Archipelago, afforded them a new opportunity of shaking off the yoke. Their Voïvode, also named Dracula,* did not remain satisfied with mere prudent measures of defence; with an army he crossed the Danube and attacked the few Turkish troops that were stationed in his neighbourhood; but this attempt, like those of his predecessors, was only attended with momentary success. Mahomet, having turned his arms against him, drove him back to Wallachia, whither he pursued and defeated him. The Voïvode escaped into Hungary, and the Sultan caused his brother Bladus to be named in his place. He made a treaty with Bladus, by which he bound the Wallachians to perpetual tribute and laid the foundations of slavery not yet abolished. (1820) <p.18-19>

* Knolles’s History of Turkey, p. 204, and Tounousli’s History of Turkey, p. 247. A piaster and a half is equal to an English shilling. (Greek title transcribed - HdR)
† Knolles’s History, p. 296

Stoker’s Notes

DRACULA in the Wallachian language means DEVIL. Wallachians were accustomed to give this as a surname to any person who rendered himself conspicuous either by courage, cruel actions, or cunning.

The Wallachians joined Hungarians in 1448 and made war on Turkey, being defeated at battle of Cossova in Bulgaria and finding it impossible to make any stand against the Turks, they submitted to annual tribute which they paid until 1460 when Sultan Mahomet II. being occupied in completing the conquests of the islands in the Archipelago gave opportunity of shaking off yoke. Their VOIVODE [DRACULA] crossed Danube and attacked Turkish troops Only momentary success. Mahomet drove him back to Wallachia where pursued and defeated him. The VOIVODE escaped into Hungary and the Sultan caused his brother Bladus received in his place. He made treaty with Bladus finding (binding - HdR) Wallachians to perpetual tribute and laid the foundations of slavery not yet abolished. (1820) <p.18-19>

When was redeemed that great shame of my nation, the shame of Cassova, when the flags of the Wallach and the Magyar went down beneath the Crescent? Who was it but one of my own race who as Voivode crossed the Danube and beat the Turk on his own ground? This was a Dracula indeed! Woe was it that his own unworthy brother, when he had fallen, sold his people to the Turk and brought the shame of slavery on them! Was it not this Dracula, indeed, who inspired that other of his race who in a later age again and again brought his forces over the great river into Turkeyland, who, when he was beaten back, came again, and again, though he had to come alone from the bloody field where his troops were being slaughtered, since he knew that he alone could ultimately triumph!

THE COUNT’S SPEECH

COLOUR CODING:

*...in 1391 the Voivode Mirtza collected...: Mircea the Elder, father of Vlad II Dracul
...engaged the Voivode Dracula...: Vlad II Dracul, father of Mircea II, Vlad III, Radu II
Dracula’s son: Mircea II, Vlad II’s heir, joined Hunyadi, buried alive by Boyars.

Hunniades their general, and regent of the kingdom during Ladislas’s minority: Hunyades
Their Voivode, also named Dracula...: Vlad Dracul III = Vlad the Impaler
...his brother Bladus: Radu II the Handsome, brother of Vlad III, ally of the Turks.

That other of his race who in a later age: Who is this??? Michael II the Brave???
P.19. **DRACULA** in Wallachian language means **DEVIL**. Wallachians were accustomed to give it as a surname to any person who rendered himself conspicuous by courage, cruel actions or cunning.

P.18.19. The Wallachians joined Hungarians in 1443 and made war on Turkey, being defeated at battle of Cassova in Bulgaria and finding it impossible to make stand against the Turks submitted to annual tribute which they paid until 1480, when Sultan Mahomet III being occupied in completing conquest of islands in Archipelago gave opportunity of shaking off yoke. Their VOIVODE [DRACULA] crossed Danube and attacked Turkish troops only momentarily success, Mahomet drove him back to Wallachia where pursued and defeated him. The VOIVODE escaped into Hungary and the Sultan caused his brother Bedriches received in his place. He made treaty with Eladus finding Wallachians to perpetual tribute and laid the foundations of that slavery not yet abolished. [1820]
Ancient Kingdom of DACIA = Wallachia, Moldavia, Transylvania, and Temesvar - finally conquered by Romans.

P.26. 1600. After abdication of Sigismund of Transylvania, this principality became tributary to Emperor Rodolphus who appointed Michael VOIVODE. Translyvanians revolted wished to recall Sigismund but were defeated by Austrians and whole province subjugated.

P.32. 1695. Sultan Ahmed declared war against the Emperor and Voivode Constantine Baranovano Bessarabba of Wallachia directed to form an army - did not help and at peace of Carlowitz Emperor Leopold made him Prince of Roman Empire and gave him landed estates in Transylvania.

P.57. THORNTON= Present State of Turkey[ P.116 ] says Boyars of ancient family assert descendants of the Slavi and are distinct race from officers of Danaians and Romans.

P.79. Galaatz is in Moldavian close to Wallachia at broadest & deepest bar of Danube 60 miles from Black Sea and 72 from Bukarest.

P.91. Boyars use German calche chiefly - gaudy carriage with poor harness and horses and Gypsy driver in rags is common.

P.92-3. No coaches to be hired - but posting quick, hot, bad - like, Crate of earthenware on 4 small wheels by wooden pegs.
It also seems logical that the second Voivode Dracula mentioned by Wilkinson is the first person mentioned by the Count: one of Vlad II Dracul's sons: Vlad III Dracula or Drăculea, the last part of the name being a patronymic (“Son of Dracul”). He became later known as Vlad Țepeș (“the Impaler”): As Mahomet II in 1462 invaded Wallachia, Vlad III had ca. 20,000 captives put on stakes. He used this horrible execution method also to fight criminality and punish his enemies. He was born in Sighișoara in the centre of Transylvania in 1431. When his father Vlad II became Voivode of Wallachia in 1436, the sons were brought to Târgoviște, Wallachia's capital. After 1442, Vlad III and his younger brother Radu were sent to Turkey as hostages, to ensure their father’s loyalty to the Sultan. During three different periods (1448; 1456–1462; 1476), Vlad III ruled over Wallachia. His brother Radu III cel Frumos (the Handsome) chose the side of the Ottomans and was installed in Vlad’s place after the latter's defeat in 1862. After Radu’s sudden death in 1475, Vlad III managed to regain power once more for a period of only two months, before he was murdered; his head was brought to Constantinople as a trophy. 

V – JÁNOŠ HUNYADI OR VLAD DRACULA III?

