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Abstract
This essay is a narratological character study of Loren. D Estleman’s novel SHERLOCK HOLMES VS DRACULA or the Adventure of the Sanguinary Count. The focus of this essay is how Sherlock and Dracula are characterised through Genette’s and Bal’s notions of focalization and description and how, through the additional incorporation of the concept of subtext, it unveils a dichotomy between the two literary figures. By further putting that relationship into historical context, it uncovers a symbolism which reflects imperial influence from the perceived decline of Britain as an empire, where Sherlock comes to symbolise England itself and Dracula an invading ‘other’. This suggests the existence of a covert reason for bringing these two famous (or infamous) characters together in a contemporary rendezvous novel.
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1. Introduction

“‘Mr. Sherlock Holmes?’ His voice was as deep and devoid of emotion as the bass note of an organ in a cathedral. The detective nodded. ‘I am Count Dracula.’” (Estleman 121).

In Loren D. Estleman’s thrilling novel SHERLOCK HOLMES VS. DRACULA, or the Adventure of the Sanguinary Count from 1978 the paths of everyone’s favourite sleuth and the infamous vampire cross. Parallel to the original story about Dracula and stylistically faithful to Conan Doyle’s structure of Sherlock Holmes novels, bizarre nocturnal events terrorise London and are brought to Mr. Holmes’, and his associate Dr. Watson’s, attention, who immediately start to investigate the case in order to put a stop to the diabolical vampire’s quest for blood in England.

Extensive research has previously been done about the characters, respectively, within their own narratives of origin. In his book, Metamorphoses of the Vampire in Literature and Film, Erik Butler analyses Dracula and vampirism as a reaction to social transformation. The vampire was characterised as a shapeshifting impostor, because he ‘designates not only a literary personality, but also a creeping process of invasion and corruption’ (108). This suggests that the historical context that prevailed in the era when Count Dracula, as well as Sherlock Holmes, were conceived has influenced its literature. The two culturally ingrained characters both embody the societal climate of their time and this can tangibly be sensed when reading the novel. The underlying fear of being overthrown by outsiders in a process coined ‘reverse colonization’ (Arata 623-624) was a prevalent concern at the time of the characters’ origination. This strongly permeates Estleman’s novel and thus affects the characterisation. It might, therefore, additionally imply a symbolism which will be
investigated; the dichotomy of representation where Sherlock is a symbol of imperial Britain and Dracula is a threatening, invading ‘other’. By analysing this proposed symbolism, one could discover covert reasons for bringing these two specific characters together in a mashup novel like Estleman’s.

In Cottom’s article, (Sherlock Holmes meets Dracula), the focus has rather been between the characters’ similar attributes and peculiarities through the concept of bohemian. This analysis of the characteristics presented in their original narratives suggests that through the similarities between Sherlock’s extraordinary abilities of deduction, bordering on the fantastical, and Dracula with his mythological gravitas, ‘. . . the bohemian becomes a superman’ (Cottom 554). The detective himself, however, refutes this by verbally affirming that ‘there’s no magic at 221B. . .’ (Estleman 26). Sherlock’s refutation accentuates the curious nature of the novel since Dracula’s supernatural elements go against what Todorov declares to be allowed in the prescribed confines of the detective genre (‘The Typology of Detective Fiction’, 49) and intertextually alludes back to the characters’ already assigned characteristics as they are defined within their original narratives. Genre will therefore be taken into consideration in this analysis, albeit briefly.

Curiously enough, there is no research on Estleman’s specific ‘rendezvous’ novel where the two often juxtaposed Victorian characters come together. Furthermore, there are discrepancies within the juxtaposition of similarities, for instance by how they seem to represent two very distinctly contrasting aspects on the spectrum of the bohemian. Where Dracula emulates the atavistic bohemian that threatens to destroy Western culture, Sherlock rather embodies the modern bohemian of an artistic soul which strives towards a respectability that symbolises the saviour of culture (Cottom 554). Rather than affirming a resemblance, this instead contradicts the characters’ inherent nature and suggests a
dichotomy as the characters present opposing binaries. This then raises the question as to why these two incompatible premises were united into one narrative if not for the affinity between the literary personalities which might have suggested them worthy opponents of equal competence and intelligence.

Since no narratological character study has been applied to this novel, this essay will explore the relationship between Sherlock and Dracula in a narrative from which neither derive. A focus on their narratological functions will allow for a detailed analysis of their representative natures. The aspiration will be to find whether there are elements to the literary figures that symbolise or represent previously elusive latent connections between the two, which causes the two narratives to naturally (or supernaturally) gravitate towards one another. For as Cixous phrases it, ‘the myth of “character” collaborates insofar as it is a sign, a cog in the literary machinery’ which ‘goes back to pure representationalism’ (384). This basically states that characters which adhere to a set of types, codes and cultural demands enable a reappropriating of meaning, expanding their literal depiction into their functions as social signs (384), or symbols.

Building on this understanding, Sherlock, too, acknowledges the possibility of finding dormant connotations by performing deeper analyses of characters in a narrative after predicting Watson’s thought processes based merely on the direction of a glance:

No man is a fixture, Watson. He may think he is, and yet by careful observation of his unconscious gestures, of his expression, and of the direction in which his eyes wander, a close reasoner would find rare instances in which he could not divine the mental processes of a man deep in thought (Estleman 27)

The techniques of deduction performed by Holmes resemble how this essay’s character study will be carried out. Through the attentive observation of gestures and expressions, the
characters Sherlock and Dracula can be appraised, and based on evidence extracted by employing narratological tools to the literary work deductions can be made.

The application of description and focalization will allow for an intricate way of deciphering how the characters are portrayed. This will be achieved, not only by interpreting information presented by the internally focalized perspective of the narrator, but further through externally observing interactions between characters, along with their own independent actions and descriptions throughout the entire narrative.

This essay argues that a narratological character study will reveal the dichotomy of opposing natures between the two adversaries where Sherlock would be a symbolic representation of imperial Britain and Dracula as an invading ‘other’. Looking at this hypothesis with the additional incorporation of subtextual and post-colonial notions could unveil a contextual reason of imperial influence for bringing these two particular characters together in a mashup narrative that is a powerbattle between the logical and the fantastic.

