



WILKIE COLLINS SOCIETY JOURNAL
VOLUME II
1982



Poster by Frederick Walker for the dramatic version of *The Woman in White* 1871

THE WILKIE COLLINS SOCIETY

The Wilkie Collins Society is dedicated to serving the study of Wilkie Collins and related subjects. Dues are \$10.00 per year, USA, and £5.00 per year, UK. Memberships begin on January 1st and end on December 31st each year. New members are requested to specify whether they wish their memberships to be current or to be applied to the following year.

The Society's officers are:

President: Kirk H. Beetz
1307 F Street
Davis, California 95616
USA

Secretary: Andrew Gasson
3 Merton House
36 Belsize Park
London N.W.3. 4EA
England

The Wilkie Collins Society Journal is published once a year by the Society for its members. Submissions should follow the guidelines of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations (1977). Query first for reviews. Send submissions to Kirk H. Beetz, Editor, 1307 F Street, Davis, California 95616, USA. Be sure to include a stamped and addressed envelope for the return of a submission.



WILKIE COLLINS SOCIETY JOURNAL

Volume II

1982

BLANK PAGE

Wilkie Collins Society Journal

Contents

Editor's Notepage 3

Articles

"The Woman in White: A Chronological Study"

By Andrew Gassonpage 5

"Twice-Told Tales of Two Counts: The Woman in White
and Dracula"

By Mark M. Hennelly, Jr.page 15

Queriespage 33

Notes on Contributorspage 34

Kirk H. Beetz, Editor

On the cover: poster by Frederick Walker for the dramatic version of The Woman in White.

BLANK PAGE

Editor's Note

The Wilkie Collins Society Journal features two fine essays for 1982. Andrew Gasson provides an excellent study of the publishing history of The Woman in White. Although the article will have a special appeal to book collectors, critics should also take note: the text of the novel was significantly altered in its early editions. Mark M. Hennelly, Jr., provides a provocative study of the similarities and differences between The Woman in White and Dracula. Again, Collins's novel is revealed as a work of fundamental importance to understanding the writings of later Victorians and for understanding Victorian culture.

As have most other scholarly societies, the Wilkie Collins Society has been hurt by the hard economic times that beset its members. Inflation has cut into its ability to serve its members, and recession is costing its younger members their jobs. The Society has had difficulty offering its members the benefits its officers hope to provide. Projects in progress are offerings of Collins-related books at discounts and the Newsletter. The Secretary and President continue to help students and scholars contact one another and find sources for research.

K.H.B.

BLANK PAGE

THE WOMAN IN WHITE: A CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY

Andrew Gasson

The Woman in White was first published in serial form in All The Year Round from November 26th 1859 to August 25th 1860, and concurrently in Harper's Weekly from November 26th 1859 to August 4th 1860. It rapidly became Collins's most popular novel and was issued in a great many editions. The identification of these early editions is difficult: first because of their variety and number; second because of the virtually simultaneous publication on both sides of the Atlantic; and third because of the many changes in the complicated text introduced by the author.

CHANGES IN CHRONOLOGY

Collins frequently revised his works in matters of style and detail. In The Woman in White, however, the complex nature of the plot, revolving as it does about certain key dates, obliged him in the interests of accuracy to make several alterations in the actual chronology of the story. These changes can to some extent be linked with its publishing history and the progress of its many early editions.

The most well known error of chronology is that first described in The Times¹ of October 30th 1860. The plot of Volume III relies on the fact that Lady Glyde's departure date for London was July 26th, whereas the reviewer points out ". . . we could easily show that Lady Glyde could not have left Blackwater-park before the 9th or 10th of August. Anybody who reads the story, and who counts the days from the conclusion of Miss Halcombe's diary, can verify the calculation for himself."

Collins wrote to his publisher, Edward Marston of Sampson Low, on October 31st ". . . If any fresh impression of 'The Woman in White' is likely to be wanted immediately, stop the press till I come back. The critic in the 'Times' is (between ourselves) right about the mistake in time. Shakespeare has made worse mistakes--that is one comfort, and readers are not critics who test an emotional book by the base rules of arithmetic, which is a second consolation. Nevertheless we will set it right the first opportunity . . ." ² Despite this stated intention, the book, which according to The Times critic was already in its third edition, was not revised in this particular respect until the first one volume edition in 1861,

respect until the first one volume edition in 1861, where Collins wrote in a new preface "Certain technical errors which had escaped me while I was writing the book are here rectified." The main correction involved putting back the relevant dates by sixteen days so that Miss Halcombe's Diary at Blackwater Park, for example, commences on June 11th instead of June 27th. But, as Kendrick³ has pointed out, the different Narratives of the story are so closely interwoven that this alteration introduced yet further inconsistencies such as those to be found in Mrs. Clement's testimony.

A second chronological error had already been noted by the Guardian⁴ of August 29th 1860, where the reviewer writes ". . . and it is almost a compliment to point out a slip in vol. iii., where an important entry in a register, assigned in p. 149 to September, is given in p. 203 to April." From a publication stand-point, the significance of this error in Hartright's Narrative is that it has been corrected by the time of the third edition.⁵

The majority of purely textual changes occurred between the serial version in All the Year Round and the first English, three volume edition. These have been fully documented in the Riverside Edition,⁶ which also indicates several other related alterations in chronology. Examples of these are:

1. Miss Halcombe's Diary at Limmeridge House commences on November 8 instead of November 7th (10th. Number).
2. In Miss Halcombe's Diary for November 27th, Laura's marriage date is changed from December 23rd to December 22nd (11th. Number).
3. In the Narrative of the Tombstone, the dates of Laura's marriage and death have been changed from December 23rd 1849 and July 28th 1850 to December 22nd 1849 and July 25th 1850 (26th. Number).
4. In the Narrative of the Doctor, the date of death has been similarly changed from July 28th to July 25th 1850 (26th. Number).
5. In Fosco's Narrative, the dates of Anne Catherick's death and Lady Glyde's arrival from London have been changed from July 28th and 29th to July 25th and 26th respectively (40th. Number).

In Mr. Fairlie's Narrative, however, "The fifth, sixth or seventh of July" in All the Year Round becomes "Towards the middle of July" in the English three volume edition, but "At the end of June, or the beginning of July" in the 1861 edition (22nd number).

PUBLISHING CHRONOLOGY

It is generally accepted that The Woman in White was published in America during August 1860, and probably on the 15th of that month. For this reason the Harper's edition has often been held to precede the English publication. Sadleir,⁷ for example, states that the book was published in England during September 1860; and that "[the Harper's edition] preceded the English by one month."⁸ His frequently used bibliographies are in accord with Brussel,⁹ who notes that "The New York edition was issued during August 1860, and the London edition was not published until September of the same year."

Robinson,¹⁰ on the other hand, suggests that both English and American editions were published on or about August 15th and how "... on August 22nd ... he learned ... that the entire first impression had been sold out on the day of publication, and that the second impression was selling fast." August publication in England is also supported by Parrish,¹¹ who gives a date between the 14th and 31st and refrains from suggesting priority for either the English or American edition.

The book form of The Woman in White was first announced by Sampson Low in the Publishers Circular as early as April 2nd 1860. It was then advertised as "to be published shortly" for the next three months until on July 2nd and July 17th it was described as "available immediately," although the story had not yet been actually completed. Robinson in this connexion quotes from a letter to Collin's mother dated July 26th, "... I have this instant written ... 'The End.'"¹¹

On August 1st 1860, Sampson Low become more precise and in their "List of Books for the month of August" the first title is The Woman in White with a publication date of "the 15th Instant." The same issue of the Publishers Circular carries on p. 407 the advertisement: "Notice - THE WOMAN IN WHITE, by Wilkie Collins, Esq., Author of the Dead Secret will be ready on Wednesday 15th August at all Libraries and Booksellers in Town and Country. In 3 vols. post 8vo. 3ls 6d. To provide against disappointment in obtaining a supply of this work in the day of publication, orders must be received by the publishers before the 8th instant."