Stoker’s notes on “their VOĪVODE [DRACULA]” copy Wilkinson almost verbatim and are in turn echoed by the Count (see text comparison on page 8). Klinger’s hint that the “Dracula” first praised by the Count might be Hunyadi (p. 69) neither has roots in Wilkinson’s book nor in Stoker’s notes. Rather, it rehashes the ideas of Nandris (1966), Ronay (1974) and Manchester (1985). Wolf picked up this thesis as well (1975), arguing that Hunyadi beat the Ottoman forces at Nándorfehérvár (Belgrade) in 1456.11 But:

1. Belgrade was not on the Turk’s own ground, it belonged to King Sigismund of Hungary, after the Serbian dictator Đurađ Branković had returned it to him.
2. Wilkinson does not mention the defence of Belgrade at all.
3. Hunyadi had no “unworthy brother” who “sold his people to the Turk”.
4. Hunyadi was none of the Drăculeștis, Vlad II’s offspring.

According to Wilkinson the name “Dracula” was given “as a surname to any person who rendered himself conspicuous either by courage, cruel actions or cunning”. But in Dracula, the Count speaks of the Draculas as a “race”, not as a group of men who happened to share the same nickname. “We of the Dracula blood” implies a common ancestor: the first Dracul, Vlad II. Hunyadi was not related to Vlad II, nor a friend of the family.12 On the contrary, Hunyadi had Vlad II Dracul decapitated, as reported by Wilkinson.13 Even in Stoker’s potpourri, it is quite unthinkable that a genuine Dracula would sing Hunyadi’s praise.

VI – VLAD THE IMPALER, RADU THE HANDSOME AND MICHAEL THE BRAVE

Two further comments confirm that Klinger’s time to get to know the family must have been limited: On p. 70, he refers to Radu the Handsome as “Radu Țepeș” and to “the other” as “Vlad III of Wallachia, Dracul, father of Vlad Țepeș.” A quick look into an encyclopedia would have produced the insight that Vlad III was Vlad Țepeș and not his own father … and that his brother and enemy Radu certainly did not bear the (posthumous) sobriquet “Țepeș” (“the Impaler”) as if it were a family name!

In the end, Klinger blames Harker’s weak memory for this “hodgepodge of misremembered facts”. Klinger believes Wilkinson’s account to be “distorted and incomplete”, but will not explain Harker’s “confused memory” from errors and gaps in Stoker’s research, resulting from Stoker taking notes from Wilkinson’s book: He insists that the Count was an accurate historian, whose lessons were garbled by Harker, relying on Wilkinson, before they were passed on to Stoker.14 If we leave this complicated “Harker Papers Cover-Up” construct aside, this suggests that both Stoker and Wilkinson were uninformed. Leatherdale expresses a similar assessment, arguing that Stoker refers to this “other” without specifying his name: “That other of his race” is sufficiently vague to reaffirm how little Stoker knew about Dracula and other anti-Turkish campaigners.15

10 Alone this detail, unknown to Stoker, disqualifies Vlad III as a vampire-to-be: How could the body, resurrecting from the grave, ever find the head again?
12 Only posthumously, Hunyadi and Vlad II became related, when Vlad III married a cousin of King Matthias Corvinus, Hunyadi’s son.
13 Allegedly, Hunyadi had Vlad II executed in Bălteni in December 1447. His eldest son Mircea II, the leader of the 4,000 men who had joined Hunyadi, was blinded and buried alive in Târgoviște by Boyars. Hunyadi’s son, King Matthias Corvinus, imprisoned Vlad III for ca. ten years based on a forged letter, in which Vlad III purportedly offered the Turks an alliance.
14 Klinger, 2008, p. 70, note 30. Cf. note 28. In the book version of this essay, space being limited, this point is worded elliptically; this is the complete line.
Regarding the two Draculas, Wilkinson neither mentions their father-son relationship nor their name “Vlad”, let alone the cruelties of Vlad jr. The idea that Stoker sought to connect the blooddripping atrocities of the historical Vlad the Impaler to the novel’s bloodsucking Count, as advocated by McNally and Florescu in their In Search of Dracula (1972), thus lacks any evidence, as Elizabeth Miller rightly emphasizes in her books. The same argument applies to Countess Elisabeth Báthory, later proposed by McNally in his book Dracula was a Woman (1983).

But at least, both Vlad II and Vlad III are specific historical persons, who have an entry in their family’s ancestral records and have done enough to build themselves a public profile, so that they appear in Wilkinson’s book and in various Romanian patriotic writings, four centuries later. Does this also apply to “that other of his race”, mentioned by the Count as a further brave warrior fighting the Turks? Klinger, after having proposed Vlad II (or III?) in note 29, in note 30 suggests that in this “other”, several national leaders are conflated and “that it is not possible to translate them into accurate history”. In fact, I found that there is one historical Voivode who seems to match all criteria set by the Count – a national hero of Romania with a better reputation than Vlad the Impaler. After describing Vlad III and the treaty closed by his ignoble brother, Wilkinson presents Michael the Brave (Mihail II Viteazul, 1558-1601) as the only noteworthy Voivode after Vlad III, “determined to deliver his country from the Turkish yoke, and restore it to independence”; after his death, the Sultans started to appoint Voivodes of their own choice. Stoker took notes on Emperor Rudolphus, who appointed “Michael VOIVODE” (“Michael” added in handwriting hand in a blank space), memorialising that the Transylvanians revolted against his appointment, but were defeated by the Austrians.

Mihail II was from the same race as Vlad III, the Drăculești branch of the Basarabs. He invaded “Turkeyland” far across the Danube: He reached Adrianople and was near Constantinople, farther than any other Voivode ever advanced. Driven back by the Ottomans, in August 1595 his troops had to defend their position south of Bucharest, when the enemy managed to cross the Danube, Outnumbered, Mihail retreated to the marshy area of Călugăreni, where the Ottoman cavalry forced him to abandon his cannons. In the afternoon, Mihail, striking Sinan Pasha from his horse with a battle axe, regained his cannons and won the battle – which matches the scenario of retreat behind the Danube and the victorious counterattack. In Chapter 23, the enraged Count claims “My revenge has just begun! I spread it over centuries and time is on my side”, causing Leatherdale to suspect that Dracula addresses some grave injustice done to him during his own life. After his glorious victory at Gürslu in 1601, Mihail was murdered by order of his own ally Giorgio Basta, who wanted to control Transylvania himself: A sufficient motive to brave even Death and return as a Vampire.

### VII – OTHER VOIVODES OF THE DRACULEŞTI LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Drăculeşti line holding the throne of Wallachia:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruler</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad II Dracul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad III Dracul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu cel Frumos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad Călugărul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu cel Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihnea cel Rău</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea III Dracul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad cel Tănăr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu de la Afumați</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu Bădica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad Încetatul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad Vintilă de la Slatina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu Paisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mircea Ciobanul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pătrașcu cel Bun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petru cel Tănăr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandru II Mircea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintilă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihnea Turcitul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petru Cercel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihail Viteazul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Genealogy.euweb; Wikipedia.