2. Theorising Character

2.1 Character

A character study is based on the application of a collection of narratological tools and concepts. But before one analyses the complex construction that is character, one needs to consider the importance of these entities in a text and what a detailed analysis of character might reveal. Hélène Cixous establishes that ““character” occupies a privileged position in the novel or the play: without "character," passive or active, no text.’ (386). A text therefore depends on the existence of characters since these literary figures function as the major agents which move a story along. One of the qualities denoted to characters which creates
this participatory urgency is in narratological terms called *agency* (Abbott 124). Agency shows the inseparable relationship a character has to action in narratives and this is what actively makes a text progress.

Cixous further mentions that characters possess a depth which contains hidden yet discoverable truths and, by definition, a character ‘preconceived or created by an author, is to be *figured out*, understood, read: he is presented, offered up to interpretation . . .’ (385). This encouragement to interpret characters’ deeper significance promotes the investigation of their symbolic natures. Characters mutually influence and are influenced by their texts, and not only do they actively move their narratives along, but further add depth by their symbolism. Their symbolic nature colours the narratives with covert nuances, which in return adds to how the symbolic function is interpreted and reinterpreted. Investigating this intrinsic relationship between characters could therefore offer new profound interpretations of the texts as well.

The techniques and narratological tools which will assist the deciphering of the traits that essentially constitute a character in the primary source of this essay and its functions within the narrative are those of focalization, description and subtext. Based on the structure of the primary source, these specific concepts’ are best suited for this character study as they will direct the focus of the analysis onto the key aspects of character where the characters of interest are not presented without prevarication. Moreover, these concepts are interlinked and provide an approach which envelops the character in a close examination, working its way from external representation and symbolism through internal observations to interpretations which are textually omitted.
2.2 Focalization

Focalization is a term coined by Gerard Genette and is connected to the concept of narratological perspective. Narrative perspective is defined by Genette as the ‘mode of regulating information, arising from the choice (or not) or a restrictive point of view’ (185-186). He specifies the concept of focalization to be the focus of narrative which is a more abstract term to the equivalence of ‘point-of-view’ (189). Mieke Bal, too, defines focalization as ‘... the relationship between the 'vision,' the agent that sees, and that which is seen’ (146). Moreover, where she makes the distinction between character-bound focalization and external focalization (146, 148), Genette alternatively divides the concept into three different subsets defined as zero focalization (or a non-focalized narrative), internal focalization and external focalization (189-190).

With external focalization the reader is restricted from anything which takes place internally within a character. There is no access to thoughts, feelings or reasonings. One is, as the term suggests, only presented with an external representation, or onlooking observation, of the elements that are being focalized whereas internal focalization provides the opposite.

Essentially, internal focalization is characterised to grant the reader access to the inner machinations such as emotions, thought processes and reactions of a character. Genette establishes the distinction that this subset within focalization, too, can be divided into additional three categories of either a fixed, variable or multiple focal point (189-190). In regards to the nature of the primary source that will be analysed in the subsequent analysis section, the category of internal focalization which will be of importance is the fixed focalizer. The fixed perspective is restricted to one character. The limited point of view
never leaves this character and the vision is presented to the reader in a manner as direct as possible, consequently the reader will ‘... in principle, be inclined to accept the vision presented by that character’ (Bal 146). Genette acknowledges the limitations of the internal approach by recognising that it is rarely applied rigorously in its absolute sense. The concept would only actually be realised in interior monologue where the ‘... character is limited absolutely to - and strictly inferred from - his focal position alone’ (193). This strict mode of narrative would therefore imply that the central character would never be subjected to any outside appraisal or referred to exterior description or attributions which is why the concept more often is applied less vigorously where instances of external focalization complements the internal notion.

The usefulness of focalization is also observed by Abbott, who emphasises that the concept serves a more adequate and encompassing purpose than mere ‘point-of-view’. As a more concentrated form it allows the reader to perceive and absorb miniscule details as presented through the eyes of the focalizer (67). The extent of this perceptiveness is however also dependent on the narrator, which is why, in correlation to focalization, one can not let the identity of the narrator go without notice for it is not solely the viewpoint but also the teller that provides perspective.

The narrator is the function who delivers the plot. Notably, since the narrator is not necessarily a part of the story, focalization is a distinctively different concept. By considering Mieke Bal’s definition of a character-bound focalizer, that is when the narrator coincides with a participating agent in the plot (152), one accordingly accepts that the perspective which the focalized narrator presents is to an extent tainted by biased personal experiences and prejudices. The aspect of focalization thus inherits a manipulative quality, seeing as the reader is only presented with the plot and the incorporated elements such as
other characters through the opinionated eyes of a biased party (157). As Abbott discusses, the choice by authors to assign the responsibility of advancing the narrative to an untrustworthy agent has certain advantages to the text even though it requires adamant interpretation by the reader insomuch as it provides textual obscurity (69). This opens up the possibility, and even invites, the reader to interpret the obscurity and critically analyse the reliability of what the text appears to explicitly present. These aspects of focalization are thus highly applicable to the subsequent analysis, insofar as Watson embodies the narratological concept of internal focalizer and a participating actor in the narrative.

An aspect that Abbott and Genette fail to acknowledge is that of a focalized object, which Mieke Bal introduces in her book. She recognises the need of a distinction here ‘because the definition of focalization refers to a relationship, each pole of that relationship, the subject and the object of focalization, must be studied separately’ (146). Bal’s specification of a focalized object is an approach that excavates a more elaborate distinction which will allow a closer examination of the characters in the analysis. Indeed, a focalized object need not necessarily be an object but can also be characters or events and will thus be applicable to how Watson perceives and puts considerable emphasis on the respective external focalization of Dracula and Sherlock as objects of interest. This will help decipher the meaning of how the characters are presented through description.

2.3 Description

Mieke Bal defines description to be a privileged site of focalization where featured textual fragments ascribe attributes to objects ‘... and as such it has great impact on the ideological and aesthetic effect of the text’ (36). As mentioned above, objects in this context do not refer to merely inanimate entities but can also be classified as characters, events and even
landscapes or settings. The aspect of description, as a closely related branch of focalization, is therefore prevalent throughout the narrative and consists of three different forms of narrative agency. Description can be applied through looking, speaking and acting (38). The most prevalent, effective and frequent aspect of description is the representation provided through looking. It is a reproduction of what a character sees and the appraising of observed objects. Important factors to this approach are time and exterior elements. The thorough observing of a character to provide with descriptive details requires time and the act of description is incorporated into the narrative’s progression of time. Additionally, the agency of looking is further dependent on the exterior factors that affect the act of description. These exterior factors can be such a thing as sufficient light which enables the observer to distinguish the elements presented (37). Hence the reader is not only reliant on the narrator to provide apt description of presented objects, but the narrator, or rather focalizer, too, is dependent on the narratological components in the text which implement his ability to perform a descriptive observation.