On August 15th Sampson Low have a further notice that "THE WOMAN IN WHITE ... may be obtained this day"¹² and the book is listed in the fiction section of the editorial review of current publications.¹³ This is further confirmed in the subsequent issue of the Pub-

Publishers Circular, where it is listed as being published from the 14th to the 31st August.

The conclusion from these various advertisements and notices is that the English first edition shared a publication date with the American first, assuming this also to have been published on August 15th 1860. In any event, simultaneous publication on both sides of the Atlantic is surely what Collins intended.

ENGLISH THREE VOLUME EDITIONS

THE WOMAN IN WHITE. By Wilkie Collins. Author of The Dead Secret After Dark, etc., etc. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co., 1860. 3 Vols.

Vol. I pp. viii + 316
 Vol. II pp. (ii) + 360
 Vol. III pp. (ii) + 368 + 16pp. advertisements dated August 1, 1860.

Purple cloth, blocked in gold and blind. Pale yellow end-papers. No half-titles. Preface dated August 3, 1860.

Because of its popularity, there were several issues of The Woman in White within the first few months. Robinson, for example, states that seven impressions appeared in six months,¹⁴ whilst Ashley¹⁵ records that "... published in mid-August ... Five editions were called for in the next two months, and a seventh appeared in February."

The true first edition is now rarely seen and requires the 16pp. publishers catalogue to be dated August 1860. Sadleir¹⁶ sounds a note of caution, stating that the first editions which he had seen had advertisements dated November 1860, "so that they clearly belong to a subsequent issue. The Woman in White is a case over which the buyer should take great care. A so called 'New Edition' was issued in the year of publication and with binding identical to that of the first edition, for which reason only the right advertisement matter can show that a copy is untampered with." This caveat of 1922 is probably even more important today when one considers the possible price for such an important but scarce first edition. The New Edition referred to is the one most frequently encountered by the collector. It can still be found with relative ease, but is quite often described erroneously as a second edition.

THE WOMAN IN WHITE.

BY

WILKIE COLLINS,

AUTHOR OF "THE DEAD SECRET," "AFTER DARK," ETC., ETC.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON :

SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47 LUDGATE HILL.

1860.

[The Right of Translation is Reserved.]

THE WOMAN IN WHITE.

BY

WILKIE COLLINS,

AUTHOR OF "THE DEAD SECRET," "AFTER DARK," ETC., ETC.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

NEW EDITION.

LONDON :

SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47 LUDGATE HILL.

1860.

[The Right of Translation is Reserved.]

"NEW EDITION" IN THREE VOLUMES (SEVENTH EDITION)

It has already been noted that according to a letter from Collins, himself, a new impression was required by the end of the day of publication and that by August 22nd 1860 this was selling fast. (Perhaps it may be speculated that this was a second impression of the first edition and contained the later advertisements to which Sadleir refers.) Certainly an identifiable second edition was published, since it has the words "second edition" on the title page and at least some of the errata listed by Parrish for the first edition have been corrected.¹⁷ Additionally, the editorial review of the Publishers Circular for September 15th 1860, page 454, records the "2d. of The Woman in White by Wilkie Collins" in their "more important publications of the fortnight," and Sampson Low featured this second edition in their bound-in book advertisements.

Also in the Publishers Circular of September 15th (page 464), a third edition is advertised as being available "on the 24th instant." This is similarly identifiable from the title page, and it is the first occasion in which the Guardian error of chronology has been seen corrected. The next editorial review, dated October 1st, refers to a fourth edition.¹⁸ This also has the words "fourth edition" on the title page, and at least one further difference in Parrish's errata. A fifth edition is listed in the issue of October 16th (page 503), and Sampson Low, themselves, advertised a "New Edition this day" on November 1st (page 554). Thereafter, all reference in the Publishers Circular until the end of 1860 is to the new edition in three volumes.

This new edition appears to exist in two distinct states for volumes II and III. In the case of Volume II, p. [1] sometimes carries its signature "B," but is sometimes unsigned. In Volume III, two collations have been seen:

a) [ii] + [1 - 3] + 4 - 368 + 16pp. advertisements dated November 1, 1860.

b) [ii] + [1 - 2] + 3 - 368 + 16pp. advertisements dated November 1, 1860.

Since the first of these collations is the same as that of the first, third and fourth editions, it may be that the second variation represents a later state.

Since the various three volume issues have differences in both chronology and errata, it does seem more correct to refer to them as editions, although some may have had more than one impression.

ENGLISH ONE VOLUME EDITION (1861)

THE WOMAN IN WHITE. By Wilkie Collins, Author of "Antonina", "The Dead Secret", etc., etc. New Edition. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co., 1861. 1 Volume. pp. viii + 496.

Magenta Cloth, blocked in gold and blind. Pale yellow end-papers. Half-title. Steel engraved, additional illustrated title page by J. Gilbert, opposite mounted portrait photograph of Collins.

It is generally stated that this one volume edition was published in February 1861. However, further study of the Publishers Circular shows that, despite mention of The Dead Secret and Antonina in the same one volume series, The Woman in White was not advertised until April 15th 1861. The May 1st issue records a publication date from the 15th to the 30th April, although Sampson Low's own advertisement states "The cheap edition of The Woman in White is published this day, May 1st."

This one volume edition is of interest for several reasons:

1. It contains a new preface, dated February 1861 (despite the apparently later date of publication).
2. It is the first occasion on which The Times error of chronology is corrected, and it contains several other alterations in the text.
3. Parrish records variations in the style and position of the printer's imprint (W. Clowes and Sons on p. [iv], or William Clowes and Sons on p. [ii]), together with a variation in the binding.¹⁹
4. It contains a notable misprint in p. 190 with "marrying we" for "marrying me." N.U.C. records a further, corrected state of this edition.
5. It forms part of the first collected edition of Collin's works.
6. It forms the basis of the text for the majority of subsequent editions.²⁰
7. It contains a mounted portrait photograph of Collins.

THE WOMAN IN WHITE.

BY

WILKIE COLLINS,

AUTHOR OF "ANTONINA," "THE DEAD SECRET," ETC., ETC.

NEW EDITION.

LONDON :

SAMPSON LOW, SON, & CO., 47 LUDGATE HILL.

1861.

[The Right of Translation is Reserved.]

THE
WOMAN IN WHITE.

A Novel.

BY WILKIE COLLINS,

AUTHOR OF

"THE QUEEN OF HEARTS," "ANTONINA," "THE DEAD SECRET," "AFTER DARK,"
&c., &c., &c.

ILLUSTRATED BY JOHN McLENAN.

NEW YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1860.

FIRST AMERICAN EDITION

AMERICAN EDITIONS

THE WOMAN IN WHITE. A Novel. By Wilkie Collins, Author of "The Queen of Hearts", "Antonina", "The Dead Secret", "After Dark", &c., &c., &c. Illustrated by John McLenan. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1860.

1 Volume pp. 264.

Publisher's advertisements occupy pp. [1] and 2 (dated August 1860); (261 - 264). This edition contains seventy-four illustrations by John McLenan. Dark brown cloth, blocked and lettered in blind; spine lettered in gold and illustrated in silver with the figure of a woman. Brown end-papers. No half-title. (Brussel states that this edition was issued in various coloured cloths. Although Sadleir describes the brown cloth, Parrish records both brown and black.)

The advertisements form part of the collation, and there appear to be three distinct states. Two of these (1 and 3) are noted by Parrish and the third (2) has been described by Moss:²¹

1. P. [261] has "Muloch" for "Mulock" and lists nine of her books; p. [262] advertises The Mill on the Floss.

2. "Mulock" is correctly spelled on p. [261], eleven titles are listed and p. [262] advertises The Mill on the Floss.