17 Notes, p. 224f., Rosenbach #72.
Vlad III receiving Turkish delegates. Th. Amann (1831-1891)

Michael II receiving Turkish delegates
The third Voivode in Stoker’s notes is Constantine Brancovano, who considered an alliance with the Russians and refused to give the Sultan military support. But he was no Drăculești and did not attack the Turks. The Ottomans accused him all the same of taking bribes from the German Empire and arrested him. In the end, he shared the fate of many Voivodes before him and was decapitated, after the Turks, looking for his gold, had tortured him.

To return to the Hunyadi theory, of course we could speculate that Stoker blended in the story of Hunyadi’s escape from the chaotic scene at Varna in 1444, after King Władysław of Poland had fallen. Vlad II and his son Mircea II blamed Hunyadi for the defeat. But neither Wilkinson nor Stoker’s notes mention Hunyadi’s escape nor the Polish charge of cowardice; Stoker merely took notes on his son, King Matthias Corvinus. I conclude that János Hunyadi does not fit the profile of “that other” either.

As to Michael the Brave, nothing in Stoker’s notes shows that the novelist was seriously interested in his military campaigns. Unless Stoker did additional research not documented in his papers, he knew nothing about the Voivode’s advance across the Balkan Mountains, nor the “tight place” in Călugăreni. Rather, he may have invented the anecdote of the “bloody field” ad libitum: Since David and Goliath, the scenario of a initial defeat in a seemingly hopeless situation finally followed by a decisive victory against an intimidating enemy is commonplace in nearly all novels and movies thriving on heroism.

I must conclude that none of the political leaders mentioned here can be clearly identified as “that other of his race”. The Voivode who would qualify best, after objective criteria, is Michael II the Brave. We know that Stoker had read about him in Wilkinson’s book and made a typewritten note about him. But evidently, Stoker was not really interested to gather and record more background information about him, nor to introduce him to his readers by name.

VIII – “STOKER, LIKE WILKINSON, HADN’T A CLUE WHICH DRACULA WAS WHICH.”

Miller addresses that Stoker’s Count speaks of a multitude of persons connected with the Dracula name:

“In the text, the Count speaks of “we of the Dracula blood,” which suggest the name is identified with more than one person. In fact, he refers to a “Dracula ... who inspired that other of his race” (3:68), while Van Helsing reports that “The Draculas ... were a great and noble race” (18:337). Stoker, like Wilkinson, hadn’t a clue which Dracula was which. Stoker just liked the name.”

To begin with, the Draculas were a blood line, the Drăculești branch of the Basarab family. A problem arises from the Count mentioning a Voivode who “was a Dracula indeed”, what might be construed to refer to a member of the blood line known by another epithet. But Van Helsing in Chapter 18 unambiguously talks of “that Voivode Dracula”. This “heals” the disambiguation in the Count’s expression: Stoker allows us to tag the first Voivode he mentions, “who crossed the Danube to renown Wallachia. Two further claimants were defeated: Vladislav III and Radu Bădića. During the same years 1521-25, he fought against the Turks. After victories near Bucharest, Clejani, Ciocanesti and Snagov, he retreated to Transylvania and from there reconquered the Wallachian throne, which he had lost for several months. In 1524, he had to fight Vladislav III, from the House of Dănești. After the Battle of Mohács in the summer of 1526, where the Magyars were completely defeated by the Turks, he saw himself surrounded by the Ottomans. By the end of 1528, a group of boyars insurged against him, so that he was beheaded, together with his son. Although his story equally matches the sequence of victory, retreat and victory, neither Wilkinson nor Stoker’s own notes acknowledge him.

To return to the Hunyadi theory, of course we could speculate that Stoker blended in the story of Hunyadi’s escape from the chaotic scene at Varna in 1444, after King Władysław of Poland had fallen. Vlad II and his son Mircea II blamed Hunyadi for the defeat. But neither Wilkinson nor Stoker’s notes mention Hunyadi’s escape nor the Polish charge of cowardice; Stoker merely took notes on his son, King Matthias Corvinus. I conclude that János Hunyadi does not fit the profile of “that other” either.

As to Michael the Brave, nothing in Stoker’s notes shows that the novelist was seriously interested in his military campaigns. Unless Stoker did additional research not documented in his papers, he knew nothing about the Voivode’s advance across the Balkan Mountains, nor the “tight place” in Călugăreni. Rather, he may have invented the anecdote of the “bloody field” ad libitum: Since David and Goliath, the scenario of a initial defeat in a seemingly hopeless situation finally followed by a decisive victory against an intimidating enemy is commonplace in nearly all novels and movies thriving on heroism.

I must conclude that none of the political leaders mentioned here can be clearly identified as “that other of his race”. The Voivode who would qualify best, after objective criteria, is Michael II the Brave. We know that Stoker had read about him in Wilkinson’s book and made a typewritten note about him. But evidently, Stoker was not really interested to gather and record more background information about him, nor to introduce him to his readers by name.
IX – THE CURRENT STATE OF DEBATE

In fact, it appears that Miller already made mince-meat of Sean Manchester for proposing Hunyadi as the model for Dracula instead: I found an overview of this discussion in the Diary of an Amateur Vampirologist, probably referring to the first edition of Dracula – Sense & Nonsense.23 I do not know what motivated Miller to include the Hunyadi option in the 2006 edition again, unless she intended to illustrate that Stoker’s knowledge and intellectual capacities were so limited that possibly, he could not tell Vlad III and Hunyadi apart.24 Miller, however, makes no effort to make this last idea plausible. The current debate still hovers around these questions: How much did Stoker really know about Vlad III and what of this knowledge finally shows up in his famous Dracula novel? Questioning Stoker’s ability to discern Hunyadi and the Voivode Dracula seems convenient to help separate the Vampire King from Vlad the Impaler.25 As I will demonstrate in the following sections, this is not necessary at all to reach the divorce Miller is filing for. But before we arrive there, Bram’s brain is still needed!

X – THE “FICTIONAL FACT PARADOX”

To avoid misunderstandings: I completely agree with Elizabeth Miller that Stoker probably knew almost nothing about the historical Vlad III: neither his father’s name, nor his first name, nor his nickname, nor what he received it for. And I agree with her that it is irresponsible to claim that Bram Stoker built his novel on the Impaler’s atrocities, without citing evidence: Stoker did not want to portray a Vampaler. Stiller, I think that one important clue needed to understand Stoker’s modus operandi has been overseen by all participants in this debate – a clue I only recently came across by analysing the story’s geographical background. While trying to identify all of the novel’s addresses, I discovered some literary mechanisms used by Stoker which allow for even more radical conclusions than the divorce Miller called for: Stoker kicked Vlad out before the wedding night!