Another distinguished agency of description is that of action. This is simply when ‘an actor carries out an action’ (38). As simple as the definition may come across, a lot of information is disclosed in an action and can produce profound understanding of character. When the focalizer interacts with an object by dynamically performing an action, it generates in itself situations which are susceptible to description. The description of action is thus intricately related to characterisation as it is through action that one reveals who they are. Abbott further suggests that it is harder to talk about character than it is to talk about action because an action offers more up for interpretation compared to the passive image that a character can present. The limitations of Watson’s internal focalization do not allow to ‘see inside character’ (126) of the focalized objects Sherlock and Dracula that are
presented externally. One must instead resort to denoting qualities to the characters based on
the description of action provided, which, therefore, becomes an important approach while
examining the primary text.

In contrast to the two narratological agencies of looking and acting, which only require
the central agent, the act of speaking requires a second agent, that of a listener (Bal 38). It is
an exchange of valuable information between the speaker and the receiving party. The oral
interaction between the focalizer and other actors in the narrative thus discloses information
which might have been inaccessible when one does not have access to characters’ thought
processes and opinions.

The interplay of these different narrative agencies of description will be central aspects
in the subsequent analysis since the primary source is narrated from Watson’s perspective
alone. Everything is focalized through him and the descriptions are the only source of
information available about the characters. Thus, all information which will be acquired
about Dracula and Sherlock is filtered through Watson’s perceptions. So whereas certain
elements in the novel might appear to be presented objectively, it could be ‘in fact, a form of
subjectivity in disguise’ (Bal 37).

Due to the dependency of what is considered Watson’s limited accounts of the events in
the novel, the information provided by description could supplementarily be analysed
through the lens of subtext. This approach might shed additional light on certain instances
where possible implied intentions are lost or hidden behind Watson’s explicit narrations in
the text.
2.4 Subtext

To analyse a novel which offers a chiefly subjective perspective, it would be prudent in turn to apply a study that addresses texts’ subjectivity. In his book *The Art of Subtext*, Charles Baxter introduces an aspect of writing which is neglected or often assumed in literary analyses, which is subtext. Similar to description, subtext focuses on the impact of each action, speech act and facial expression produced and acted out by each character or active agent and considers the effect it bestows upon a scene. It puts meticulous attention to the hyperdetailing of gestures, speech, characterisation as well as dramatic and fictional staging. These notions, for instance the detailed attention to gestures, might add unnoticed emphasis and inclination as to what is featured more directly. For Baxter states that the secreted and suppressed is found in the staged details. He goes on to define staging in fiction as the strategic positioning of characters and the focus on what their ‘particular gestures and facial expressions might be at the moments of dramatic emphasis, exactly how their words are said. . . Staging, you might argue, is the poetry of action and setting when it evokes the otherwise unstated’ (13-14), which allows for unvoiced nuances to be revealed.

Regarding this definition, the narratological techniques in creating subtext are used from an attentively observing perspective and cover, to an extent, psychological aspects. It does, however, remain within the narratological realm as it investigates the literary representation of characters’ attributes in narrative rather than their projected motives. This consequently procures a natural response to the identifying of hidden subtext based on the descriptions of literary creations.

The application of subtext to the analysis similarly works in the spirit of the detective himself, who often expresses something along the lines of how ‘you can see clearly and
distinctly what you see, but you simply can’t be sure what you’re looking at’ (Baxter 110). This is particularly the case in a novel such as SHERLOCK HOLMES VS DRACULA where one is presented with a limited point of view. The intended or hidden meaning might still be lost in subtext considering how the narrative is a recollection of memories rather than a story experienced simultaneously as the events unravel. It will therefore be equally important to consider the subtextual meaning to the descriptions in the narrative and not just rely on the explicit representation.

2.5 Literary Context

In order to appropriately interpret the elements which will be disclosed and analysed in the primary text by applying the narratological theoretical framework, one should additionally consider the historical and societal context in which the characters were conceived. However, the actual historical context of the late nineteenth century is less relevant than the literary representation of that history. John Scaggs raises Foucault’s and Derrida’s notion that ‘rejects a representational or mimetic “reconstruction” of history’ (Scaggs 123), which demonstrates that a supposedly objective and verbatim reproduction of history in textuality is an impossible feat. The influence of a novel’s historical period therefore inevitably permeates the narrative, but it is the textual adaptation of historical accounts that dominates literary texts. Thus, when analysing Estleman’s novel the focus must be on the subjective reconstructed textual history as recounted by the narrator, Dr. Watson, since ‘no ‘telling’ or ‘repetition’ of history is pure fact, free of individual perception, interpretation, or selection’ . . . [t]hat the historical record is itself a discursive entity made up of signs means that it offers a re-presented, thoroughly selective account of what actually happened (Scaggs 123)
The context then, from which both Dracula and Sherlock Holmes derive ‘. . . includes the decline of Britain as a world power at the close of the nineteenth century; or rather, the way the perception of that decline was articulated by contemporary writers’ (Arata 622). Britain, then, as a world empire which feared the threat of imminent invasion, corruption and decline thus allowed literature of the time to absorb the features of anxiety and xenophobia felt throughout society. The imperialistic literature elicited during this historical context implemented a reciprocatory reaction. The implication of a crumbling empire in turn provoked an increased producing of literary texts imprinted with heroic themes such as conquering, taming and the besting of any presented threat (McLaughlin 3). This evocation of literary heroic counter reactions to the societal threats constitutes fundamental elements of the textual representation of Holmes’ London, insofar as the city is presented to associate violence with foreign conspirators (49).

Another important concept that induced societal anxiety and spurred the ‘hero’ narratives is Arata’s notion of ‘reverse colonization’. Arata defines this as the fear that countries subjected to colonisation would reverse the phenomenon and, by the same imperial practices used by Britain, colonise the superpowers (623). Moreover, this threatening paradox where the invading other would mirror colonisation led to the emergence of ‘invasion scare’ novels in the 1880s and 1890s (623), which displayed the national fears of being overthrown by outsiders (624) as well as the themes of heroism that challenged these perceived threats.

