

What's in a Name:
Tracing the Origins and Trajectory of Turkey's Nationalist Version
of *Dracula* through an Onomastic Lens.

Introduction

Starting in 1973, the first Literary Onomastics Conference was held in Brockport, New York at the State University College. According to Drs. Grace Alvarez-Altman and Frederick M. Burelbach, the focus of the conference was to expand the field of literary study concerning names.

Literary Onomastics is an area of literary criticism in which scholars are concerned with the significance of names in drama, poetry, prose fiction, and folklore. These include names of places, characters, cosmic symbols, even of the works themselves (the title as “name”), as they are related to theme, structure, and other literary critics, historians, philosophers, psychologists, and others work on the kaleidoscope aspects of names. (Alvarez-Altman pg. III-IV)

When looking at Bram Stoker’s 1897 novel *Dracula*, connections to several of Drs. Alvarez-Altman and Burelbach professed onomastic themes become apparent, themes that have been alluded to countless times throughout the novel’s considerable life span. In 1972, Drs. Raymond T. McNally and Radu Florescu published the first critical research done in the West concerning the connections between Stoker’s novel and the historical Vlad III, commonly known as Vlad Tepes (The Impaler), of Walachia.

In 1928 Turkish historian and author, Ali Riza Seyfi published what has been commonly decried as an “unauthorized version” of the *Dracula*. Titled *Kazikli Voyvode*, Seyfi’s book replaces London for Istanbul as Dracula’s ultimate destination and updates key points of the story to coincide with the growing Turkish national, linguistic, and political identity. At its core, *Kazikli Voyvode* draws from not only the vampire story but enhances it with additional historical terms intended to more closely relate the story to Turkey’s real-world enemy, Vlad Tepes. These additions and alterations transform the novel into a unique work of sociopolitical nationalistic writing. These changes, as will be examined later, suggest that terms such as “unauthorized” or

“pirated,” as used on the 2017 English translations’ book cover, are oversimplifications that ignore the transformative aspects of Seyfi’s remediation and places discussions about his work in the realm of legalities more than a literary review. Seyfi’s remediation, when examined against Stoker’s work, puts the trajectory of the novel *Dracula* into a new light and suggests how the onomastic history of the Count’s name illuminates key historical and tonal aspects of both books, starting with how the name even came into existence in the first place.

This examination will begin with looking at how the Roman invasion and occupation of what is today Romania brought about sizable linguistic evolutions that allowed for the name Dracula to become formed. It will follow the military history of the name up through its discovery by an Irish writer working in London as a theatrical agent. From there, this essay will jump ahead in time and space to the early twentieth century Turkey, where the novel and its titular character are utilized by a Turkish historian to construct a nationalistic remediation of the work. Coincidentally, this new Turkish remediation illuminates the historical use of names as political signifiers and how the factors at play evolve swiftly over time. All these factors and historical pathways will highlight the onomastic factors as set out by Drs. Grace Alvarez-Altman and Frederick M. Burelbach.

Ultimately, the goal of this research is not merely to trace the etymology of a historical and literary name but to reconceptualize how its evolution and meaning sheds new light on Stoker’s work and its themes across the years and crossing borders. As we evaluate names as signifiers in real-world political and historical contexts, I postulate the onomastic lens will dispel the concept that, despite decades of critical response to the contrary, *Dracula* is a seductive character embodying latent sexual desires of those he encounters. I hope to determine how, from its linguistic bedrock on, Stoker’s novel is quintessentially about a character who is the physical

personification of military conquest with no need or drive to seduce his victims. Dracula, whether in Wallachia, England, or Turkey, does not entice others into doing his bidding, he applies the military mindset inherent in his very name.

Onomastics and the Historical Vlad Dracula

As Stoker's use of the name was itself a remediation, let us establish the etymology of the word Dracula and what the onomastic lens suggests about its larger meaning. In 29 BCE, Marcus Licinius Crassus conquered the land known as Moesia in eastern Europe which comprises what is today parts of Serbia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Bulgaria, and Romania. By 87 CE, the Roman Emperor Domitian sent six legions into Dacia, the lands east of the Danube river that had remained free from Roman rule up until then. After 106 CE all of Wallachia and Transylvania, now known as Romania, were firmly under their control. Along with their presence, the Roman legions stationed in the area brought both the Greek and Latin languages and injected their influence onto the native languages. (Florescu pgs. 30-31) One of the new words that infected the culture was the Latin word *Draco*, meaning a great serpent but almost exclusively associated with the image of the dragon. For over a thousand years, the Latin influences remained in the region and were strengthened over time through the association with the rising popularity of Christianity.