Miller stresses that “A fictional character can have any history his creator wishes to endow” (p. 172) and that Stoker “was creating a fictional “history” for a fictional character, and in doing so, he tossed everything he could find into the stew” (p. 174). This is true, and it is not: Stoker was not writing any kind of fiction. By presenting his novel as a manuscipt trouvé, at the same time personally warranting its factual character, the journal entries being made by his high-standing friends without any “statement of past things wherein memory may err”, he abandons the option to write whatever he wants. What applies to the Vampire, also aims at the editor of this “true story”: “

“He can do all these things, yet he is not free. Nay, he is even more prisoner than the slave of the galley, than the madman in his cell. He cannot go where he lists, he who is not of nature has yet to obey some of nature’s laws, why we know not.”26

Just like Klinger is trapped in his “Harker Papers” discourse, Stoker sees himself obliged to provide detail after detail, reconstruct all train trips with the Bradshaw’s in hand, cite local habits, dishes, costumes, proverbs etc. in order to create a convincing backdrop. The paradox: The more authentic the setting he describes, the easier recognisable the persons and places, the quicker his narrative can be cross-checked and thus falsified. A second problem: Stoker cannot step back anymore from what he writes about real persons by saying “I was just producing fiction.” His claim to present facts creates an intriguing legal situation. Stoker is broke, still he is ambitious: His nosferatu is not just any bloodsucker, it must be the Vampire King. In life, he must be a Count at least, but why not the commander of a complete nation? Who cares for a local nobleman with some fancy title like Earl of Marsden or Count von Klatka? A real historical princeps would sell better. Edmund Ironside, Henry the Eighth – but would anyone believe they were shapeshifters? And if the book is taken seriously, how to avoid damage to the Kingdom’s reputation, now that Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee is approaching? A vile Frenchman maybe? What about an unknown twin brother of King Louix XIV, who suddenly rises to power? Damn, Dumas used that guy already! Where to find a reckless warrior, not worn by romantic prose yet?! I love these sunny days at the harbour, maybe? What about an unknown twin brother of King Louis XIV, who suddenly rises to power? Damn, Dumas used that guy already! Where to find a reckless warrior, not worn by romantic prose yet?! I love these sunny days at the harbour, talking with the old fishermen... but all their heroes were sailors... the library... I have to go to the library... some spot in Europe still must be virginal ground for novelists... mysterious... full of natural wonder... yet war-ridden and blood-soaked!

Such may have been Stoker’s thoughts – we do not know. But as an artist, I would understand an other artist thinking that way.

24 “Of the three Draculas mentioned by Wilkinson, the voivode “who beat the Turk on his own ground” could equally have been John Hunyadi (...)” Miller, 2000 (2006 edition), p. 160. Miller’s Filing for Divorce (In: The Shade and the Shadow, 1998), explains that by “the three Draculas mentioned by Wilkinson” she means occurrences of the name “Dracula”, not three distinct persons.
25 In an 2002 interview with Frontline World, Miller stated: “Most people, even experts in the field, say it’s a given (fact) that Stoker based Count Dracula on Vlad the Impaler. I’m sort of a lone voice crying in the wilderness.” Source: http://pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/romania/miller.html. By now it appears she has earned the respect of anyone doing serious academic research about Dracula.
26 Dracula, Chapter 18, Mina Harker’s Journal of 30 September.
XI – IN THE WRITER’S KITCHEN

What we do know, however, is that Stoker garbled all addresses which could possibly lead to an identification of his characters.27 The only genuine addresses are merely temporarily inhabited: the London hotels. Likewise, The Spaniards and Jack Straw’s Castle are given with their true names: Should someone ever try to trace Van Helsing and Seward, visiting these pubs would be of no great help anyway. The farther removed from the private sphere of the characters, the more authentic the information: the railway stations, Bradshaw’s train tables, the transport company Carter, Paterson & Co., the Orient Express, until we arrive at Slovak clothing and local recipes. But the addresses of the Whitby lodging house, of the Westenra estate Hillingham, of Seward’s asylum, Holmwood’s Ring estate, the Harker’s home in Exeter, the Vampire’s lairs in London’s West End, Whitechapel, Walworth or Bermondsey are either simply omitted or tampered with: Every trace is a dead end.

The names of the protagonists themselves: modified, of course, as the novelist readily admits – he sees it as his duty to protect the privacy of these brave and virtuous people, his own friends:

“Apart from excising minor details which I considered unnecessary, I have let the people involved relate their experiences in their own way; but, for obvious reasons, I have changed the names of the people and places concerned. In all other respects I leave the manuscript unaltered, in deference to the wishes of those who have considered it their duty to present it before the eyes of the public. (…) All the people who have willingly – or unwillingly – played a part in this remarkable story are known generally and well respected. Both Jonathan Harker and his wife (who is a woman of character) and Dr. Seward are my friends and have been so for many years, and I have never doubted that they were telling the truth; and the highly respected scientist, who appears here under a pseudonym, will also be too famous all over the educated world for his real name, which I have not desired to specify, to be hidden from people – least of all those who have from experience learnt to value and respect his genius and accomplishments, though they adhere to his views on life no more than I.”28

Sources quoted in the novel, like the names of newspapers: mostly faked or modified. Arminius, introduced as a Professor at the Budapest University, might point to Vámbéry – but the latter was a specialist on Oriental cultures, not Wallachian history.29

The route to Castle Dracula: Although we know for sure now that Stoker hat a specific site in mind, Mount Izvorul Călimanului, 2,033 m high, located in the Transylvanian Kelemen Alps near the border with Romania, all travel descriptions to the Vampire’s headquarters grow vaguer and vaguer the nearer the protagonists get to it. Even in May, the byroad leading from the Borgo Pass is packed with snow. Jonathan, Van Helsing and Mina all fall asleep while approaching the Castle, so that their diaries for the decisive stretch of road show a narrative gap. Jonathan flees from the Castle in a state of mental shock, while during the final chase, he and the other men are guided by the Czigany they pursue; here again, both the Journals of Jonathan and Seward show a hiatus of ca. 32 hours. Although I finally managed to reconstruct the Castle’s location with the help of old military maps and satellite images, the final key was buried in Stoker’s notes, never recognised as such by Dracula specialists since these notes were made accessible for research around 1975.30 Obviously, Stoker never intended to encourage his readers to take a look on top of the Izvorul.