3. "Mulock" is correctly spelled with eleven titles listed, but p. [262] carries an advertisement for nine titles by W. M. Thackeray.

In contrast with the first English, the Harper's edition follows the original All the Year Round text very much more closely, so that the great majority of chronological errors remain uncorrected. With the exceptions of a single change in each of the 15th and 38th numbers, alterations in the text of the American edition occur only in the 33rd, 34th, and 35th numbers, where most but not all of the English changes have been incorporated. In the case of the 38th number, the omission of Mr. Vesey's letter means that it is altogether absent from the Harper's version in both places where it might have appeared in the text. It is also of interest that the later 1865 Harper's edition follows precisely that of 1860, so that all of the errors of chronology, including those pointed out by The Times and the Guardian are perpetuated. This is once again in contrast with the many alterations between English serial, three volume and one volume versions. The 1860 First American Edition contains no preface, although a shortened version of that published in the English First does appear in the 1865 Harper's edition.

OTHER EDITIONS

On the Continent, The Woman in White was translated into French and several other languages. It was also published by Tauchnitz in 1860 as Volumes 525 and 526 of the "Collection of British Authors," its chronology being the same as that of the three volume, first English edition.

In America, Collins suffered from his perennial difficulty with pirated editions. This was despite his best endeavours on behalf of Harpers to provide them with proofs as rapidly as possible, and explains why time did not permit illustrations in the final two Numbers, 39 and 40. Nevertheless, twenty years later he bitterly recalled in Considerations on the Copyright Question Addressed to an American Friend (London: Trubner 1880, p. 12) ". . . one American publisher informed a friend of mine that he had sold 'one hundred and twenty thousand copies of The Woman in White.'"

Sutherland²² suggests that the equivalent of more than 100,000 copies were sold in All the Year Round, together with a probable 50,000 of the 1861 edition. If these numbers are added to those from the several three volume editions, subsequent English editions in 1865, 1872, 1875, 1889, 1890, 1894, and 1896 and later Harper's issues in 1861, 1863, 1865, 1867, 1871, 1873, 1893 and 1899, it can be seen that during the nineteenth century The Woman in White was sold in truly prodigious quantities.

THE WOMAN IN WHITE: A CHRONOLOGY

November 26th 1859	Serialisation begins in <u>All the Year Round</u> and <u>Harper's Weekly</u> .
January 1860	Sampson Low acquire book publication right.
April 16th 1860	First Announcement by Sampson Low in <u>Publishers Circular</u> .
July 26th 1860	Collins completes <u>The Woman in White</u> .
August 4th 1860	Serialisation completed by <u>Harper's Weekly</u> .

August 15th 1860	Publication in book form of first English edition and first American edition.
August 22nd 1860	Second impression of English edition "selling well."
August 26th 1860	Serialisation completed in <u>All the Year Round</u> .
August 29th 1860	<u>Guardian</u> Review.
by September 15th 1860	Second edition.
September 24th 1860	Third edition.
Between September 14th and 29th 1860	Fourth edition.
By October 16th 1860	A fifth edition.
October 30th 1860	<u>The Times</u> Review.
November 1st 1860	New edition.
February 1861	Date of Preface to one volume edition.
April 15th 1861	First advertisement for one volume edition.
Between April 15th and May 1st 1861	Publication of one volume edition.

Notes

¹Page, Norman. Wilkie Collins: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974. p. 103.

²Marston, E. After Work. London: William Heinemann, 1904. p. 85.

³Kendrick, W. M. "The Sensationalism of The Woman in White." Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 32 (June 1977), 23.

⁴Page, p. 90.

⁵Although a third edition has been examined, it has not yet been possible to locate a second edition of Vol. III, so that this correction may have been made in either the second or third edition. It would be of interest to hear from anyone possessing a copy of the second edition to clarify this point.

⁶The Woman in White, ed. Anthea Trodd. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

⁷Sadleir, Michael. Excursions in Victorian Bibliography. London: Chaundy and Cox, 1922. p. 140.

⁸Sadleir, Michael. XIX Century Fiction. London: Constable, 1951. p. 95.

⁹Brussel, I. R. Anglo-American First Editions, 1826-1900. Volume I, East to West. London: Constable, 1935. p. 45.

¹⁰Robinson, Kenneth. Wilkie Collins: A Biography. London: Bodley Head, 1951. pp. 145-146.

¹¹Robinson, p. 145.

¹²Publishers Circular, p. 422.

¹³Publishers Circular, p. 415.

¹⁴Robinson, p. 147.

¹⁵Ashley, Robert. Wilkie Collins. London: Arthur Barker, 1952. p. 59.

¹⁶Sadleir, Excursions, pp. 140-141.

¹⁷parrish and Miller, pp. 139-140.

¹⁸publishers Circular, p. 477.

¹⁹parrish and Miller, pp. 42-43.

²⁰E.g. Chatto and Windus editions, and Odham Press edition. O.U.P. World's Classics (1980), p. xxiii, adds Cassell's (1902), Everyman's Library (1910), Maurice Richardson (1955), and World's Classics (1921).

²¹Mott, H. Bookseller's catalogue and personal communication.

²²Sutherland, J. A. Victorian Novelists and Publishers. London: Athlone, 1976. p. 42.

TWICE-TOLD TALES OF TWO COUNTS:
THE WOMAN IN WHITE AND DRACULA

Mark M. Hennelly, Jr.

Anyone who reads Wilkie Collins's The Woman in White (1859-60) and Bram Stoker's Dracula (1897) in close succession should experience repeated flashes of deja vu. Stoker admitted "borrowing"¹ the epistolary form perfected by Collins; but late Victorian critics of Stoker's Gothic masterpiece, especially those from Punch and The Bookman, saw little other evidence of Collins's influence: "Since Wilkie Collins left us we had no tale of mystery so liberal in manner and so closely woven. But with the intricate plot, and the methods of narrative, the resemblance to the stories of the author of 'The Woman in White' ceases; for the audacity and the horror of 'Dracula' are Mr. Stoker's own."² In the twentieth century, only Nuel Pharr Davis has gone further. After suggesting that by the example of the The Woman in White, "Bram Stoker was inspired to frighten generations of youth with Dracula," Davis footnotes that "the schoolroom scene of children talking about the beautiful lady in the cemetery is the most exactly identifiable evidence of Dracula's debt to The Woman in White, but there are a host of others, and the letter-diary form of Dracula is one of the most interesting of The Woman in White's imitations."³ Unfortunately, Davis never specifies his "host of others," though there is evidence of provocative similarities, if not downright influence, which is much more "exactly identifiable" than the schoolroom scene. Rather than stressing a reductive chain of influences, however, I would like to indicate some of the many uncanny resemblances between the two novels. The real value of such an exercise lies in the reader's consequent understanding of the similarities (and dissimilarities) between a mid and a late nineteenth-century handling of corresponding Victorian and Gothic narrative structures, plot structures, image patterns, and character clusters. More specifically, it lies in a final understanding of how the remarkably analogous Count Fosco and Count Dracula mutually personify compatible themes as their mysterious characters fascinate and invade the vulnerable defenses of the Victorian audience reading these twice-told tales of two counts.

As I have indicated in a previous study of Dracula,⁴ its narrative structure is splintered into various private and public papers for epistemological reasons. Stoker notes in his Preface that these papers are "given from the standpoints and within the range of knowledge of those who made them" so as to assure the late Victorian reader "that a history almost at variance with

the possibilities of later-day belief may stand forth as simple fact" (D,p.vii).⁵ And as we know, this narrative structure is an admitted "borrowing" from Collins who, in The Woman in White, originally stressed the legal necessity of Walter Hartright's unifying various, different points of view: "The terrible story of the conspiracy so obtained, was presented in fragments, sadly incoherent in themselves, and widely detached from each other" (WW,p.390).⁶ The point of Collins's narrative "borrowing," however, goes far beyond style and directly into the substantive concerns of both novelists. Both epistolary tales are almost obsessed with trading information or acquiring "knowledge," that is, the gnostic or noetic process which is at the thematic core of the Victorian crisis of faith as well as at the nerve-center of the shock of recognition provoked by the otherworldly, apparent or real, in Gothic fiction. These two common crises of belief or faith are the particular, shared concern of The Woman in White and Dracula.