In 1408 the King of Hungary, later becoming the Holy Roman Emperor, Zsigmond von Luxembourg created an order of nobility whose purpose was to, ostensibly, defend Christian lands against invasions by the Ottoman Empire. Another potential reason for the formation of the order is that Zsigmond had once been a member of the Order of St. George. Shortly after ascending to the throne Zsigmond's wife, Queen Maria, died "without issue by Zsigmond (that left the latter without any claim to the throne save that derived from the election of 1387".

(Boulton, pg. 348) Because his hold on the throne had been through his marriage to the legitimate heir, Maria's death left Zsigmond in the grip of a revolt from rival families. Only through a shrewd political marriage and aligning himself with several powerful factions did he retain the throne. The main body who opposed his reign were high ranking members of the Order of St. George. After securing his throne, he quickly left the order. "It was apparently in recognition of this fact that Zsigmond... proclaimed in 1408, the foundation of the organization which should probably be called the Society of the Dragon." (Boulton, pg. 349)

Thus, the Society of the Dragon appears to have been the first organization of its type to be conceived of in purely political terms, without even a gesture in the direction of the chivalrous ideology that had underlain all the earlier foundations. (Boulton, pg. 349)

By naming it the Society of the Dragon, ie. *Draco*, Zsigmond was potentially choosing a linguistic signifier that was in direct opposition to his political rivals, the Order of St. George. Noteworthy is the fact the Society used the language of the once invading and occupying enemy nation after it had conquered the land and its people.

In 1431, Vlad II, Prince of Wallachia, was made a member of the order. As a member of the Society, known as Draconists, Vlad II was entitled to add the dragon symbol to his personal coat of arms as well as his coinage. After this time his people began to call him Dracul, meaning "The Dragon"; a name which he came to embrace and associate himself with. Drs. Florescu and McNally's research indicates that by adopting the title Dracul, Vlad II was also making it known where his political allegiances were, at least at that moment. This was in response to his almost certain fear of being overthrown by his allies. During this period of history, princes of Wallachia were not autonomous and were essentially vassals to other Holy Roman Empire and could be, and often were, replaced with rulers more to the tastes of the Holy Roman Empire; a fear felt by

the Society of the Dragon's founder. Wallachian rulers were required by statute to repel the Turkish invaders; however, they also maintained a cordial series of relations with the Ottoman Empire and even sent them yearly tribute to maintain the peace. This placed Wallachians in a precarious position. Working with both the Holy Roman Empire and the Ottomans was seen as a demonstration of the duplicitous nature of Wallachian rulers and that they were inherently untrustworthy. In the end, the Princes would either be killed in battle against the Turks or, more often, be forcibly replaced either by neighboring countries or even with the Holy Roman Emperor working in tandem with local nobles who felt they were not being treated with enough respect by their ruler.

After being killed in military coup alongside his heir, Mircea, Vlad Dracul's eldest son, Vlad III, later Vlad Tepes, claimed the throne. In place of his father's title of Dracul, Vlad adopted the name of Dracula, meaning "Son of the Dragon." The addition of the "a" at the end of a word in Romanian denoted the status of "little" or "junior," hence the name demonstrated Vlad Tepes as the child of the dragon, and more importantly, the rightful heir to the Wallachian throne. The name and signifier of Dracula was crafting a rhetorical statement in advance of a potential political coup and stating both home and abroad that the Dracula family intended to create and maintain a lasting dynasty. Dracula would rein in Wallachia through three separate phases until being defeated by Ottoman forces either in late 1476 or in January of 1477.

What held true in the origins of the name Dracula holds true for Vlad III's real-life mortal enemies, The Ottoman Empire, and the Turkish remediation of the name. Using Saussure's signifier/signified model of tacking remediation, in the Ottoman Empire, the historical names of Vlad Tepes and Dracula as signifiers were fairly meaningless to the general population. The reason for this is that around the year 1500, Ottoman writer and historian, Tursun Beg, wrote *The*

History of Mehmed the Conquer in honor of that leader's military conquests and eventual overthrow of Constantinople. In the few pages he dedicated to Mehmed I campaigns against the Wallachians, he only referred to Vlad Dracula as *Kazıklı Voyvoda*.