That the national anxiety which riddled society at the time had such evident influence on literature that it even provoked the emergence of new literary themes and genres highlights the important relationship of intertextuality and genre in the primary source. The intertextual nature of the novel is pivotal to the character study because it draws on preconceived notions
and previously assigned characteristics when recreating Sherlock and Dracula, which
interconnects how the characters can be interpreted when put into historical context and what
they might come to symbolise. Characters tend to be defined within their narratives and,
thus, automatically, through the confines of their genres. The importance of genre in this
intertextual novel presents to what extent the characters conform and deviate, not only from
the previously assigned traits, but also from their respective genres. From what components
and rules Todorov distinguishes in his article ‘The Typology of Detective Fiction’, the
detective genre is to rely heavily on rationality and the fantastic is not at all admitted (230).
When analysing the characters based on preconceived characteristics along with the
narratological representation in the primary source and putting it into historical context the
dynamic nature of the characters is allowed to surface. Because not only is there a
supernatural invasion on the genre, there is also the indication of a symbolic invasion of
empire. Thus what is additionally established about the characters from the close reading and
focus on focalisation must further be put into the literary context of the historical
representation to establish if, or how, they function as symbols of imperial constructions of
political unease and reflect the fermented societal atmosphere. This complements the
narratological approach of the analysis as it aims to investigate the historical influence
through a literary reconstruction of history (Scaggs 123) and how it intertextually remains
prevalent in the narrative of the primary source, which was written in 1978, a cold war
period piece.

Advancing onto the analysis section, this essay will employ techniques similar to the
detective’s own. Taking into account the literary reconstructions of historical and societalcontexts as well as the narratological framework and subtextual interpretation, the analysis
will be an ‘accumulation and cataloguing of data, and rational and logical analysis based on this scientific foundation’ (40).

3. Sherlock VS Dracula

3.1 Sherlock Holmes

The Sherlock Holmes that the reader is presented with is constructed from the internal focalization of the fixed focalizer that is Dr. John Watson. As Bal mentions about internally focalized perspectives, ‘the reader is only presented with the plot and the incorporated elements such as other characters through the opinionated eyes of a biased party’ (157), which tends to lead to a certain unreliability of the information that is conveyed. However, in the preface Watson himself assures the reader that ‘[t]he account which follows is the correct one. I have double-checked the copious notes which I took at the time of the events I describe and am reasonably certain of their accuracy’ (Estleman 21), and one should therefore treat the material featured in the novel to contain a certain amount of accuracy, despite the subjectivity that accompanies a first-person narrator.

Sherlock’s narratological function becomes that of focalized object (Bal 149), which offers an external focus from the perspective of the narrator, thus he undergoes careful observation under the eyes of Watson. The external references of description and analysis of the detective’s characteristic traits that are recounted through the narrative will therefore be the exclusive source of information about what constitutes Sherlock as a character. This can be supported by what Baxter mentions about ‘reading faces, expressions, gestures, in the hope of discovering both character and social subtexts. . . The face is where you start. Sometimes that is where you stay’ (148). Additionally Cixous highlights that a:
character represents a set of externals. He has referents (real causes that are anterior and exterior to the text: he could be the portrait of a real person) to which he alludes, while he fixes his essential traits so as to preserve them in the book (385).

This stresses the reliance on the external traits as well as referential traits that help constitute the character in its novel. This notion is a prevalent concept in the construction of Sherlock since he is based on the already existing fictional character who is now being recreated. As mentioned in the preceding theory section, the accumulation of information from such different theoretical approaches should help deciphering the key aspects presented in the novel that are presented through internal and external observations as well as explicit and covert symbolism, in tandem with the already existing understanding of the character.

Preconceived notions about the culturally ingrained fictional character as an eccentric man of logic, science and order permeates the narrative and is reiterated not only by Watson, but also by other characters’ awareness of the detective. On multiple occasions he is recognised both nationally and internationally. Van Helsing, when encountering Sherlock, acknowledges that ‘I have heard of you’ (Estleman 88), and admits, after witnessing the sleuth’s famous logical prowess, that his ‘. . . reputation is well deserved’ (91). The devilish vampire, too, confesses how ‘[e]ven in the country of my birth we have been fortunate enough to read of your marvellous exploits. . . ’ (122 -123). This notoriety of Sherlock continuously imprints itself due to the rigorous recurrence and the adamant application of his so well recognised practices and methods, because Holmes is a man who lives for action (Estleman 50) and his cases.

Although quite generally perceived as a cold or dispassionate man, when Sherlock is on a case he inherits the countenance of a hunter. When presented with a mystery his ‘cheeks retained the flush which I knew to be a sign of his intense interest in the affair of the
moment’ (38). He is repeatedly described to possess characteristics of a hunter, both in features and in demeanor. Watson’ observations, as a first person narrator with internal focalization, are restricted to appraise the focalized object externally. His gaze therefore focuses on the physical attributes of Sherlock’s corporeal figure such as his stance, body language and facial expressions, and Watson has to rely on these externals in order to interpret Holmes’ character and his motives. As Baxter emphasises in his book, ‘the pure soul will show itself in the face and in one’s actions’ (149), so in order to figure out who Sherlock is as a character on a deeper level the external focus can apprehend features that might have been lost from a differently focalized perspective. Thus Sherlock can be understood to reveal his true self as a creature of pursuit by how, upon being presented with an intriguing case, ‘his complexion darkened, his brows drew together, his lips grew tight. His nostrils appeared to dilate exactly as does a dog’s when it is on a scent’ (Estleman 35).

It is further emphasised how Sherlock’s true self emerges in a passage when they are out on a vigil. Watson again observes and contemplates his friend’s mannerisms:

Head erect, torso tilted forward, muscles coiled as if to spring, he reminded me of a crouching lion waiting patiently for his prey to show itself. It was an apt comparison, for what was Sherlock Holmes if not a hunting creature? (69)

This passage where Watson uses description, mainly through looking, one can sense his close scrutiny to have an evaluating quality. Watson as an outside observer might be more aware of this characterisation than Sherlock himself and, regardless of the limitations to objectivity due to him being an internally focalized narrator, he provides a more objective perspective than had the narrative been internally focalized through Sherlock. This outside perspective gives a more perceptive analysis of character and characteristics, which might have been lost had the focalizer rather been Sherlock, who might have focused more on the
nature of the crime rather than the nature of the active participants in the case. Instead, from Watson’s contemplative observations, Sherlock displays a nature of hunting, or pursuit, and demonstrates his predominant characteristic of being a man of action. The detective’s own assertive comment that ‘nothing exhausts me, except inactivity’ (74) puts further emphasis on the man’s disposition for action. One of his main traits, therefore, is that of agency itself, but his actions further contain embedded traits of who Sherlock is as a character.