Now should we expect that in the very centre of this elaborate camouflage operation, Stoker would place a member of the European nobility, a national leader merited by defending Christian Europe against the Muslims, now to represent the Anti-Christ, the most horrible embodiment of pure Evil? As Stoker knew nothing about the sadistic executions staged by the Voivode Dracula he initially connects to his Vampire Count, he had no reason to believe he could simply smear the reputation of this historical person, whose descendants possibly still were in power positions, without any counter-reaction. Simply taking for granted that Stoker had no clue at all about whom he was writing and mixed up the historical persons involved implies that the good name of some leader of an “obscure” country at very the outskirt of Western civilisation did not bother him anyway. This point is open to debate. What in Canada today is believed to be a merely fictitious country,31 in England was perceived as real, though distant. But I reckon that at least his own public standing as a novelist publishing a mystery story, that is “a history almost at variance with the possibilities of latter-day belief (...) standing forth as simple fact”, was not completely indifferent to Stoker. Within the framework of his literary enterprise, a national leader who could be traced in any history book on his country in the long run might be no sustainable candidate for the role of Satan’s ally on earth.

29 Some authors believe Stoker was informed about Vlad III by the Orientalist Ármin Vámbéry from the University of Pesth, who visited England after returning from extensive travels in Asia. It is also assumed that Vámbéry worked as a spy for England. Stoker and Vámbéry met twice, but nothing confirms they ever talked about Wallachian Voivodes. Cf. Miller, 2000 (2006), p. 161-163.
30 Stoker’s notes were first referred to by Raymond McNally in his 1975 anthology A Clutch of Vampires, see Notes, Introduction, p. 4.
31 Elizabeth Miller reports that many of her (Canadian) students believe that Transylvania is purely fictional – Miller, 2000 (2006), p. 199.
As we cannot read Stoker’s mind, let’s return to the novel. The year, in which the action is supposed to take place, for example. Many hints point to the year 1893: the death of Charcot in August 1893, bemoaned by Van Helsing, the Westminster Gazette, which first appeared in 1893, the use of the term “New Woman”, coined in the very same year, etc. But when the novel appeared in 1897, Harker’s final note stated that the events must have taken place at least seven years before. Counting back, this means in or before 1890. Impossible to believe that Stoker, the date-and-time fiend, was not aware of this. It would not have cost him any extra penstroke to write: “Four years ago we went all through the flames.” But for some reason, he had to tear down that elaborate framework of clues, all indicating the year 1893, in the very last second – a point completely ignored by Elizabeth Miller. Klinger uses it to backdate the novel’s events to 1888 or 1889, but equally ends up with disparities, as he is forced to assume Stoker smuggled some later-day inventions into the “Harker Papers”.

I vote for the much simpler conclusion that Bram Stoker did not want his novel to be connected to a specific year.

And very much in the same way, by the end of his book, Stoker removes the historical Voivode, whom we have identified as a “proto-Vlad-III-Dracula” by now, from the scene again.

**XII – BRAM STOKER’S VAMPIRE TRAP**

No Dracula aficionado yet has recognised the truly astonishing stage magic trick that Bram Stoker is playing on us here. Shortly before the final chase commences, in Chapter 25 Van Helsing starts a spiralling discourse, then invites Mina to join in his thoughts, only seconds after he admonished Seward not to tell her a word about her trance. Seward reports:

> “I thought that the Professor was going to break down and have hysterics, just as he had when Lucy died, but with a great effort he controlled himself and was at perfect nervous poise when Mrs. Harker tripped into the room, bright and happy looking and, in the doing of work, seemingly forgetful of her misery. As she came in, she handed a number of sheets of typewriting to Van Helsing. He looked over them gravely, his face brightening up as he read.

Then holding the pages between his finger and thumb he said:

> “Friend John, to you with so much experience already, and you too, dear Madam Mina, that are young, here is a lesson. Do not fear ever to think. A half thought has been buzzing often in my brain, but I fear to let him loose his wings. Here now, with more knowledge, I go back to where that half thought come from and I find that he be no half thought at all. That be a whole thought, though so young that he is not yet strong to use his little wings. Nay, like the “Ugly Duck” of my friend Hans Andersen, he be no duck thought at all, but a big swan thought that sail nobly on big wings, when the time come for him to try them. See I read here what Jonathan have written.

> “That other of his race who, in a later age, again and again, brought his forces over The Great River into Turkey Land, who when he was beaten back, came again, and again, and again, though he had to come alone from the bloody field where his troops were being slaughtered, since he knew that he alone could ultimately triumph.

> “What does this tell us? Not much! No! The Count’s child thought see nothing, therefore he speak so free. Your man thought see nothing. Your man thought see nothing, till just now. No! But there comes another word from some one who speak without thought because she, too, know not what it mean, what it might mean. Just as there are elements which rest, yet when in nature’s course they move on their way and they touch, the pouf! And there comes a flash of light, heaven wide, that blind and kill and destroy some. But that show up all earth below for leagues and leagues. Is it not so? Well, I shall explain. To begin, have you ever study the philosophy of crime? “Yes”and “No.” You, John, yes, for it is a study of insanity. You, no, Madam Mina, for crime touch you not, not but once. Still, your mind works true, and argues not a particulari ad universale. There is this peculiarity in criminals. It is so constant, in all countries and at all times, that even police, who know not much from philosophy, come to know it empirically, that it is. That is to be empiric. The criminal always work at one crime, that is the true criminal who seems predestinate to crime, and who will of none other. This criminal has not full man brain. He is clever and cunning and resourceful, but he be not of man stature as to brain. He be of child brain in much. Now this criminal of ours is predestinate to crime also. He, too, have child brain, and it is of the child to do what he have done. The little bird, the little fish, the little animal learn not by principle, but empirically. And when he learn to do, then there is to him the ground to start from to do more. “Dos pou sto,” said Archimedes. “Give me a fulcrum, and I shall move the world!” To do once, is the fulcrum whereby child brain become man brain. And until he have the purpose to do more, he continue to do the same again every time, just as he have done before! Oh, my dear, I see that your eyes are opened, and that to you the lightning flash show all the leagues,” for Mrs. Harker began to clap her hands and her eyes sparkled. He went on, “Now you shall speak. Tell us two dry men of science what you see with those so bright eyes.” He took her hand

---

and held it whilst he spoke. His finger and thumb closed on her pulse, as I thought instinctively and unconsciously, as she spoke:

“The Count is a criminal and of criminal type. Nordau and Lombroso would so classify him, and qua criminal he is of an imperfectly formed mind. Thus, in a difficulty he has to seek resource in habit. His past is a clue, and the one page of it that we know, and that from his own lips, tells that once before, when in what Mr. Morris would call a ‘tight place,’ he went back to his own country from the land he had tried to invade, and thence, without losing purpose, prepared himself for a new effort. He came again better equipped for his work, and won. So he came to London to invade a new land. He was beaten, and when all hope of success was lost, and his existence in danger, he fled back over the sea to his home. Just as formerly he had fled back over the Danube from Turkey Land.”