This *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, however, was a very tyrannical man. If an individual from a certain village were to commit a crime, he punished the whole village- man, woman, and child- by impaling them on spikes. In his capital [...] he had a huge garden extending six miles long and enclosed by fences on both sides. In between the fences were displayed the bodies of all the Hungarians, Wallachians, and Moldavians whom he had impaled. But his cruelty did not end even here, for the number of those he had hung from the trees outside the fortress is undetermined (Tursun Beg pg. 47)

Meaning the “Impaling Warlord,” the term “voyvoda” was the Wallachian term for Prince while “kazıklı” being the Ottoman term for Impaling. At no point in the remaining history does Tursun Beg refer to Dracula by any other name. In short, the Ottoman signifier for Vlad III was a reference to the office he held in conjunction with his preferred method of dealing with enemies. The irony of this being that it was at the court of Sultan Mehmed I, shortly to be replaced by his son Mehmed II, that Vlad Dracula had been taught the art of impaling. He and his brother, Radu the Handsome, had been sent to the Sultan's court by their father as essential hostages while children. During the early 20th century, the Turkish Language Reform, as started by Mustapha Kemal Atatürk was not wanting for a “pure” word for the remediation of Stoker's novel.

Kazıklı Voyvoda became the main signifier for the historical Dracula throughout the Ottoman Empire. While it may appear, there was no difference between the Romanian and Ottoman signifier for Vlad Tepes, since he was called The Impaler in both Wallachia and abroad during his reign, the title in his homeland was always made in conjunction with his given name, as in the example Vlad the Impaler or Vlad Dracula. Only in the Ottoman Empire was he denied

the application of his proper name. This striking of a common, one may say a “human” name, from the signifier of a character seen as a brutal enemy, rhetorically dehumanized one of The Ottoman Empire’s greatest enemies. They additionally often denied him the moniker of the “dragon” that he and his father had adopted. In the eyes of those who saw themselves as the oppressed, he was an inhuman construct, and they were rejecting the name he intended to force them to use. The name Dracula, unlike Kazıklı Voyvoda, would have little significant meaning in Turkey until the 20th century.

Before Stoker wrote his novel, the signified character of Dracula held remarkable rhetorical power throughout both the Ottoman and Holy Roman Empires from 1477 onwards. The ecology that allowed the name to come into being related to how later remediations came about. One example of this is how in modern Romania, the signifier of Dracula is associated with military prowess, heroism, national pride, and reverence. Even though Stoker’s book has had an impact on their economy and tourist trade, their understanding of the name remains intact despite the vampiric attachments. An image of how the Romanian people have taken up the historical signified aspects of Vlad Dracula, Mihai Eminescu, a 19th-century Romanian poet, wrote a ballad to the past princes of Wallachia calling on them to come to his country’s aid. In his “third letter,” he wrote,

You must come, O dread Impaler, confound them to your care.
Split them into two partitions, here the fools, the rascals there;
Shove them into two enclosures from the broad daylight enisle 'em,
Then set fire to the prison and the lunatic asylum.

Florescu furthered this impression of Dracula by writing that he is their equivalent of “America’s George Washington.” (Florescu, McNally, pg. 7)

Following the Onomastic Trail from History to Bram Stoker

In their first book, *In Search of Dracula: A True History of Dracula and Vampire Legends*, Drs. McNally and Florescu lay the groundwork for understanding how and why Stoker selected the name Dracula for his vampire count. Their early research suggested that Stoker had been inspired to write the novel after reading about the real-life Vlad Dracula and included several historical points of reference in his novel connecting the two. Years later, according to Michael Barsanti's forward to *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula: A Facsimile Edition*, Stoker's working notes were purchased by Charles Sessler, a bookseller in Philadelphia, in 1970. These notes initially became available in 1913 when Florence Stoker, Bram's widow, sold them at Sotheby's to a New York book dealer named James Drake. How they moved from Drake to Sessler is not completely known as records of the sales of the notes disappear shortly before Sessler purchased them and donated to the Rosenbach Library in Pennsylvania. While on a visit to the museum to see a fifteenth-century pamphlet about Vlad Tepes, Drs. McNally and Florescu were informed for the first time of the inclusion of the working notes in the foundation's collection. According to the introduction to their 1979 annotated version of Dracula, *The Essential Dracula*, they wrote:

Then, like a bolt from the blue, the archivist asked us a startling question: might we also be interested in seeing the original notes that Stoker made while creating the novel Dracula? At first, we could not believe our ears. No scholar had ever found Stoker's notes. In fact, no one knew where they were... After we poured over the Stoker notes, we looked at each other in triumph. We knew that we were, at last, witnessing the birth of Dracula in the mind of Bram Stoker. (pg. 17)

Based on their review of the notes, we can see that Stoker had been well into the writing process for the novel before he had encountered the name Dracula. The earliest notes were written starting March 8th, 1890. At that point, and for several months following, Stoker named his vampire Count Wampyre and intended to set the story in the Styria, an Austrian province.

According to several scholars, among them the noted historian Joseph Bierman, while visiting the town of Whitby in the summer of that same year, Stoker happened to encounter a book that included the name and deeds of Vlad Dracula. At this point, his notes clearly show that Stoker crossed out the name Wampyre and wrote in the new name, underlining it several times for good measure. This, to a wide extent, is where the onomastic research into the name of Dracula, the vampire ended. Further research was conducted concerning the name as applied to Vlad III and his family, but other than using the historical Dracula as further window dressing for film remediations of the novel there has not been much done with onomastics and this work of literature until recently.

An often-reprinted misconception concerning Bram Stoker's novel was that he was inspired to write it after encountering the name of Dracula in the 1820 book written by William Wilkinson, *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia with Political Observations Relative to Them*. Stoker's working notes proves he nearly finished writing the outline of the novel by the time he encountered Wilkinson's book. Before reading *Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia*, one of the titles Stoker had considered, which remained in place until only a few weeks before publication, was *The Un-Dead*, and that the name of the count was originally to be Count Wampyr. Essentially, Stoker's novel had not initially been constructed to take advantage of the signified aspects of the name Dracula.

While his notes do not make explicit all the reasons that Stoker adopted the name Dracula, we can look at several reasonable points of interest. Looking back to the power of names to shape impressions and as attempts to control narratives, Dr. Adam Alter comments on how ease of names effects their reception. "Beyond their meaning, words also differ according to how easy they are to pronounce. People generally prefer not to think more than necessary, and

they tend to prefer objects, people, products, and words that are simple to pronounce and understand.” (Alter pg. 2) The signifier of Dracula was simple enough to say and to recreate in print, uncommon marks such as umlauts were unnecessary, which allowed sizable ease of use and fluidity in the way the name could be taken up by his readers. It also afforded him the use of some of the history of Romania and their wars as set dressing and bits of dialogue.

Another point of consideration for choosing a simple and unique name is that Stoker had an open opportunity to define the signified aspects of Dracula that he wanted for his intended British and American audiences. If he had stayed with the name Count Wampyre, he would have essentially made too explicit the idea that his character was a slight variation of the mythical vampire. Since a common spelling for “vampire” at the time was with a “y,” as in “vampyre,” it would have been no effort for a reader to connect his signifier with a traditional impression of the monster. Wampyre was only a vampire. However, Stoker almost completely reinvented the genre parameters of the vampire and incorporated aspects from werewolves and other supernatural beings. His creature was not merely a variation on the vampire archetype; it was meant to be an evolution of the species. It makes sense that he took advantage of the opportunity to rebrand his character in such a way that drew from expectations about the myths while also setting it apart. As the name, Dracula was foreign to English readers; it held little to no inherent meaning. England was never connected to Wallachia in a way that the common reader would prescribed connotations, and Americans were even more removed from that part of the world. Also, there is no evidence that Winkinson’s book was a commonly read text that would have brought attention to the name of Dracula. What Stoker had was a blank slate to create a unique signifier/signified dynamic.

The only concern Stoker would have had would be the creature that Dracula was, not necessarily the name itself. The archetype of the vampire had long been germinating in English literature, going as far back as Samuel Taylor Coleridge's 1797 fragment of a poem, *Christabel*. Byron had obtained a copy of the unfinished work and brought it along to be read during the famous tour with himself, Percy and Mary Shelly, and Byron's physician, Dr. Polidori, where one can argue the modern monster movement was formed. (Summers, pg. 281) Since that time, the word vampire had been in the public consciousness to such an extent that even in *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Bronte has her titular character refer to Bertha Rochester, in chapter twenty-five, as "the foul German specter – the Vampyre." If Stoker had stayed with Count Wampyre, so close in form to the name of the mythical creature he was, it is possible the work would have been at the mercy of the pre-established connotations associated with the vampire.