Sherlock’s actions, behaviour and methods, which are considered eccentric with the detective often flinging himself onto his stomach, peering through his magnifying glass and usually being met with puzzled reactions (Estleman 50), are nonetheless rationally based on scientific evidence. His actions thus provide the reader with the insight of the close connotations Sherlock has to his characteristics of a logic and scientific being. He is the advocate of the detective fiction genre considering his resolutely applied methods where ‘everything must be explained rationally; the fantastic is not admitted’ (Todorov, ‘The Typology of Detective Fiction’, 49). This representation of the rationality and realist tradition which governs the genre of detective fiction (Scaggs 51) is the fundamental essence of the detective’s beliefs and his doctrine of crime solving. Regardless of the intertextual nature of the novel and the invading gothic narrative that introduces deviating and prohibited themes to the detective genre, Sherlock maintains and conducts his rational investigations. He acknowledges the presence of the supernatural, yet admits that ‘reaching this conclusion has not been an easy process’ (Estleman 74). In order to reach that insight he struggled to maintain his principles and practices in search of a logical answer where none was to be found. He has ‘… eliminated the impossible time and time again, and always the same improbability remains’ (74); the improbability that Dracula has managed to infiltrate his world that rejects the supernatural. Despite this horrid realisation of intrusion on the natural
world order, Sherlock continuously relies on logic, scientific evidence and rational explanations to solve the mystery.

Action, to reiterate, produces instances that are susceptible to description and can reveal profound information which might have to be deciphered subtextually. Yet even ‘[w]hen a subtext breaks out into action, a cauld of invisibility may still surround it’ (Baxter 84). This analysis therefore requires greater focus on several instances rather than just attentive focus to a singular activity. A very common pattern of Sherlock’s is his negligent approach to the law when solving crimes. Sherlock is a man of the law, in a sense, but on his own terms. He diligently works on solving crimes, although his habit of following his own moral compass entails him to disregard legal means of acquiring information to reach conclusive ends. Through this process of working for society by neglecting society’s rules throughout the novel, he more or less creates his own legal system. Watson provides the reader with support for this assumption by noting his companion’s love for cases ‘on both sides of the law’ (Estleman 35). The justification for his nonchalant behaviour and superior mentality can be perceived to derive from his tendency of collecting information on British affairs and concerns and imparts this ‘. . . information into one of those commonplace books upon which many criminals would dearly love to lay their hands’ (26). Therefore, ‘Holmes shows no compunction about making extralegal judgments, deliberately foiling the official course of justice, when he considers himself better qualified in the matter than the police or courts might be’ (Cottom 558), seeing as he regards himself to be more well informed and integrated with society than any authority or legal head such as Scotland Yard:

‘My advice to you, Inspector, is to abandon any preconceptions you may have. . . in this case. We stalk a far more dangerous foe’. . . ‘And my advice to you, Mr. Sherlock Holmes, is to keep your advice to yourself. The Yard is quite capable of apprehending its criminals without your help’. . . Holmes was chuckling when we
stepped from that place of death into the scarcely more cheerful atmosphere of the East End street. ‘Lestrade never ceases to astound me. . . .There seems to be no limit to his ignorance.’ (Estleman 138)

By undermining the legal system and repeatedly pursuing his own means of acquiring justice, Sherlock, in a way, can be seen to somewhat subtextually come to symbolise the highest power of the law, although it is never expressed explicitly in so many words. This interpretation can be shaped through Sherlock’s active tendencies to obtain information about the nation’s affairs, both political, social and legal matters, and more notably through how he utilises that information in his practices even without being approached or involved by the authorities.

Although his superiority is something Sherlock himself overtly expresses in discourse, the fact that he comes to symbolise the highest legal power is more subtextually indicated when people involve Holmes rather than actual authorities with their legal queries, and doing so without alerting or clearing the cases with establishments like Scotland Yard. It is additionally evident when even Scotland Yard itself often turns to Sherlock when they have exhausted their skills to proceed in a case. Furthermore, through his aptitude to disguise himself in order to gather elusive information Sherlock assimilates and embodies society, as he disguises himself as people from many different social classes. He thus comes to represent a figure of high authority possessing superior access to information of England’s affairs, exceeding even the political heads of the country, and as such ‘Holmes is the only subject who can be supposed to know. No one else can enter into, communicate with, and comprehend all parts of society as can he’ (Cottom 559). Holmes thus encompasses several different aspects of the nation on a personal and impactful level. He personifies and advocates the people, the political and legal system, and McLaughlin states that through such
intrinsic embodiment Sherlock’s own body becomes charged with similar anxieties as
'Britain’s political body’ (55). Consequently, as he encapsulates the entire population of
England and asserts himself as the highest authority of the nation, involved with its political
affairs, he can be assumed to symbolise and epitomise England itself.

3.2 Count Dracula

‘Who is Count Dracula. . . As well may you ask me who is Lucifer, for the two have much
in common’ (Estleman 98). The idea and myth of Dracula as a literary character is deeply
ingrained in culture, and based on Todorov’s notions of the Fantastic - the encounter of
something supernatural in a world that only knows the law of nature (‘The Fantastic’, 25) -
the sanguinary demon represents an ‘otherworldly terror’ (Cottom 537). Despite his elusive
participation in both his narrative of origin and the rendezvous novel SHERLOCK HOLMES
VS. DRACULA he is easily characterised with these prominent portrayals; this is because
Dracula ‘. . . designates not only a literary personality, but also a creeping process of
invasion and corruption’ (Butler 108). This elusiveness, where Sherlock only actually
physically encounters the vampire three times, causes the focalization to focus more on the
idea of the character and the creeping sensations rather than relying on physical description
provided by Watson to determine the antagonist’s characteristics. Watson’s description of
Dracula as a focalized object therefore revolves more on an indirect, yet tangible, presence
which is manifested and lingering throughout the narrative. This leaves a lot of
interpretation of the character to the subtextual realm as it focuses on ‘a collection of
instances, of luminous specific detail that take us in the direction of the unsaid and unseen’
(Baxter 36).
Before the Count is introduced in the novel and his involvement in the terrors of London is established, traces and clues about the villain’s movements become detectable, which leads Sherlock and Watson to conjure preliminary deductions about his nature. By appraising the case they are convinced that it is ‘a beastly business’ (Estleman 64) and based on the details they have received about the disposition of the crime and its culprit Watson realises that ‘if what you say is true, then we are dealing with a brute!’ (54), which Holmes affirms: ‘Precisely’ (54) before his voice drops low ‘to a curious guttural, quite unlike the strident tenor to which I was accustomed’ (54). The intonation and gravity of this affirmative exclamation suggest that Sherlock emphasises the probability that the culprit is literally an animal-like brute, beyond what can be considered human. He is not simply affirming that the case is unusually gruesome considering that, subtextually, ‘the tone with which the wording is conveyed . . . signals belief and urgency’ and ‘offers a glimpse of what is usually unseen’ (Baxter 93), therefore offering an interpretation beyond the obvious.