Both works initially are reflexive treatises on the empirical methodology of induction; in lawyer Kyrle's words to Hartright: "I pass over minor point of evidence, on both sides, to save time; and I ask you, if this case were to go now into a court of law--to go before a jury, bound to take facts as they reasonably appear--where are your proofs?" (WW,p.407). Yet both are also complementary exercises in subjective literary detection--what we might call Victorian-Gothic whodunits--trying to capture and symbolically assimilate the alien mentalities, or epistemologies, of Fosco and Dracula. Both, then, try to reconcile the apparently conflicting persuasions of objectivity and subjectivity. Marian Halcombe writes: "In the perilous uncertainty of our present situation, it is hard to say what future interests may not depend upon the regularity of the entries in my journal, and upon the reliability of my recollection at the time when I make them" (WW,p.259). And Jonathan Harker echoes her concern with personal certitude and objective authority: "Let me begin with facts--bare, meagre facts, verified by books and figures, and of which there can be no doubt. I must not confuse them with experiences which will have to rest on my observation, or my memory of them" (D,p.33). Indeed, the private eye finally becomes the private I in each novel as the intimate, personal act of recording one's thoughts and collating them with apparently unrelated public documents discovers certitude in once relative emotion collected and recollected in tranquility. Moreover, this act engages the Victorian reader in the surrogate but simultaneous process of assimilating diverse epistemological viewpoints and reconciling them by personally discovering similarity in dissimilarity. Marian is careful to preserve her auto-

nomous self in the sanctuary of her writing-desk where her "journal was already secured, with other papers, in the table-drawer" (WW,p.276); and Hartright repeats this insistence on the sanctity of solipsism, the Victorian heritage of the Gothic quest for the absolute validity of heightened states of sense and sensibility:⁷ "I turn to my diary for repose. The habit of entering accurately must help to soothe me" (D,p.40). Interestingly enough, at the conclusion of both novels, a child--Hartright's and Harker's--becomes the heir apparent to the collected papers, the novels themselves, and a significant surrogate for the reader who has also just inherited the various epistemologies gathered in this reflexive "mass of material": "We want no proofs; we ask none to believe us! This boy will some day know what a brave and gallant woman his mother is" (D,p.418).

Such a narrative structure is reinforced by the comparable plot structures of both novels, which likewise stress the resolution of rival epistemologies. Hartright participates in a "mysterious adventure" (WW,p.39) to solve the enigma behind the woman in white; while Harker also pursues what I have called the Victorian "gnostic quest,"⁸ "a wild adventure" in which he and the other questers "seem to be drifting into unknown places and unknown ways; into a whole world of dark and dreadful things" (D,p.395). That is, the occidental vampire hunters wish to detect or solve the noetic riddle of Dracula and his exotic life force; as Van Helsing puts it, "We shall go to make our search--if I can call it so, for it is not search but knowing" (D,p.348). Appropriately, both structures in Gothic fashion seek to reconcile rational and irrational premises. On the one hand, like conventional detective novels, both appear to be chess games of rational logic between master detective and master criminal, each attempting a special syllogistic strategy to outwit and checkmate both the other and, temporarily, the reader. Marian implies that Fosco's gamesmanship is an analogy for his criminal strategies: "For the first two games he politely allowed me to conquer him; and then, when he saw that I had found him out, begged my pardon, and, at the third game, checkmated me in ten minutes" (WW,p.206). Dracula's momentary disappearance prompts Van Helsing to use the same metaphor to describe seizing the advantage: "Good! It has given us opportunity to cry 'check' in some ways in this chess game, which we play for the stake of human souls" (D,p.279). On the other hand, Hartright anticipates the irrational cosmos of Dracula when he compares his mysterious quest to the deja vu ambience of a chthonian nightmare: "a sensation oddly akin to the helpless discomfort familiar to all of us in sleep, when we recognize yet cannot reconcile the anomalies and contra-

dictions of a dream" (WW,p.25). In similar fashion, Harker wonders "whether any dream could be more terrible than the unnatural, horrible net of gloom and mystery which seemed closing around me" (D,pp.36-37).

As The Woman in White and Dracula approach their goals of answering epistemological riddles, both rely on a comparable kind of breathless suspense to anticipate their respective re-solutions of Gothicism's rational and irrational modes. For example, Hartright's imminent collision with his flesh-and-blood Count stimulates and simulates the reader's own terrified anxieties: "The rapid motion of the cab, the sense that every instant now was bringing me nearer the Count, the conviction that I was embarked at last, without let or hindrance, on my hazardous enterprise, heated me into such a fever of excitement that I shouted to the man to go faster and faster" (WW,p.543). Mina's description of the vampire hunters' desperate attempt to overtake the ghoulish Dracula's coffin in Transylvania before sunset echoes analogous but more horrified audience anxiety: "On the cart was a great square chest. My heart leaped as I saw it, for I felt that the end was coming. The evening was now drawing close, and well I knew that at sunset the Thing, which was all then imprisoned there, would take new freedom and could in any of many forms elude all pursuit" (D,p.412). And indeed Collins, in an 1887 letter to The Globe, annotated the resolution of his symbolic structure with a perception that seems even more true of Stoker's tale of the Victorian divided self than of his own: "The destruction of her identity represents a first division of the story; the recovery of her identity marks a second division" (WW, quoted on p. 596). His Laura symbolically dies and is reborn; in turn, Mina "almost" becomes an "Un-Dead," and then is redeemed by her transfusion of Eastern and Western bloodlines, by her sanguine understanding, in fact her oral incorporation, of Dracula's blood knowledge.

The major image patterns in each novel are very similar and should be apparent to readers of both tales. Many of the Gothic locales and atmospherics, for example, are alike, approximating what Anne calls "the world beyond the grave" (WW,p.253). In fact, a sentence like "I saw the white tomb again, and the veiled woman rising out of it" could easily describe the central Gothic iconography from either book, though here it is from The Woman in White (p.262). Thus graveyards, insane asylums, dreary mansions, old chapels, zoological gardens, spectral trysts in "the thickening obscurity of the twilight" (WW,p.262), and eerie encounters during misty or foggy, moonlight nocturnes, especially at Blackwater Park and Transylvania where "in almost complete darkness, . . . the rolling clouds obscured

the moon" (D,p.15), establish the chiaroscuro tone of Victorian-Gothic in both novels. Again the difference resides only in the relative reality of the otherworldly impulses in each tale; and yet as G. R. Thompson has suggested, both kinds of Gothic phenomena, the rational and irrational or natural and preternatural, are "compatible" with each other.⁹ Both ultimately stress the validity of instinctual or imaginative responses to metaphysical crises. In The Woman in White, of course, as in Ann Radcliffe's Gothic romances, the suspected occult defers, though with serious qualification, to the more rational symbols of conventional science and law; while in Dracula the related point of the story, as in Maturin's Melmoth the Wanderer, is the desperate need to balance the rational with belief in the existential validity of the irrational. In each novel an exclusively secular or rational approach to life, symbolized by the ineffectual legal systems of Harker or Kyrle, by the medical sciences of Mr. Dawson, who misdiagnoses Marian's typhus, or of the skeptical Dr. Seward, and by the aristocratic prejudices of Mr. Fairlie or Godalming, is explicitly condemned. In Dracula, as Van Helsing preaches repeatedly, irrational belief in vampirism, or maintaining "the open mind," is the only successful weapon against the Count. In The Woman in White, on the other hand, it is not belief in the irrational lore of vampires, but the irrational belief in love that resolves the dualism of the divided self. At the end of his quest, Hartright consequently discovers that his and Marian's symbolic goal of a reborn Laura would have been unattainable if "we had loved her less dearly, if the instinct planted in us by that love had not been far more certain than any exercise of reasoning, far keener than any process of observation . . ." (WW,p.399). And yet the final sentence of Dracula likewise emphasizes that out of the irrational, nightmare imagery of that novel, the vampire hunters' legacy of love for Mina will ultimately redeem and renew her son: "later on he will understand how some men so loved her, that they did dare much for her sake" (D,p.418).