Stoker would have been rightly concerned that his vampire novel might be associated with overtly grotesque representations of the vampire, turning away some readers. As previously mentioned, several successful books, short stories, newspaper serials, and theatrical works covered the vampire image. For every reference in a noted work such as *Christabel* or *Jane Eyre*, far more offerings were made to appeal to the masses and often had titles that made explicit the monster contained in its pages such as *The Vampyre* by John Polidori or *Varney the Vampire; or, The Feast of Blood* attributed to James Malcolm Rymer. The negative popular associations made with the archetype of the vampire were too numerous to leave to chance. Some theatres, the same line of work Stoker was employed in, were already using the vampire imagery in association with what we might call "blood bath" spectacles such as Paris' infamous Le Théâtre du Grand-Guignol. Using graphic special effects to depict images of vampiric horror, many productions reportedly make people physically ill.

Whether as the victim or killer, the actors' gaze during the performances pulled the audience into this dark world of the human psyche, inviting them to discover the monster hidden deep inside their hearts and minds. Thereby creating a new form of violent entertainment in theatre, which takes us back to its beginnings rooted in the depictions of violence from Roman times onward. (Jurković)

Even in the best circles, vampire tales held provocative images. *Varney the Vampire* was famously published as a weekly serial and often included drawings that are still included today in collections of vampire stories and images. Placing the word vampire in the book's title might have lumped Stoker's novel in with the more sensational offerings. Besides wanting to ensure strong book sales, a potential calculated remediation was forward in Stoker's mind from the moment he neared completion of his work. Since he was the manager for a well-respected theatre company, The Lyceum, Stoker recognized the ways he would need to go about protecting his current employment while simultaneously preemptively safeguarding his intellectual property as a course of business. These factors came into play on the 18th of May 1897; when he staged his own theatrical reading of his novel to protect the stage play copyright. The 1842 Copyright Act held that "the author of a work of fiction needs to dramatize it himself or herself and secure separate copyright in that text." (Laird pgs. 5-6) Stoker recognized the marketability of his book and wanted to secure those rights before anyone else had the opportunity. Thus, he ensured he would be the only one to be able to produce a play adaptation and cemented his control over the initial connotations to be associated with the name of Dracula.

In the end, it may be seen that Stoker ended up using the name as a rhetorical blank slate to construct a mythology on, removing his novel from possible associations common with some Victorian remediations of the vampire. At the same time; however, for those who had a working knowledge of Latin, he was able to add in a layer of subtext drawing from the military and historical connotations of the name. As we have seen, "Draco" comes from the Latin "dragon"

which had a long association with war and knights in the image of St. George and his slaying of the mythical monster. As Stoker also discovered from reading *Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia*, the word picked up a second connotation through Christian remediations. Dragon as a serpent grew to be connected with not only the Leviathan in the bible but also the serpent in the garden of Eden. Starting as a creation myth, Genesis was soon interpreted by Christian scholars as to the first encroachment of the devil. From that point on, the word Draco was translated as both “dragon” and “devil.” Early German and Russian woodcuts, the same kind being researched by Drs. McNally and Florescu when they were informed of Stoker’s notes, translated Vlad III’s name to mean the secondary interpretation, Son of the Devil. This was in service to the fact that Vlad Dracula had made many enemies of both country’s business classes who had vested interests in Wallachia and Transylvania and had their properties seized in service to Vlad’s throne. The early anti-Dracula pamphlets were often the main source of information for Western audiences. Interesting to note is the fact Stoker may well have tipped his hat to a well-informed audience concerning Tepes when he used the name DeVill as one of the Count’s aliases.

One last point that must be included is that Stoker demonstrates his understanding of the title the real Dracula ruled under. When in Chapter 18 he has Van Helsing state of the vampire “He must, indeed, have been that Voivode Dracula who won his name against the Turk.” Here Stoker includes the local term for the ruler of Wallachia, Voivode. While others have held that title, few associated with the “Draconists” and none declaring themselves the Son of the Dragon held that distinction. This term will carry meaning over to the later Turkish remediation of the story as written by Ali Riza Seyfi that is part of what Lancaster University scholar, Tugee Bicakei calls, “global gothic studies.” (Bicakei, pg. 1)