What is further interesting here is how the mere presence of Dracula and his supernatural nature in his narrative seems to permeate Sherlock’s characterisation. The threat of something otherworldly affects the detective’s reason of logic, not only making him accept the existence of something so logically deviant in his world, but the guttural elocution to his affirmation indicates that he in some ways have assimilated some of the vampire’s beastly characteristics.

An additional instant where the intonation of the discourse suggests implicit theorising is when Sherlock confirms the miscreant to be ‘a man of tremendous strength. . . more than tremendous’ (Estleman 67), thus emphasising the speculation on whether the strength might even be beyond human capacity.
When finally facing Count Dracula, their speculations of the villain’s horrid nature are confirmed. The descriptions that follow upon the encounter consolidate their conjectured preconceptions about his deviation from the normal. Portrayed with animalistic traits and attributes, crawling on castle walls, ‘his cloak spreading behind him like the wings of a monstrous bat’ (110-111), ‘And what eyes! More those of a beast than a man’ (127), he opposes Sherlock’s nature and turns into the hunter’s prey. This notion is further supported by apprehensive actions as they pursue the antagonist, considering the dangerous ‘capabilities of a cornered beast’ (139) and as such, the brute Count Dracula, when ‘cornered was a thing to be feared’ (142). Not only is he portrayed to resemble animals through demeanor, he additionally reveals his fantastic characteristics by his power of shapeshifting where he can ‘assume also the outward appearance of bat, moth, rat, owl-aye, even dust motes and vapour - whatever prowls at night’ (101). Thus he unveils an ‘otherness’, taken this strong deviation from the normal, natural and realism otherwise dominating the narrative. This tendency to assume forms of disguise does in a way parallel and mimic Holmes’ own disguise. However, where Holmes’ assumed personas encase and integrate him with society’s different levels, Dracula’s further distinguish him as a supernatural ‘other’, transgressing the boundaries of what is physically possible. Moreover, the Count’s beastly attributes are not limited to his physical body, but is additionally described to have a beastly effect on his surroundings that traverses into his fantastic nature. Akin to Bal’s notion that a focalized object need not be an actual object or even a character (150), the focalization instead aims a lot of attention at the vampire’s characteristics displayed in his physical absence. The character’s nature has a tangible effect on the very atmosphere, which conveys and amalgamates his embodiment of something ‘other’ further. Despite his absence, the vampire’s lingering presence elicits unnatural influences, such as ‘a
physical sensation of cold, as if all windows were suddenly flung open and the fire doused with water’ (Estleman 126), which displays his menacing nature as something breaching the natural and infuses a sense of horror. Furthermore, Dracula not only leaves a pressured trace on the atmosphere, he affects the air around him so deeply that it even leaves a detectably vile smell in the air:

Immediately my nostrils were assailed by an odour so foul that my first impulse was to hold my breath against it. It was not the stale smell one expected of a building that had been closed up a long time, but was rather the all-pervading stench of evil (116)

This very distinctive description highlights the threatening effect of Dracula, because even the smell is a stench of malevolence, emphasising the ominous nature of his presence in England. Moreover, the vampire’s supernatural abilities further extend beyond merely creating a looming eeriness on the atmosphere, he can actually control that which is assumed naturally impossible. ‘We can hardly expect human interference in something as natural as the direction of the wind’ (Estleman 42), yet interference with the natural elements is exactly what Dracula performs. ‘He can. . . command the fog, the wind and the storm’ (101), however, it is indeed not human interferences, but rather the influences of a supernatural being, transcending the laws of nature and, consequently, the realism of the novel’s genre.

Thus, in this novel, in accordance to Cottom’s analysis of Dracula, the vampire’s supernatural ‘otherness becomes a violation of the very concept of law’ (542). His very existence becomes a crime, not only to the narrative’s genre due to the prohibition of supernatural elements in detective fiction, but also as the presence that opposes Sherlock as the advocate for rationality and representative of authority superior to even the legal system of Britain. The vampire’s very being and his presence in the narrative thus represents an invading ‘other’ who is trespassing not only in the genre, but also in England. And, as
discussed in the previous section, Sherlock encapsulates several aspects of the nation and Dracula’s infiltration of England can therefore be interpreted to symbolise a personal invasion on Sherlock as a symbol of the country itself, which could explain the incited response from Sherlock to personally deal with this foe.

3.3 Imperial Collision

Early on in the novel, Sherlock is presented with a case that he initially regards with disinterest. The statement of a foreign involvement, however, peaks his interest considerably and he engrosses himself in the matter with tangible intensity: ‘Foreign you say?’ (Estleman 32). This significant enthusiasm, or rather urgency, to solve a case with foreign perpetrators can be understood to have historical connotation from the imperial context in which the character came into existence. In order to understand how it has influenced the text and characterisation ‘history must be read through the discourse within which historical texts are produced, and secondly, it must be read within the particular social, historical, and political context of its production’ (Scaggs 124). Although no textual re-telling of history can be perceived as objective fact or a completely accurate representation (123), the precarious societal disposition from the historical period when the characters were created prevails in the characterisation and their literary symbolic functions. Consequently, the threat of foreign conspirators, which was considered ‘a fundamental fact in Holmes’ London’ (McLaughlin 49), predominates even this contemporary narrative and, therefore, naturally incites the attentive and protective actions from Holmes towards the outside threat. This works in accordance to what was discussed in the theoretical framework, section 3.5, which showed that the political climate incited literature of heroism where the perceived threat is
confronted and challenged. And this influence is further supported through the interpretation of Sherlock as a character in the preceding section of this analysis, where his actions and characterisation display him as a protector of homeland and embodiment of the nation, thus he reacts protectively to an outside threat.