Finally, then, a belief symbolically dramatized by both Collins and Stoker is that a Victorian life without Gothic libidinal energy is a paralyzed or parasitic, empty gesture, while libido without love and self-sacrifice is mere lust and licentiousness. In a therianthrope Gothic image, which prefigures both his own (ironically) and Dracula's instincts, the vampirish Count Fosco reviles a "savage" bloodhound and implies that its cowardly demonism must be domesticated, that natural savagery and civilization must be symbolically reconciled: "Anything that you can surprise unawares-- anything that is afraid of your big body, and your wicked white teeth and your slobbering, bloodthirsty mouth, is the thing you like to fly at. You could

throttle me at this moment, you mean, miserable bully; and you daren't so much as look me in the face, because I'm not afraid of you. Will you think the better of it, and try your teeth in my fat neck?" (WW,p.199). And in *Dracula* the cockney London zoo-keeper uses a comparable kind of theriomorphism to describe the natural instincts of his wild wolves: "there's a deal of the same nature in us as in them theer animiles" (D,p.149). Indeed, both novels finally employ the same image to emphasize the need for a fortunate fall from the heady towers of Victorian class superiority, cloistered innocence, and skeptical rationalism to the repressed "bitter waters" of instinctual human nature which flood Gothic fiction. For Marian the "thought of" Laura's victimization by the Count "welled up like a spring in the depths of my heart, and filled it with waters of bitterness" (WW,p.262); while Van Helsing often repeats the same metaphor, noting that after the loss of Lucy, they "must pass through the bitter waters to reach the sweet" (D,p.222). Both bitter baptisms assure an ultimate, sweet renewal.

Like the image patterns, the symmetrical character relationships in each novel are remarkably similar. Even the individual names--Hartright-Harker, Marian-Mina, Laura-Lucy--suggest the probable extent of Collins's influence on Stoker. And the figurative hint of almost incestuous or narcissistic *menages a trois*, like those implied between Hartright, Laura, and Marian or Fosco, Lady Fosco, and Marian, and between Dracula, Lucy, and Mina are also notably parallel. Even Pesca and Renfield are similar grotesques personifying Victorian Jekyll-Hydeism. Briefly, then, Hartright and Harker play comparable roles as sympathetic double agents, that is, as the major reporters and actors in the drama. Each is a reader-identification figure, what Stoker terms "a sufficient substitute" (D,p.19) for the nineteenth-century audience. As detached Victorian lawyer and artist, both also grow from mere uninvolved spectators of life so that, as Hartright indicates, the rising Gothic action can force him, like Harker, finally "to act for [him]self" (WW,p.578). Along the way, both also learn the danger of repressive concealment and the redemptive value of "open-minded" trust and revelation. Speaking really of all his later improved relationships, Hartright confirms: "We had no concealments from each other" (WW,p.374); and Harker seconds such a motion: "there was to be no more concealment of anything amongst us" (D,p.359). It should be noted, though, that some of Hartright's thematic functions seem split between Harker and Van Helsing so that just as Walter must learn to identify with, and at least partially assimilate his Count's powers, so too must the Professor. In fact, Hartright affirms that "I thought with his mind" (WW,p.546, Col-

Collins's emphasis); and Van Helsing repeats, almost verbatim, this telepathic virtue: "I, too, am wily and I think his mind" (D,p.346).

Laura and Anne, those "living reflexions of one another" (WW,p.84), are likewise reflected in Lucy since all three are not only conventional emblems of Gothic embowered damsels in distress, but are also and more crucially tragic victims, or scapegoats, of Victorian female stereotyping. Thus, Laura's apparent death creates "the false Lady Glyde" and "the true Lady Glyde" (WW,p.568) just as Lucy's qualified death juxtaposes "the false Lucy" against "the true Lucy" (D, p.341). Laura, then, becomes "the dead alive" (WW, p.387), and Lucy of course, one of the "Un-dead" (D, p.221). Each suffers under the repressive "dual life" (D,p.320) which both Collins and Stoker find plaguing their respective mid and late Victorian audience, especially the female audience. Indeed, the "suppressed tigerish jealousy" (WW,p.175) of Madame Fosco and the latent "serpent hatred" (WW,p. 451) of Mrs. Catherick often metamorphose them into sinister succubi. Still, Collins's condemnation of the tragic, life-denying consequences of cloistering females against sexual realities is generally less blatant than Stoker's similar though more outraged critique. Laura, for instance, after Glyde's proposal of marriage, must hear the facts of sexual life from Marian: "I poured the profaning bitterness of this world's wisdom into that pure heart and that innocent mind. . . . The simple illusions of her girlhood are gone" (WW,p.167). Stoker's fainting female, on the other hand, more irrationally personifies the ghastly Gothic results of the Victorian dislocation between flesh and spirit, between its own prurience and its pretensions of "purity": "She seemed like a nightmare of Lucy as she lay there; the pointed teeth, the bloodstained, voluptuous mouth--which it made one shudder to see--the whole carnal and unspiritual appearance, seeming like a devilish mockery of Lucy's sweet purity" (D,pp.234-35).

Finally, it is the emblematic posture of Laura and Anne replayed in Lucy that the reader may find most eerie when comparing the two novels. All three girls are virtually mysterious women in white, suspected lamias etched against a backdrop of moonlight and tombstone marble. And the obsessive Victorian fascination with the macabre interrelations between female sexuality, death, change, and changelessness¹⁰ is captured, indeed almost metaphysically frozen, in the enigma of this recurring Gothic tableau. Thus, Hart-right feverishly describes the deja vu titillations of seeing Laura mime the symbolic attitude of Anne: "My eyes fixed upon the white gleam of her muslin gown and head-dress in the moonlight, and a sensation, for

which I can find no name--a sensation that quickened my pulse, and raised a fluttering at my heart--began to steal over me" (WW,p.50). And Dr. Seward's account of the reincarnation of Lucy, his "dead" lover, echoes the disturbing oxymoron of Hartright's mingled sense of dread and desire: "There was a long spell of silence, a big, aching void, and then from the Professor a keen 'S-s-s-s!' He pointed; and far down the avenue of yews we saw a white figure advance--a dim white figure, which held something dark at its breast. The figure stopped, and at the moment a ray of moonlight fell upon the masses of driving clouds and showed in startling prominence a dark-haired woman, dressed in the cerements of the grave" (D,p.231).

But the similarities between Marian and Mina are even more startling and significant since both women outgrow the Gothic postures of their weaker sisters and thereby reintegrate and heal the divided self. Indeed, both ultimately prove to be the Victorian answer to Margaret Fuller's famous question: "Will there never be a being to combine a man's mind and a woman's heart?"¹¹ Initially, though, both girls appear to be as one-sided as their epicene counterparts. Marian's notions of caste assume it is indecorous for her blue-blooded sister to contemplate marriage with a commoner like Hartright, while Mina feels it is even "improper" (D,p.188) for her husband to hold her hand in public. Both change, however, as soon as they are wooed and branded by their demon lovers. Count Fosco admits his restrained passion for Marian: "behold in the image of Marian Halcombe, the first and last weakness of Fosco's life!" (WW,pp.261-62). Count Dracula similarly, though with more sadomasochism, admits his ardor for Mina: "And you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood; kin of my kin; my bountiful wine-press for a while; and shall be later my companion and my helper" (D,p.317). And certainly his act of "passion" is far more violent and overtly sexual than Fosco's when "the ruthless hands of the Count had held" Mina "in that terrible and horrid position, with her mouth to the open wound in his breast" (D,pp.313-14). The fact that these early emblems of female orthodoxy are singled out for love by such glaring personifications of depravity ultimately marks both women with ambivalent sexual connotations.