Turkish Language Revolution

In the early 20th century, The Turkish War for Independence occurred following the country's occupation by Western forces after the cessation of World War I. Especially problematic for the younger generation were the actions of Sultan Abdulhamid II who ruled from 1876 until 1909. His reign was marked with the dismissal of Parliament in 1877 and the suspension of the constitution in February of 1878. He ruled his country through the use of his draconian secret police force while remaining secluded at the Yıldız Palace in what is today Istanbul. After Abdulhamid was forced to abdicate his throne his younger brother, Mehmed V, came to believe he was ill-equipped to rule and so set himself up as a constitutional monarchy and turned political rule over to the Young Turks and their Committee of Union and Progress. After a disastrous series of political alliances and entering WWI on the side of Germany and Austria-Hungary, Turkey found itself with a depleted empire and an Allied force occupying their country. In 1918 Mehmed V died and his brother, Mehmed VI, became the last Sultan of the Ottoman Empire before the empire was dissolved by Allied forces in 1922 and the position of Sultan abolished.

In the intervening years, a new national identity began to form, and in 1923, Turkey claimed a personal victory. Out of the post-war remnants of the Ottoman Empire the new Turkish identity was constructed on a three-pillared foundation: “‘Turkish,’ the language of a nation called the ‘Turks,’ is spoken in a country names ‘Turkey,’ and qualifies as intellectual property of a discipline known as ‘Turcology.’” (Szurek pg. IV) The driving force of this evolution was Mustafa Kemal, later Ataturk. A strong-willed and well-educated Turkish Field-Marshal, Mustafa Kemal understood the power of tactics, language, and especially names. He proved a formidable military leader during the Gallipoli Campaign when he and his forces

repelled British and French troops from 1915-16 and won himself a loyal following amongst his men and most of Turkey. Afterward, from 1919 to 1922, Turkey found itself entrenched with a war with Greece when that country attempted to take Ottoman lands that had been promised them by England and the Allied forces. In 1922 both sides agreed to a truce which recognized Turkish sovereignty over its lands and peoples. The effects of constant warfare left Turkey in a weakened state with little sense of national self.

As previously mentioned, the Arabo-Persian form of writing had been in common practice in the Ottoman Empire for centuries and had been adequate for peacetime operations. This state of affairs, however, was not embraced by many intellectuals who felt that the language was inhibiting the growth of a “pure Turkish” identity and was even a factor in some of the defeats suffered during and after WWI (Szurek pg. VIII). Kemal was educated at one of the best schools in Turkey, all of which emphasized the connection between the nation and its military in that one was a direct reflection of the other. As he advanced in his studies, Kemal entered what is known as the War College, an institute designed to craft the next generation of military leaders. The Turkish military had been on great terms with Germany and lauded their military thinking over that of French tacticians who had been the standard model up to that time. This respect went so far as to include German military commanders coming and teaching at the War College (Gawrych pg. 10) before and during Kemal’s time there. He and his fellow students learned to speak German and would study at their schools for several years, which greatly influenced their world views.

Amongst the texts that the German officers required for reading were those of General Suleyman Pasa, including a critical text titled *Turkish Grammar*. The book “argued for the language of the empire being Turkish, not Ottoman” (Gawrych pg. 13) Kemal believed this was

essential for Turkey's future for several reasons, two previously mentioned points being based on a unifying national identity and simple utilitarian purpose. In the first regard, Kemal believed that a unified language brought with it unified morale that was the core of military success and cited the Russo-Japanese War. "The real lesson of the Russo-Japanese War was widely seen as being that the truly important element in modern warfare was not technology but morale, and the morale not of the enemy alone, but of the nation from which it was drawn." (Howard pg. 519)

The second reason was that the Arabo-Persian form of writing had proven to be a hindrance during efforts in WWI on account of the complex rules the written language followed.

Its intrinsic beauty aside; there is nothing to be said in favor of the Arabo-Persian alphabet as a medium for writing Turkish. [...] Only the context and a sufficient grasp of the vocabularies of Turkish, Persian, and Arabic can make clear which of the possible readings (of a text) is intended. (Lewis, G., pg 27.)