The power struggle between the vampire, the invading presence of corruption, and Sherlock, as the embodiment of Britain and ‘the protector of homeland’ (30), starts as Dracula endeavors to infiltrate London. The foreign schooner ferrying the otherworldly terror that is Dracula into London harbour also carried ‘[f]ifty wooden boxes. . . containing nothing but plain earth’ (Estleman 37). These boxes, containing soil from the foreign land, can be seen quite literally to represent the invading country. Holmes and Watson find, when they investigate the vampire’s lair, Carfax Castle, ‘. . . only twenty-nine boxes’ (118). The rest has been distributed elsewhere in London or Britain and symbolise the threatening expansion and spread of the invasion. The representative nature of the earth brought from Dracula’s homeland conveys the nature of his invasion of England; not so much as a vampire in quest for fresh blood, but as a personification of his land infiltrating and claiming another in order to expand his own empire.

The urgency of this threat is elevated by its nature, which can be described by Arata’s notion reverse colonization (623). Late nineteenth-century London had an increasing ‘awareness of the colonies as an invasive source of new and even more menacing dangers’ (McLaughlin 29), which incited the fear that the colonised would revert the situations by colonising the colonisers (Arata 623-624), which would instigate other foreign countries to target the super powers.

The quality of fearing the invading ‘other’ is further reinforced in this novel by Butler’s notion that vampires possess the uncanny ability to ‘. . . penetrate private spheres’(118). On
a macro-level Dracula succeeds in this endeavour as he, symbolised by the boxes of earth, crosses the country’s border and infiltrates the land. It is also exhibited on a micro-level in a chapter where Dracula ‘invade[s] the sanctity of our Baker Street digs’ (Estleman 121), breaking into a private sphere as he crosses the threshold and steps into and confronts, what can be seen to symbolise, the heart of England. As the fiend enters flat 221B, the struggle of asserting and exuding power becomes unmistakable in a close confrontation. Watson promptly retreats into a corner of the flat and assumes his focalizing role as the avid observer of the confrontation, dwelling on details and offering description of both characters’ physicalities and body language. The focused attention on the two characters’ positions additionally provides important information to the interpretation of the encounter. ‘Staging in fiction involves putting characters in specific strategic positions in the scene so that some unvoiced nuance is revealed’ (Baxter 13) and considering how the characters place themselves and move about thus offers evidence of covert imperial connotations that are not displayed verbally. While Holmes assures Watson that Dracula’s visit was prompted merely to ‘observe his enemy in his natural habitat’ (Estleman 127), and the opportunity to appraise his adversary without ulterior motives or intentions to gain any specific information, his actions and demeanor suggest otherwise. The Count advances slowly and noiselessly into the room, approaching Sherlock: ‘I noticed that he towered over my friend’ (123). This ominous stance and the refusal to take a seat when requested suggests how Dracula tries to emulate and establish a position of power by physically remaining at a higher position. He effectively and subtextually exhibits the power he possesses as an invading threat.

Another factor which further reinforces how Dracula represents the embodiment of an invading ‘other’ as a threat to the nation rather than a vampire with self-indulgent motives
for claiming land in Britain is the unveiling of him to possess myriads of forces that will aid him in his conquest. ‘It would appear that Dracula still commands armies’ (119) and he ascertains the intentions of his armies by warning Holmes that ‘. . . those forces are gathering, responding to my unspoken instructions with but one purpose in mind: to destroy all obstacles which stand in my path’ (125).

Throughout the seemingly innocuous confrontation which contains a concealed threat subtextually embedded, invisible through their verbal exchanges, Sherlock remains aloof and unconcerned, lounging languidly in his armchair and indulging in a cigarette. His relaxed demeanour can be implied to display an inherent sense of superiority, the reassurance of Britain’s position as a superpower, which leaves him impervious and unfazed by the evil presence and his subtextual threats. It could also be assumed to derive from the sense of entitlement which is a prominent quality in the concept of bohemian - a concept, mentioned in previous sections, that Daniel Cottom examines more closely in his article “Sherlock meets Dracula” (538). It is this deeply ingrained sense of entitlement that ‘becomes a claim to empire that potentially extends over all the world; in an inversion of the course of European imperialism’ (539) and leads them both to pursue their undertakings of what they believe to favour their respective empires. Whereas Cottom contrasts the two characters to be similar in their representation of the concept, there are discrepancies that suggest they rather represent two very different aspects of what actually constitutes the concept. As mentioned briefly in the introduction, Dracula is the atavistic presentation of the concept; he characterises its prehistoric existence before it reached a modernising twist, and Sherlock rather embodies the modern interpretation of an artistic soul of respectability that further strives to protect society and culture that is threatened to be destroyed by Dracula’s emulation of the bohemian (554).
In spite of the discrepant embodiment of the concept, the bohemian sense of entitlement, however, is a quality they do have in common and leads to their inherent conviction that they are entitled to imperial expansion. Dracula, in tandem with Auerbach’s notion that the vampire ‘is cosmic and ungovernable. . .’ and ‘. . . rules the world’(102), becomes a threat to the western culture and the imperial superpower England in his quest to expand his own empire. Sherlock, by contrast, works hard to salvage this culture and country (Cottom 554), based on his justified right to protect the status of his empire as a superpower. Thus the two distinctly different characters work toward a similar imperial goal based on different motives.

Sherlock’s involvement and protective action against Dracula’s impending intrusion is further noted through the introduction of the character Van Helsing. It becomes evident that the features of fear and xenophobia that riddled society at the time of the characters’ original creation has influenced the literature (Arata 622) and has been absorbed and permeated in the narrative of this contemporary rendezvous text. In the chapter ‘The Tale of The Count From Transylvania’ (Estleman 90-103), Professor Van Helsing gives Sherlock a detailed description of who Dracula is; his history and abominable nature. He also introduces himself and his accompanying vampire hunters and goes on to ascertain Holmes that his continued investigation and cooperation is unwanted and unnecessary. This he justifies by the certainty and belief in his group’s own capability to extinguish the threat the Count poses on England, given the knowledge they have accumulated. After their encounter, Watson believes this to be the end to their own involvement; ‘Well, I suppose that’s that’ (103). However, rather than feeling reassured and entrusting this national issue to another foreigner Sherlock assures his friend:
‘On the contrary, Watson,’ remarked my friend, puffing on his pipe. ‘That is definitely not what it is.’