Such a reversal is quite rare in most mainstream Victorian fiction and thus is disturbing to an audience weaned on languishing ladies of Shalott like Laura, Anne, and Lucy (before her "undeath"). In Gothic fiction, despoiling virgins like Antonia in The Monk is almost a perfunctory convention, if titillation can be said ever to be perfunctory; but when virgins are

violated in the Victorian novel, and in one sense even seem to welcome the violation, it makes for a shattering commentary on cultural repression. Though Collins chose to kill off the illegitimate and distracted Anne, and Stoker did the same with her fictional twin, the corrupted Lucy, neither writer resorts to such an expedient with his major heroine. Rather, Marian and Mina both develop sanguine, androgynous personalities after their baptisms of blood and flesh; and consequently they adumbrate, as much as Hardy's Sue Bridehead or Eliot's Gwendolen Harleth, the "New Woman" whom Mina early scoffs at (D,p.98). Thus Marian matures to a "magnificent woman," with "the foresight and the resolution of a man," one who "stands in the strength of her love and her courage" (WW,p.296). Similarly, "that wonderful Madame Mina" boasts a "man's brain--a brain that a man should have were he gifted--and a woman's heart" (D,p.258). Indeed, the last sentences of both novels preach comparable testaments to the greater glory of Marian and Mina. Collins ends: "Marian was the good angel of our lives--let Marian end our Story" (WW,p.584); and as we have heard, Stoker concludes: "some men so loved her [Mina], that they did dare much for her sake" (D,p.418).

Two of the most eccentric, corresponding characters in the novels are the Italian homunculus Pesca and the native English "zoophagist" Renfield. Both Gothic curiosities are also classic examples of the Victorian divided self, or what Dr. Seward terms "unconscious cerebration" and its "conscious brother" (D,p.76), when reflecting on Renfield's split-personality. Moreover, both lead comparable double lives; both are grotesque alter-egos for the major, self-divided characters, and both are intimately connected with their respective counts. Pesca, for instance, unaware of the real extent of Hartright's past trials and tragedies, ironically adumbrates the links between himself and Fosco and thus, more importantly, links Hartright with the dualism of this "secret self": "The iron that has entered into our souls has gone too deep for you to find it. Leave the refugee [Fosco] alone! Laugh at him, distrust him, open your eyes in wonder at that secret self which smoulders in him, sometimes under the every-day respectability and tranquility of a man like me" (WW,p.535, Collins's emphasis). The masquerading Pesca is early characterized "by the harmless eccentricity of his character" (WW,p.3); and yet it is later clear that his "extraordinary anxiety" (WW,p.540) brands him as a possible murderer and thus a fitting prefiguration of the self-masking, often gentle homicidal maniac Renfield. Seward suggests Renfield's normal abnormality when he wonders whether "I have anything in common with him" (D,p.118). Thus, this "sanest lunatic" (D,p.273), like Pesca, personifies the "secret self" which erases the false Victo-

rian boundary line between reason and rage and in Gothic fashion bridges the gap between abnormality and normalcy. As Renfield himself understands when remembering the Count's last visitation, "I must not deceive myself; it was no dream, but all a grim reality" (D,p.306). And just as Pesca and Count Fosco are marginal members of the symbolic "secret Brotherhood" of humanity, so too Renfield is "so mixed up with the Count" (D,p.273) that the unavoidable symbolic implication is that fledgling, native vampires, like Renfield, are already alive and unwell in London before the "foreign" Dracula ever smuggles himself ashore. Ultimately, though, both would-be murderers convert to self-sacrificing messiahs as Renfield, in battle with the Count, gives up his life for Madam Mina and Pesca struggles to bring his Count to justice for the salvation of Hartright and the honor of the Brotherhood.

By far the most teasing and thematic correspondences, however, exist between those dark paracletes, the two counts--Fosco and Dracula. Again and again, Collins's and Stoker's irony implies that their respective Gothic villains represent crucial atavistic and anarchic values which the repressive Victorian culture, to its own detriment, has neglected.¹² Consequently, these foreign imports must be culturally assimilated if they are to rehabilitate England's insular creeds. But at first glance the culture and the reader see both men only as monstrous, if masterful, criminals. To justify his own *raison d'etre*, Fosco even descants on the craft of the creative criminal: "The hiding of a crime, or the detection of a crime, what is it? A trial of skill between the police on one side, and the individual on the other When the criminal is a resolute, educated, highly-intelligent man, the police, in nine cases out of ten, lose" (WW,pp.210-11). And Mina similarly identifies the criminal pleasure principle she finds motivating Dracula: "The Count is a criminal and of criminal type. . . . as he is a criminal he is selfish" (D,p.378). Clue by clue, however, the attentive detective-reader discovers that beneath these villains' veneer of surface evil and corruption survives a vital life force capable of redeeming the moribund Victorian wasteland. Marian is most honest here: "I can only repeat that I do assuredly feel, even on this short acquaintance, a strange half-willing, half-unwilling liking for the Count. He seems to have established over me . . . [a] sort of ascendancy" (WW,p.210). Mina's less urbane Count, of course, has also "infect[ed]" her (D,p.353); but a good part of this infection is figuratively as well as literally sanguine and thus salutary since "There have been from the loins of this very one great men and good women" (D,p.265). Fosco discusses his symbolic role as a jaded reality principle in terms of its shock therapy: "I say what other people

only think; and when all the rest of the world is in a conspiracy to accept the mask for the true face, mine is the rash hand that tears off the plump pasteboard, and shows the bare bones beneath" (WW,p.213). Dracula is content to abandon skeptical metaphysics for "open-minded" epistemology: "There is reason that all things are as they are, and did you see with my eyes and know with my knowledge, you would perhaps better understand" (D,p.23).

Aside from Fosco's corpulence, which itself is indicative of his vampirish orality, even the particular emphases in the appearances of the two counts are quite similar. In fact, Stoker's life-long confidant, the famous Victorian actor Sir Henry Irving, was almost certainly one of the models for Dracula's commanding presence and physiognomy; and his "quality of strangeness" has been described as possessing "a dash of Wilkie Collins's Count Fosco."¹³ At any rate, Fosco's "singular sallow-fairness" of complexion, his cruel, "plump yellow-white fingers" and rich head of "dark brown" hair (WW,pp.197-99) are repeated in Dracula's "extraordinary pallor," his "white" hands, "broad, with squat fingers" which were "cut to a sharp point," and his bushy "hair growing. . . profusely" (D,pp.19-20). More significant are the almost identical eyes and mouth. Indeed, Fosco's identifying trait is "the extraordinary expression and extraordinary power of his eyes," which Marian describes as possessing "a cold, clear, beautiful irresistible glitter in them, which forces me to look at him, and yet causes me sensations when I do look, which I would rather not feel" (WW,p.197). Dracula's famed eyes are even more hypnotic, always "gleam[ing]" or "burn[ing] into" one (D,p.309) and often "positively blazing. . . . as if the flames of hell-fire blazed behind them" (D,p.42) like the "blaze of basilisk horror" (D,p.57). As suggested earlier, while Dracula "can transform himself to [a] wolf" (D,p.263), Fosco's gastronomic appetite also becomes carnivorous when it is symbolically displaced onto a vampirish "bloodhound" who cowers under his gaze and hand, a brutal familiar with "wicked white teeth, and . . . slobbering, bloodthirsty mouth" that would like to "try [its] teeth in . . . a fat neck" (WW,p.199). Dracula's parasitic appetites, of course, leave him "like a filthy leech . . . gorged with blood," while "on his lips were gouts of fresh blood" (D,p.56). And his mouth, too, is "rather cruel-looking with peculiarly sharp white teeth" (D,p.20).¹⁴ Moreover, Marian remarks on Fosco's "unusual command of the English language" and his impeccable "fluency" (WW,p.197); and Harker likewise remarks to Dracula: "you know and speak English thoroughly you speak excellently" (D,p.22). Finally, both counts give the appearance of perpetual rejuvenation, almost of immortality (WW, p.197; D,p.20)

Of course, as one of the "undead" Dracula, suffering "the curse of immortality" (D,p.235), justifies such a claim--he is a master of "necromancy," or "divination of the dead" (D,p.260). But even Fosco, significantly, "has discovered . . . a means of petrifying the body after death, so as to preserve it . . . to the end of time" (WW,p.199).