“Good, good! Oh, you so clever lady!” said Van Helsing, enthusiastically, as he stooped and kissed her hand. A moment later he said to me, as calmly as though we had been having a sick room consultation, “Seventy-two only, and in all this excitement. I have hope.”

Turning to her again, he said with keen expectation:

“But go on. Go on! There is more to tell if you will. Be not afraid. John and I know. I do in any case, and shall tell you if you are right. Speak, without fear!” “I will try to. But you will forgive me if I seem too egotistical.”

“Nay! Fear not, you must be egotist, for it is of you that we think.”

“Then, as he is criminal he is selfish. And as his intellect is small and his action is based on selfishness, he confines himself to one purpose. That purpose is remorseless. As he fled back over the Danube, leaving his forces to be cut to pieces, so now he is intent on being safe, careless of all. So his own selfishness frees my soul somewhat from the terrible power which he acquired over me on that dreadful night. I felt it! Oh, I felt it! Thank God, for His great mercy! My soul is freer than it has been since that awful hour. And all that haunts me is a fear lest in some trance or dream he may have used my knowledge for his ends.”

For better orientation, I have highlighted the crucial lines in yellow. All of a sudden, Van Helsing ignores the opinion of his friend Arminius on “that Voivode Dracula”. Rather, he relies on his “friend Hans Andersen” now and follows the half-

Through his work, Stoker of course was familiar with the use of trap doors, often featured in Shakespearean theatre. 38
The “vampire trap”, employed to let Lord Ruthven, struck by lightning, suddenly disappear at the end of the last act was developed by James Planché for his play already discussed: *The Vampire, or the Brides of the Isles*, staged at *The English Opera House* in 1820, later renamed to *Lyceum Theatre*, run by Stoker.39

By his stunning trick, so smoothly performed that it has gone unnoticed for more than a century, Stoker bereaves us of “that Voivode Dracula” and thus, without knowing, from Vlad the Impaler – that pet of 50 years of heated debate – and has no intentions at all to give us Michael the Brave (or any other national leader) in exchange: Any traceable historical person would be an invitation to expose Stoker’s bundle of allegedly factual reports as notional, thereby reducing its artistic impact and commercial success. Possibly – but this remains speculation – the studied barrister even thought of the risk of libel suits by an indignant offspring of the nobleman his novel might associate with compulsive bloodsucking, or of protests by Romanian nationalists: During the 19th Century, Michael II was romanticised as the first Romanian ruler unifying Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania.40 But also Vlad III, despite his cruelty, was often hailed as a strict ruler, who just did what had to be done to defend his country against the Turks and extinguish crime and corruption.41

Insults were not taken lightly in Stoker’s day, as the criminal conviction of the journalist Edward Mylius shows. After Prince George of Wales (King George V) had married Princess Mary of Teck in 1893, Mylius, called him a bigamist in the French republican newspaper *The Liberator* in 1910. Still, I reckon that Stoker was not aware that Prince George’s bride was a descendant of Vlad II Dracul – which makes her granddaughter, Queen Elizabeth II of England, a relative of the infamous Vlad the Impaler.42

We do not know for sure what finally moved Stoker to revoke the initial link to Vlad III, thin as it may be. Neither do we know at which point in time he created the Count’s double-tracked discourse, presented in Chapter III. Already in this monologue, the foundation is laid for both Van Helsing’s – or rather Arminus’ – statement about “that Voivode Dracula” and its later revision in Chapter 25. The only thing that seems sure is that Stoker knew what he was doing. Too obvious are the parallels to the way he handled the issue of addresses and the novel’s year of action. Moreover, both the novel and the Notes show that Stoker was intrigued by the *topoi* of secrecy and disappearance.43

Already Stoker’s mixing up of Szeklers and Wallachians may have been part of his strategy to mystify the Count’s historical past: He was informed enough to avoid this confusion, if he had wanted so. To take Stoker serious as an author in my view means to understand such manoeuvres from the dilemma he saw himself confronted with, that is, from his high ambition. Creating a mere fantasy tale was not enough for him: He wished his story to fulfil the expectations of authenticity as set out in the preface. On the other hand, he did not want persons, places and dates to be clearly identifiable. Only from this paradox, the contrast of detail and vagueness, the narrative ruptures and the consistent garbling can be explained. And like in the case of Castle Dracula’s precise site, his methods turned out to be highly effective: His novel has shown to be a genuine “mystery story”, or, to employ the idiom coined by Professor Van Helsing in Chapter 23: The plot is a perfect puddle.

40 E.g. Nicole Bălcescu, *Romanian History under the Rule of Voivode Michael the Brave* (1849, published 1860). But during the same time, some Romanian authors also hailed Vlad III as an energetic leader defending national interests. Maybe to appease the progeny of “that Voivode Dracula”, Van Helsing in Chapter 18 assures that “There have been from the loins of this very one great men and good women, and their graves make sacred the earth (...)”
41 See the last stanza of *Srisoarea 3* (Letter 3) by Mihail Eminescu, May 1881.
42 Prince Charles in the TV Show *Wild Carpathia*, 30 Oct. 2011, Travel Channel. Edward Mylius was sentenced to one year in prison for criminal libel. The rumour he had spread was that George had already married on Malta as a young man. Source: Wikipedia.
43 This point will be illuminated in more detail in my book *The Ultimate Truth about Dracula*. 
APPENDIX A: HOUSE OF BASARAB (IOAN ASARAB >> MIHAIL VITEAZUL)

The ancestor of this family was one Thocomerius, Voivode of Wallachia (ca 1298-ca 1310), who could have been either a Bulgarian boyar called Tihomir, or (less probably) a Tatar khan named Toqtemir. He had a son:

Ioan Basarab, Voivode of Wallachia (ca 1310-1352), *1270-80, †1352; ☽ Margit Dobokai, from Kükényes-Renold family; They had issue:

* A1. Teodora Basaraba; ☽ ca 1320 (div) Tsar Ivan Aleksandar of Bulgaria (†17.2.1371)
* A2. Nicolae Alexandru, Voivode of Wallachia (1352-64), †16.11.1364; 1 soared: Maria N; 2 soared: Clara N
  o B1. [1 soared] Voislaw
  o B2. [1 soared] Vlaicu I, Voivode of Wallachia (1364-75), †ca. 1375; m.Cherana N
  o B3. Radu I „Negru Voda”, Voivode of Wallachia (1375-83), †ca. 1383; 1 soared: Ana Kallinichia; 2 soared: NN; (possibly ☽ N Lackň /OR N, from Jagiello family)
  + C1. [1 soared] Dan I, Voivode of Wallachia (1383-86), †k.a.Bulgaria 23.9.1386; ☽ Maria N (a Serbian noblewoman)
  + C2. [2 soared] Mircea I „the Elder”, Despot of Dobruja, Voivode of Wallachia (1386-94) + (1397-1418), †1418; ☽ Mara N
    # D1. Mihail, Voivode of Wallachia (1418-20), †VIII.1420
    # D2. [by Maria Tolmay] Vlad II Dracul „the Dragon”, Voivode of Wallachia (1436-42) †(1443-46), he was granted Order of the Dragon by his relative Emperor Sigismund, hence his nickname,
      * in Wallachia before 1395, †beheaded Balteni XII.1446; 1 soared: Vasilissa of Moldavia (†after 1447);
      2 soared: N, a Transylvanian noblewoman
      (Wikipedia mentions Princess Cneajna of Moldavia, eldest daughter of Alexandru cel Bun, aunt of Stephen the Great of Moldavia - HdR)
    * E1. [1 soared] Mircea II Basarab, Voivode of Wallachia (1442), *in Germany ca 1422, †buried alive XII.1446; (This date is not accurate, must be XII.1446, before his father was beheaded - HdR)
    * E2. [1 soared] (Wikipedia indicates Vlad III’s mother was Princess Cneajna of Moldavia, so that Mircea II was Vlad’s half-brother - HdR)
      Vlad III Tepes „the Impaler”, Voivode of Wallachia (1448)+ (1456-62)+ (1476), *in Wallachia ca 1431,
      †murdered XII.1476, bur Snagov (The burial at Snagov is based on rumours rather than facts - HdR)
      1 soared: 1452/56 N, a Transylvanian noblewoman
      (she committed suicide when their home was captured by enemy forces);
      2 soared: 1474/76 Ilona Szilágyi de Horogszeg (†after 1497), cousin of King Mathias I of Hungary
    * E3. [2 soared] Radu III „cel Frumos” „The Handsome”, Voivode of Wallachia (1462-75), *before 2.8.1439, †1.1475:
      ☽ Maria Aranita
    * E4. [by Caruna N, later Mother Euphrasim, an Abbess] Vlad IV „Calugarul” „the Monk”, Voivode of Wallachia (1482-95), †XI.1495; 1 soared: Rada-Samaranda N; 2 soared: by 1487 Maria Palaiologina
      o F1. [1 soared] Radu IV „the Great”, Voivode of Wallachia (1495-1508), *ca 1467, †V.1508;
      2 soared: Catalina from Sarata
      + G1. Vlad „Vințila”, Voivode of Wallachia (1532-35), †after 10.6.1535;
      2 soared: Rada, daughter of Vlaicu of Wallachia
      + G2. Radu „Paisic”, Voivode of Wallachia (1535-45) †after 1545; 2 soared: Targoviste 1541 Stana N /OR N Basaraba, daughter of Néagoé Bassaraba
    # H1. Petru Patrascu „Bun” („the Good”), Voivode of Wallachia (1554-57), †26.12.1557;
      2 soared: Voica Slatinac
      * I1. Vintila, Voivode of Wallachia (4 days in V.1574), †V.1574
      * I2. Petru „Cercel”, Voivode of Wallachia (1583-85), †III.1590; 2 soared: Bogáthy de Bogat (fl 1590-1635)
        o J1. Dimitrie, fl 1585
        o J2. Marcel Cercel, fl 1600
      * I3. Maria; 2 soared: by 1555 Tudor Dragoste
    * I4. [by Theodora (†1606)] Mihail Viteazul, Voivode of Wallachia (1593-1600), Hospodar of Moldavia (1600), †19.7.1601; ☽ Stanca, daughter of Dimitru Izverani

Source: http://genealogy/enweb.cz/balkan/basarab.html • Author: Miroslav Marek
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APPENDIX B: SAMUELSON ON HUNNIADES AND VLAD THE IMPALER

Before referring to the events which were passing in Moldavia during the period, it may not be out of place to say a few words here concerning another hero, who, although he ruled in Transylvania, was a Wallachian by birth, led the Wallachian armies against the Turks, and for a time succeeded in checking their advance in Europe. This was John Corvinus, as he is known to English readers, or, more correctly, Johann Corvin von Hunniad, Prince of Siebenbuergen, who was born about the year 1368 in the village of Corvin, in the Wallachian Carpathians. His father was a Wallachian, some say of ancient family, and his mother a Greek, to whom also a high ancestry is attributed. As his history was written by flatterers in order to gain the favour of his son and successor, these statements as to his high ancestry must be taken _cum grano salis_. Johann was at first the captain of a small party of adventurers, having served, as was the custom in those days, with a troop of twelve horse, first under Demetrius, Bishop of Agram, and then for two years in Italy under Philip, Duke of Milan. There he met Sigismund, King of Hungary, who induced him to join his standard, and, as a reward for his services, conferred upon him the estate of Hunnyades, from which he took his name. Subsequently he rose from post to post, until he was appointed Viceroy of Siebenbuergen (Transylvania), and eventually Regent of Hungary. In the former capacity he formed an alliance against the Turks (about 1443) with Vladislaus, King of Poland and Hungary, and Vlad, Voivode of Wallachia, and under his leadership the Christian armies frequently encountered the Ottomans, notably on three occasions – at Varna under Amarth II. (1444) and Cossova (1448), in both of which encounters the allies were defeated, and finally at Belgrade (1456), where the Turks were completely routed. Various and conflicting accounts have been given of these battles, and of Hunniades's conduct during the encounters. At Varna, where Vladislaus was killed, the Poles charged Hunniades with cowardice; but the facts are probably that he defeated the right wing of the Turks, but that the temerity of Vladislaus caused the defeat of the army and his own death. The same charge was brought against him by the Poles in regard to the defeat at Cossova, but from his known bravery it was no doubt equally groundless. At Belgrade the city was completely invested by the Turks; but at the head of an undisciplined army Hunniades forced his way into the city, and by a subsequent sally, in which the Sultan Mohammed was wounded, he compelled the Turks to raise the siege and withdraw in confusion. John Hunniades died in the same year, and his son Matthias was elected to the crown of Hungary, over which country he ruled for more than thirty years.