‘Whatever do you mean? I can see us going no further on this business without Van Helsing’s aid.’

‘Perhaps you’re right.’ He smiled mischievously. (103)

Again, despite being recommended not to partake further in the hunt, Holmes’ mentioned ‘lawlessness’ where he views himself above and beyond the law, as well as their strong connection to their country makes the two men tackle the problem with a newfound motivation. Regarding Sherlock’s actions subtextually, one can decipher the xenophobic influence which causes him to disregard Van Helsing’s reassurances, where Holmes through acting ‘shows us what they cannot say through the manner in which they say what they can say’ (Baxter 14). What Sherlock’s actions implicitly then convey is that Van Helsing, too, presents a foreign ‘other’ that he does not trust. Ignoring Van Helsing’s encouragement, or rather warning, to drop the case Sherlock instead resumes his investigation. Holmes and Watson manage to acquire crucial information denied them by Van Helsing from Mrs. Harker, one of the professor’s own associates. By imploring her ‘for reasons which must remain my own, I must request that you speak to no one about or visit’ (Estleman 113) Holmes can be understood to express his distrust in the professor without explicitly putting it into so many words. This plea to keep their involvement concealed from the professor could be stemmed from the belief that Van Helsing would be easily ready to assume Sherlock a fiend if he interferes, which emphasises the chasm between their nationalities. One can additionally see more directly how the professor is portrayed as a foreign ‘other’ through Watson’s focalization and use of description. At their encounter he pays close attention to the professor’s use of the English language and notes that ‘his command of English was good but stilted’ (Estleman 92) and ‘the elderly man’s guttural tones also denoted foreign
extraction’ (88). This can be interpreted as the professor having a reasonably good command not only on the language but of the nation itself, yet the man’s foreign nature makes him untrustworthy and inadequate to treat issues of a national concern. This supports the notion of Sherlock as the epitome of England as he takes it on himself to confront the invading individual, since it displays quite explicitly Holmes’ protective and even patriotic motives.

Although this symbolism is interpreted as something covert, the analysis of historical context in tandem with narratological tools helps unveil the subtextual symbolism and foregrounds it. Because even though it is hidden, Sherlock emphasises that ‘the obvious is always difficult. It is that which is hidden that is perceived most readily’ (Estleman 41). As such, the hidden instances in this novel weighs heavier than that which is overtly presented, thus supporting the symbolism which has been found and discussed in this analysis.

Moreover, by considering what Cixous said about characters’ functions in the cog of the literary machinery as signs and representing sets of externals (384-385), it is feasible to conclude that the characters portray something deeper through representationalism. Insofar, she additionally emphasises how characters are supposed to be read, understood and figured out, offered up for interpretation that will reveal what their attributed characteristics covertly suggest (385). And by putting this into historical context, Dracula perfectly emulates and embodies the looming yet elusive presence and fear of the invading threat upon England that riddled the empire. Holmes equally adequately symbolises and embodies his country, protecting not only his land but also his narrative from any foreign threats, applying his usual methods within the confines of his own genre.
4. Conclusion

Through the narratological investigation of Estleman’s novel it was discovered that Sherlock and Dracula do indeed display a dichotomy, even though small similarities between the characters also exist. The application of focalization provided with an outside perspective of the two characters subjected to analysis, which additionally allowed the use of description to uncover the two literary figures most prominent traits. The concept of subtext enabled additional interpretations of the findings disclosed by description, thus unveiling characteristics that might otherwise have gone unnoticed. Namely, although both characters were externally portrayed to possess animalistic characteristics, even these overlapping features opposed each other as Sherlock embodied a hunter who pursued the cornered animal that is Dracula. It was also discovered that Sherlock had close connotations to his nation as he communicated and integrated with society on both personal, legal and political levels. He therefore seems to embody and personify England itself, which made his response to an invading ‘other’ reasonable and expected. It was further established that Dracula’s supernatural disposition acted as an additional feature that turned him into an invading ‘other’ as he not only invaded Holmes’ country, but also his narrative by transgressing the genre’s rules forbidding the intrusion of the fantastic.

Since it was outside of this essay’s scope to analyse the characters’ preexisting characteristics an understanding of the characters’ originally assigned traits had to an extent be taken for granted and is an influence that could be researched further. The characterisation in Estleman’s novel alone, however, seemed to indicate a strong connection between the characters as perfectly opposing antagonists, which was further accentuated as the analysis uniquely incorporated the historical context along with the narratological tools.
through the lense of subtext. Due to the precarious political climate in Victorian times, with palpable anxieties concerning the possibility of Britain’s decline as a superpower combined with the xenophobia of reverse colonisation and of the invading ‘others’, ‘invasion scare’ literature emerged. Thus the imperial atmosphere of the time was found in this analysis to have detectably influenced both the characters and how they act in accordance to their symbolic representations even in Estleman’s contemporary work; the symbolism of Sherlock as England protecting the nation against Dracula who posed as the threatening ‘other’. Thus Dracula’s and Holmes’ dichotomous characteristics established in this essay entwined with the historical and societal influence of the imperial climate might have inspired the author to have these two specific characters meet in this unconventionally paired narrative.

Since no previous research has been performed on this specific novel there are several approaches that could further be applied. For one, a similar symbolism could be investigated from a different theoretical angle that might unveil different interpretations of said symbolism. For example, reader response theory, where the reader would more actively participate in shaping the narrative and thus, consequently, also the interpretation, might yield different results. Another interesting research approach due to this novel’s curious crossover nature, which was only briefly touched upon in this essay, is that of genre study. A study that investigated whether one genre is more prominently dominant than the other to see which narrative is being trespassed upon by intruding genre characteristics would be intriguing, since its structure appears stylistically adherent to Sir Conan Doyle’s detective novels but follows Bram Stoker’s story about Dracula. It would be especially relevant considering the popularity of travelling characters that traverse not only different narratives, like the novel analysed in this essay, but also different media, in order to understand the
text-external life of characters which causes people to remain interested when the literary figures leave their original habituations.

Summerarily, this essay, in true spirit of everyone’s favourite sleuth, has performed an analysis based on accumulated narratological evidence and managed to logically solve the mystery of an underlying symbolism of imperialism between the vampire and detective.
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