More revealing is the common Faustian pedigree of Fosco's and Dracula's scholarly and scientific backgrounds, which pedigree helps in part to explain their original powers. Fosco's pompous heading to his narrative¹⁵ indicates that, among other upper case titles, he is the "PERPETUAL ARCH-MASTER OF THE ROSICRUCIAN MASONS OF MESOPOTAMIA" (WW,p.557). But he is just as adept at chemistry as hermetics: "Chemistry, especially, has always had irresistible attractions for me, from the enormous, the illimitable power which the knowledge of it confers" (WW,p.560). Indeed, Fosco is such a polymath that he would be "the prominent personage of any assembly in the civilised world" (WW,p.199). He boasts "a daring independence of thought, a knowledge of books in every language and an experience of society in half the capitals of Europe" (WW,p.199). Dracula "learned his secrets in the Scholomance" (D,p. 265); and part chimera and part alchemist, like the chemist Fosco, he is a true Renaissance creature: "he was in life a most wonderful man. Soldier, statesman, and alchemist--which latter was the highest development of the science-knowledge of his time. He had a mightly brain, a learning beyond compare" (D,p.333). Dracula's extensive reading also resembles Fosco's and includes "history, geography, politics, political economy, botany, geology, law" (D,pp. 21-22). And like the earlier Count, Dracula also associates such knowledge with power: "All through [his background] there are signs of his advance, not only of his power, but of his knowledge of it" (D,p.333). Both men, then, for their Victorian culture, are walking testaments to the redeeming gospel of the "open mind," and conversely are admonitions against the life-denying stagnation of narrow-mindedness. This is at least one of the reasons why both are also strangely boyish, that is, invariably flexible and growing toward mature knowledge. Fosco is infatuated with "childish interests and amusements" (WW,p.198); and Dracula is equally puerile, though more potentially pernicious if his libidinal "child-brain" is not reintegrated into the Victorian frame of mind. In "some faculties of mind he has been, and is, only a child" (D,p.334).

And yet the two counts possess still other common powers, which are also conventions of Gothic, over-reaching horror. Both share, for instance, the uncanny ability to materialize, apparently ex nihilo. For example, Fosco characteristically appears before Marian

"as if he had sprung up out of the earth" (WW,p.245); while Dracula "can, within limitations, appear at will when, and where, and in any of the forms that are [available] to him" (D,p.264). Both are night creatures, or more precisely, twilight creatures whose powers seem to ebb and flow during threshold periods of natural transition between light and darkness (D,p.264). The force of this imagery ultimately condemns the solar reading-public who cannot adapt to changing conditions and certainly cannot therapeutically externalize its own unconscious heart of lunar darkness. Fosco "love[s]" the "trembling English twilight," believing that it foreshadows "all that is noble and great and good." As he tells Marian, he even identifies with its darker symbology: "Observe, dear lady, what a light is dying on the trees! Does it penetrate your heart, as it penetrates mine?" Further, he begs that "the lovely dying light might not be profaned . . . by the appearance of lamps" (WW,p.261). Appropriately, Fosco's demise begins after Hartright has boldly sat through the night with him and after "the sunlight of the new morning poured into the room," while the Count, more and more, "was getting anxious . . ." (WW,p.555). And, as every reader knows, one of Stoker's recurrent moments of suspense is that Dracula's "power ceases, as does that of all evil things, at the coming of the day" (D, p.264) so that Van Helsing's prayer is that "we shall travel towards the sunrise" (D,p.354). Moreover, both counts exert an enigmatic influence over the animal kingdom, especially their verminous familiars. Fosco loves dogs, birds, but particularly his white rodents which he "kisses" as they "crawl all over him" (WW,p.198); while Dracula "can command all the meaner things: the rat, and the owl, and the bat--the moth, and the fox, and the wolf" (D,p.261). Lastly, both counts exercise degrees of telepathic powers which transcend rational discourse by irrational, intuitive impulses. Marian reveals that Fosco's "eyes seemed to reach my inmost soul through the thickening obscurity of twilight"; and this hint of telepathic projection recalls the "mystery and terror of [her] dream" (WW,pp.261-62) of Laura returning from the grave. And vying with Van Helsing, Dracula more certainly mind-reads and hypnotizes Mina into a state of "sad dreaminess" (D,p.344), just as his eyes also "burned into" Renfield while the lunatic's individuality "became like water" (D,p.309).

But what, finally, is the value of comparisons like the foregoing? My aim here has not been to insist upon a series of exact, intentional points of influence, though even without Stoker's admission of "borrowing" from Collins, the textual evidence for it is most compelling. Indeed, the remarkable affinity between the two novels seems to be one of the more identifiable instances of a source relationship in all of literary

history. Yet it is not enough merely to suggest sources and parallels unless these also tell us something new about both works, their interrelationships, and the literary traditions which inform their mutual vision. What we have seen, then, to be most enlightening about the multiple correspondences between The Woman in White and Dracula is that, although written a generation apart in the nineteenth century, both tales make remarkably analogous use of compatible Victorian and Gothic tropes and themes in order to criticize and correct mid and late nineteenth-century philosophical and psychological dilemmas. Indeed, some themes, like that of the divided self, one hardly knows whether to call Gothic or Victorian. And the fact that Collins's Gothicism is finally rational while Stoker apparently felt compelled to push beyond into the irrational realm suggests, among other things, how deeply entrenched and probably incurable was such Victorian one-sidedness.

Collins ridicules the fact "that men, in the nineteenth century, were above superstition" (WW,p.52) and relied upon "insular notions of propriety" (WW,p.5). In the same way Stoker, though again in more extreme Gothic fashion, rails against "this age, so skeptical and selfish" (D,p.207), this "scientific, skeptical, matter-of-fact nineteenth century" which rejects "traditions and superstitions," though "tradition and superstition--are everything. Does not the belief in vampires rest . . . on them?" (D,p.262). As primal, atavistic life forces, both the terrifying Fosco and the horrifying Dracula represent a form of the Demiurge,¹⁶ a psychological, philosophical, and at least in Dracula's case almost religious insistence on the redemptive value of Matter and its symbolic equivalents--instinct, emotion, sex, and the intuitive and imaginative belief in (as against the cerebral intelligence of) all these values. Thus, Fosco's iconoclastic, cardinal faith reverses normal deistic rationalism: "Mind, they say, rules the world. But what rules the mind? The body" (WW,p.560). Dracula's demiurgism, on the other hand, is much more actively supernal since he is that god of matter or "the body," a negative force with the "attributes of the Deity" (D,p.296) who is "brute, and more than brute; he is devil . . . he can, within his range, direct the elements; the storm, the fog, the thunder; he can command all the meaner things" (D,pp.260-61). Thus, the different chthonian emphases in Collins's and Stoker's Manichaeism both ironically uphold the values repressed and displaced in nineteenth-century culture.