Since communications during and after WWI needed to be sent, received and decoded with haste, the written Arabic alphabet proved far too dependent on contextual clues to suit the speed of modern warfare. Regardless of its difficulties representing an ideal Turkish identity, this alphabet remained the official language of the Turkish government for some time after the war. Mustafa Ataturk was opposed to keeping the Arabo-Persian alphabet for official writing due to its weakness in military use, and he received remarkable pushback from leading religious authorities on this subject. The major argument for the retainment of the Arabic alphabet was centered on religious grounds. A change in the written language was perceived as a serious threat to the Muslim faith since it would require a translation of The Koran into any new potential alphabet. According to doctrine, the Koran cannot be considered the true Koran if it is not written in Arabic. This position was considered sacrosanct, and scholars of the time were quick to posit that the Turkish people would never be able to handle either a newly written alphabet or learning one in addition to the traditional Arabic one. "If it (the Arabic language) were replaced

by a Latin-alphabet, the number of Turks able to read the Koran-whether or not they understood it-would inevitably diminish, because one alphabet is as much as most people can be expected to learn in a lifetime.” (Lewis, G pg. 32) It is worth noting that the pro-Arabic scholars conceded that even if a Turk was able to read the Koran that it did not necessarily translate into a meaningful understanding of the text. Comprehension was secondary.

As understanding written communication was paramount for Ataturk, he bided his time on language reform until he had a more opportune time to effect a change. Ataturk’s placing greater value on utilitarian language over those of religious dogma was in line with his official military training in that what is best for the military is best for the country. Since Ataturk saw a new language as being a lynchpin for solidifying a Turkish identity, it only made sense that it takes preference over religious concerns. The ideology of functionality was bolstered by his desire to have the new government by secular, especially since he had been taught that a true military education would necessitate a moral component already. Ataturk possessed a “conviction of conscious” in “having superiority in political ideals for achieving the objective.” (Gawrych, pg. 12) It wasn’t until November 1, 1928, after an exhaustive campaign and having personally performed on-the-road demonstrations of the new form of writing that Mustafa Ataturk was able to begin the change to the Latin alphabet. The Law on the Adoption and Implementation, which solidified the move towards the new Turkish Alphabet, became effective on January 1, 1929, and in July of 1932, the Society for the Study of Turkish Language was created. (Szurek, pg. 5)

That same year the Turkish Language Reform began to excise words from the language that were not considered sufficiently Turkish in his history. These Arabic “loan words” were to be replaced by other words deemed more in line with what was to become the dominant form of

discourse. Oğuz Atay, the Turkish novelist, and advisor to the Turkish Language Reform wrote, “What he (Atatürk) wanted us to do was to leave as many words in the language as possible, so long as we could demonstrate that they were Turkish.” (Lewis, G. Pg. 54) On December 24th, 1934, the Regulations on Family Names was adopted by the Turkish government, which established new rules regarding names and naming practices.

Article 1. Each Turk shall bear a family name in addition to his personal name. Those who do not possess a family name are required to choose one and have it written down in the records of the civil registry, as well as on their birth certificates, before July 2, 1935.

Article 5. New family names will be chosen in the Turkish Language...

Article 7. It is forbidden to bear a name appearing to contain suffixes or words implying the idea of another nationality or borrowed from a language other than Turkish

Article 8. It is forbidden to use and, once again, bear family names which indicate in a general manner other nationalities... or which express the idea of another nationality... or which are borrowed from other languages. (Szurek pgs. 7-8)

These new laws were not meant for only the general population as high-ranking officials, and government works were required to do likewise. This revolution created an onomastic opportunity to cement the link between the leader of the Turkish War for Independence and the image of the modern Turk.

On November 24, 1934, five months after the adoption of the *Soyadı Kanunu*, (language reform) the Turkish National Assembly unanimously passed a law under the terms of which the family name *Ata Turk* (subsequently, *Ataturk*, in a single word) was solemnly conferred upon the president of the Republic of Turkey. Mustafa Kemal became “The Father Turk.” At the beginning of December, the parliamentary member for Kocaeli, Ibrahim Sureyya, proposed the prohibition of the use of this patronym par excellence by any other person. The creation of a separate and exclusive onomastic status for the head of state shows us that the act of naming was also a celebration and that the *name* Ataturk was also an honorific *title*. (Szurek, pg. 16)

We understand that having been pivotal in the country’s war efforts and cultural evolution, Ataturk was linguistically transitioned into the leader of the new country to define its

people and their identity. The linguistic movement is directly in line with how the historical Vlad Dracul accepted the name given to him by his people after his investment into the Society of the Dragon and how his son became the Dracula of infamy. The onomastic lens will now shift and return us to Stoker's vampire count and examine how the historical character established by way of an English novelist's work reappeared in Turkish society.