The character of John Hunniades is well worth a brief consideration. As we have said, he was charged with cowardice by his Polish allies, but by the Turks he was so dreaded that they gave him the name of the Devil, and used it to frighten their children when they misbehaved themselves. Many anecdotes, of which the following is one, are related of his personal courage. After the battle of Cossova, whilst fleeing alone through the Carpathians, he was captured by two brigands, who deprived him of his arms. The cupidity of these men was aroused by a splendid gold chain which he wore, and one of them snatched it from his neck. Presently, however, forgetting the maxim that there is honour even amongst thieves, the two bandits began wrangling for the possession of the booty, and whilst they were so occupied Hunniades managed to recover his sword, and, engaging them in fight, he ran one through the body, whereupon the other fled.

If his biographers are to be believed, he must have been a remarkable man. ‘As fishes are used to the water,’ says one, ‘as the deer to the forest glade, so was he adapted for the bearing of arms, a born leader of warriors, and the field of battle was his life-element.’ The nobility of his bearing, another says, and his winning manner enabled him to secure the affection of his soldiers, whilst his readiness to serve, his piety and benevolence, and his shrewd policy, gained for him the confidence of his superiors, the leadership of armies, and the highest offices of the State. At his death he was universally mourned. Pope Nicholas ordered the cardinals to perform a magnificent _requiem_ in his memory, as the pious and successful defender of the Christian religion. Even the Sultan Mohammed, whom he had just defeated – when George, Despot of Servia, brought him what he thought would be the gratifying news of the prince’s death – lowered his head, and, after a long silence, exclaimed, ‘There never was, under any ruler, such a man since the beginning of the world.’

As we have said, the Turks were so much afraid of Hunniades that they are said to have given him the name of ‘the Devil,’ but the same designation, as well as that of the Impaler, has also been bestowed upon Vlad, a voivode of Wallachia, who was probably the ally of Hunniades, and who, if one-tenth of what has been related of him be true, has a much better claim to the title. He is represented to have been one of the most atrocious and cruel tyrants who ever disgraced even those dark ages. One day he massacred 500 boyards who were dissatisfied with his rule. The torture of men, women, and children, seems to have been his delight. Certain Turkish envoys, when admitted into his presence, refused to remove their turbans, whereupon he had them nailed to their heads. He burned 400 missionaries and impaled 500 gipsies to secure their property. In order to strike terror into Mohammed II., he crossed over into Bulgaria, defeated the Turks, and brought back with him 25,000 prisoners, men, women, and children, whom he is said to have impaled upon a large plain called Praeluatu. Notwithstanding his successes, however, Vlad was at length compelled to submit to the Turkish rule, and he concluded the ‘Second Capitulation’ at Adrianople (1460), in which the tribute to the Porte was increased, but no other important change was made in the terms of suzerainty.134

---
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The two crowns had been united under him.

To show what uncertainty hangs over the history of this man, and in fact of the whole period, it may be mentioned that Neigebaur and other writers make this treaty to have been signed between Vlad II. and Mohammed III., who reigned 135 years later, whilst French writers state that it was between Vlad V. and Mohammed II.; but they all agreed as to the date 1460. Henke calls him Vlad III. He was universally named the Impaler in consequence of a practice which is well known to our readers through the so-called Bulgarian atrocities. A sharpened pole was forced into the body of the victim, and the other end was then driven into the earth, the unfortunate man, woman, or child being left to writhe in agony until relieved by death.

APPENDIX C: THE BALLAD OF STEPHEN THE GREAT’S FLIGHT TO NIAMTZ

In 1476 Stephen sustained a terrible defeat at the hands of the Ottomans at Valea Alba (the White Valley), but eight years afterwards, allied with the Poles, he again encountered this terrible enemy. His army was at first forced to give way, and he is said to have fled for refuge to Niamtz, where he had a castle, but his mother refused him admission and bade him return to his army. Here is the story, with its sequel, as it is told by the poet who has already once been quoted (Bolentineanu):--

"Blows are heard resounding at the outer gate.
'Tis the hour of midnight; whose the voice so late?
"Hasten, dearest mother" – ha! that well-known sound –
"From the host I'm driven, bleed at every wound!
Fearful was our fortune, terrible the fray,
Scattered all my army, fled they in dismay.
Mother, open quickly; infidels pursue,
Icy is the night wind, purple blood their cue."

Ha! what say'st thou, stranger? Stephen's far away,
Dealing death, strong-handed, where he stands at bay.
Of him the mother I; such my son is he.
Be thou who thou may'st, my son thou canst not be.

(Yet can Heaven have fated, dealt this fearful blow?
Can his soul be craven, quail before the foe?)

If in truth thou'rt Stephen, faint returning home,
Not within these portals shalt thou ever come.
Hasten to thy brave ones; for thy country fall;
Then maternal love with wreaths shall deck thy pall!"

Once more Stephen rallies; lusty sounds his horn;
Heroes flock around him on the battle morn.
Fierce and dire the slaughter; on that glorious day
Falls the Moslem chivalry like the new-mown hay.”

APPENDIX D: ALLEGED LINK OF QUEEN ELIZABETH II OF ENGLAND TO VLAD THE IMPALER

Vlad II Dracul (*in Wallachia before 1395, †beheaded Balteni XII.1446) ◊ Catuna N, later Mother Euphrasim, an Abbess ◊ Vlad IV ‘the Monk’ († 1495) (half-brother of Vlad III Dracula “the Impaler”) ◊ Rada-Samaranda ◊ Radu IV, Voivode of Wallachia (1508) *ca 1467, † IV.1508; ◊ Catalina from Sarata ◊ Mircea III „Ciobanul” (“the Shepherd”), Voivode of Wallachia (1545-52)+(1553-54)+(1558-59), † 21.9.1559; ◊ Suceava VI.1546 Chiajna of Moldavia ◊ Stanka Basarab (Stana, † after 1601; ◊ Ioan Norocea († Transylvania 1599), Logofat de Pitesti, Great Chancellor of Wallachia ◊ Semphira (Zamphira) Logofat de Szaszebes ◊ Adam Racz de Galgo ◊ Peter (Petru) Racz de Galgo ◊ Christiana (Kristina) Racz de Galgo ◊ Katalin Kun de Osdola ◊ Ágnes Baroness Kendeffy de Malmoviz ◊ Baron Gregor (Gergely) Inczédy de Nagy-Várad ◊ Ágnes Countess Inczédy de Nagy-Várad ◊ Claudine, Countess of Hohenstein (Klaudia Rhédey de Kis-Rhède) ◊ Francis, Duke of Teck ◊ Princess Victoria Mary of Teck = Queen Mary ◊ King George VI of England ◊ Queen Elizabeth II of England
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