In this essay I have tried to suggest that Collins's mid Victorian strategy chose the more reasonable strain of Gothicism, classically located in Ann Radcliffe's romances; that is, Fosco's implied preternaturalism is all but finally explained away by rational discourse,

though the disturbing memory of his presence and powers lingers on.¹⁷ Stoker's fin de siècle Gothicism, on the other hand, posed the more radical epistemological challenge of Monk Lewis or Charles Maturin, which demands complete imaginative belief in the agency of the netherworld: "that faculty which enables us to believe things which we know to be untrue" (D,p.211). Significantly for the Victorian common reader, both Gothic gospels preach to what we have heard Marian call "a strange, half-willing, half-unwilling liking" (WW,p.201) for each Count. Stoker's folkloric defense of Dracula's mysterious accessibility to the home of even the sanest Victorian is finally a more fitting epitaph to the combined power of these twice-told tales of two counts: "He may not enter anywhere at the first, unless there be some one of the household who bid him to come" (D,p. 264).

Notes

¹See Daniel Farson's The Man Who Wrote Dracula: a biography of Bram Stoker (London: Michael Joseph, 1975), p. 141. Interestingly Farson also suggests that Collins's fear of vampire-induced, premature burial provoked him to write a long list of precautions to be followed before he could be interred, p. 120. He also notes that Collins, like Stoker, made periodic trips to Paris to enjoy the famed pleasures of Parisian bordellos. His point here is the conjecture that Stoker really died of syphilis, pp. 234-35. For other information on the composition of Dracula, see Joseph S. Bierman, "The Genesis and Dating of 'Dracula' from Bram Stoker's Working Notes," Notes and Queries, 24 (1977), 39-41, and Raymond T. McNally and Radu F. Florescu, In Search of Dracula: a True History of Dracula and Vampire Legends (New York: Galahad Books, 1972), pp. 178 ff.

²This excerpt from The Bookman is quoted in H. Ludlam's The Life Story of Bram Stoker (London: W. Foulsham, 1962), p. 107. Punch was considerably less impressed with the "borrowing": "The story is told in diaries and journals, a rather tantalising and somewhat wearisome form of narration, whereof Wilkie Collins was a past-master," p. 108.

³The Life of Wilkie Collins (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1956), pp. 216 and 328, note 55.

⁴"Dracula: The Gnostic Quest and Victorian Wasteland," English Literature in Transition, 20(1977), 13-26. As I indicate in this essay, strangely there has been little critical attempt to relate Dracula to the

Gothic tradition. See McNally and Florescu for a cursory treatment, pp. 175 ff.

⁵Bram Stoker, Dracula (New York: Modern Library, 1897). Cited hereafter as D in text.

⁶William Wilkie Collins, The Woman in White, edited with an introduction by Harvey Peter Sucksmith (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975). Cited hereafter as WW in text.

⁷After the original writing of this essay, I discovered the following recent article which sporadically alludes to "Victorian Gothic": Anne Humphery, "Dombey and Son: Carker the Manager," Nineteenth-Century Fiction, 34(1980), 397-413, especially 399-400. See also John Reed's "The Occult in Later Victorian Literature" in Victorian Conventions (Athens: Ohio Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 459-73.

⁸See note 4 and also my "Reading Detection in The Woman in White," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 22 (1980), 449-467, passim.

⁹Romantic Gothic Tales 1790-1840, edited with an introduction and bibliography by G. Richard Thompson (New York: Harper, 1979), p. 16.

¹⁰I have treated the Victorian preoccupation with change and changelessness in a series of previous essays: "David Copperfield: 'The Theme of This Incomprehensible Conundrum Was the Moon'," Studies in the Novel, 10(1978), 375-96; "The Time Machine: A Romance of 'The Human Heart'," Extrapolation, 20(1979), 154-167; and "The 'Silent Symbols' of the 'Fatal Cross-Roads' in Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," Gothic, 1(1979), 10-16.

¹¹Quoted by Lydia Blanchard in her review-essay, "Women and Fiction: Life as Imitation of Art," Studies in the Novel, 10(1978), 456.

¹²For a discussion of this Victorian theme, see U. C. Knoepfelmacher's relevant study of "The Counterworld of Victorian Fiction and The Woman in White," in The Worlds of Victorian Fiction, ed. Jerome H. Buckley (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 351-70.

¹³See Madeline Bingham, Henry Irving: The Greatest Victorian Actor (New York; Stein and Day, 1978), p. 58. McNally and Florescu quote Stoker's reaction to one of Irving's performances as "foretaste" of Dracula's personality, p. 173.

¹⁴For studies of the sexual implications in Dracula, see C. F. Bentley, "The Monster in the Bedroom: Sexual Symbolism in Bram Stoker's Dracula," Literature and Psychology 22(1972), 27-34; Joseph S. Bierman, "Dracula: Prolonged Childhood Illness and the Oral Triad," American Imago, 29(1972), 186-98; and Phyllis A. Roth, "Suddenly Sexual Women in Bram Stoker's Dracula," Literature and Psychology, 27(1977), 113-21.

¹⁵It is interesting to note here that Stoker allows his Count no such sustained narrative section. Perhaps this would elicit too much sympathy for Dracula; more probably it would be too difficult for Stoker to maintain Dracula's high charge of evil if the Count were allowed a great deal of articulation. He is much more evil off stage as a silent menace. For an outline of Dracula's infrequent appearances in the novel, see The Annotated Dracula, with an Introduction, Notes, and Bibliography by Leonard Wolf (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1975), pp. 350-51. By Wolf's count from his edition, Dracula appears in only sixty-two of three hundred and ninety pages, or roughly sixteen percent of the novel.

¹⁶For a detailed discussion of this theme in Dracula, see "Dracula: The Gnostic Quest and Victorian Wasteland," 13-17, 23.

¹⁷Henry James developed the relationship between Mrs. Radcliffe and Collins further, suggesting that "To Mr. Collins belongs the credit of having introduced into fiction those most mysterious of mysteries, the mysteries which are at our own doors. This innovation gave a new impetus to the literature of horrors. It was fatal to the authority of Mrs. Radcliffe and her everlasting castle in the Apennines Instead of the terrors of Udolpho, we were treated to the terrors of the cheerful country-house and the busy London lodgings. And there is no doubt that these were infinitely the more terrible." Stoker, of course, transports his horror from its exotic homeland to "the cheerful country-house." This unsigned review, "Miss Braddon," first appeared in Nation, 1 (1865), 593-5, and is reprinted in Wilkie Collins: The Critical Heritage, ed. Norman Page (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 122-24.

BLANK PAGE

Queries

Andrew Gasson seeks to examine a copy of the second edition of The Woman in White. He needs to study the edition for his analytical bibliography of Collins's works. Please write to him at: 3 Merton House, 36 Belsize Park, London, N.W.3. 4EA.

Mark M. Hennelly, Jr., needs information on the alchemical background of the gem in The Moonstone for an article he is writing. Please write to him in care of: Department of English, California State University, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819.

Notes on the Contributors

Andrew Gasson is author of several articles on Wilkie Collins. He is an important collector of Collinsiana, and owns the largest private collection of Collins's letters. He has worked for several years on an analytical bibliography of Collins's works. He is cofounder of the Wilkie Collins Society and serves as the Society's Secretary.

Mark M. Hennelly, Jr., is Professor of English at California State University, Sacramento, and he teaches nineteenth-century literature, myth, and romance literature. Until its recent demise, he was a member of the editorial board of Gothic. He has been a reader for several journals and has published over twenty-five essays on literature, including a fine article on Collins--"Reading Detection in The Woman in White," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 22, No. 4 (Winter 1981), 449-467.