Turkish Mimetic Remediation: From Book to Book

Shortly after the 1934 Regulations on Family Names, Ali Rıza Seyfi, a Turkish historian, poet, and translator changed his name in accordance with the new laws. Seyfi altered his name from the original Seyfioğlu, which was deemed to contain non-Turkish elements, to the more nationalistic version he maintained for the remainder of his life. This onomastic alteration places Seyfi alongside Atatürk, Dracul, and Dracula as individuals using their names as nationalist identifiers and altering them to suit those ends.

As stated on the back cover to the English translation of Seyfi's book published by Neon Harber,

For the first time in English comes a remarkable literary discovery. In 1928, Turkish author Ali Rıza Seyfioğlu pirated Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, completely rewriting it with new material, patriotic overtones, and Islam. A rare example of a "bootleg" novel, it's also the first adaptation to plainly identify Dracula as the historical warlord Vlad the Impaler.

What needs to be addressed before proceeding is the idea that Seyfi's work is a "bootleg" of Stoker's novel and is often called a "pirated work." In contrast to this labeling, journalist Kim Newman talks about the Icelandic version of Stoker's novel, *Powers of Darkness*, in his forward to *Dracula in Istanbul* as a "free (Icelandic) adaptation" (Stoker, Seyfioglu pg. i) This rhetorically suggests a legitimacy to *Powers of Darkness* not afforded to Seyfi's work. It is true that Stoker had created a business arrangement with *Powers of Darkness*'s author Valdimar

Asmundsson, but I urge caution of how a work is labeled if it is predicated on business transactions and legal terminology or else every literary scholar may have to take up law as well in order to critique a book. I suggest Seyfi's work better fits into the category of what I will call a *Mimetic Remediation*. Using Webster's Dictionary definition of *memetic* as the base, I consider this term to be defined where "an idea, behavior, style, or usage that spreads from person to person within a culture" and is reinterpreted into the genre as the original work of art. This description is closer to what Seyfi, in my opinion, achieved with his novel than is suggested by terms such as pirated or bootleg. It recognizes the trajectory of a work within its own genre but across usages and does not weigh down the discussion with ideas of what constitutes legal or illegal art. If one is inclined to remain beholden to legal terms and ideas as the basis for discussion, this represents a similar situation in what is seen as "fair use" in online videos when sampling other media in their work. Wishing not to disturb the spirit of Florence Balcombe Stoker and reignite the fires that brought her to a legal war against Prana Films and their own representation of her husband's work, *Nosferatu, Eine Symphonie des Grauens*, let us return to Turkey.

After years of service to the newly formed government, Seyfi worked his way into becoming a member of Ataturk's inner circle of decision makers. He was aware of the desire by Ataturk and his cabinet to find items that would aid in the effort to rhetorically define what it meant to be a modern Turk and to consider how that identity would be placed in a burgeoning global context. Seyfi took up the task of finding writings that could be of cultural significance to the country and began bringing them into line with the evolving aspects of what was becoming the Turkish perspective. One of those efforts was to take Bram Stoker's vampire novel and create a modern remediation of the text. Current scholarship has been unable to discover how Seyfi

came to be aware of the book and whether or not he decided to remediate the text or may have been Ataturk himself who made the selection.

In 1928, Seyfi created what was considered to be in Turkey an indigenous novel, *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, in accordance with the historical name the Ottoman Empire interacted with Vlad Tepes under. As seen in Tursun Beg's *The History of Mehmed the Conquer*, the name Dracula was not how the Turkish people related to their historical Wallachian enemy. According to Dr. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar in her introduction to the English translation of Seyfi's work, now being called *Dracula in Istanbul*, the book, "enabled the author to use his translation as a platform through which he relayed his vision of Ottoman-Turkish history and addressed a strong national sentiment." (pgs. Vii-ix)

According to Tugce Bicakei, there has been no Turkish research done on this topic of remediation, and so many details remain unclear surrounding the ecology this translation grew from. "The adaptations of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* in Turkish literature and film are relatively unknown by Western academia and have been poorly discussed by Turkish critics and scholars on the grounds of being superficial copies of the original." (Bicakei, pg. 1) Exactly how Seyfi came to read *Dracula* is unknown. What can be gleaned, however, is that Seyfi recognized the rhetorical power inherent in the titular character's signified past, if not the signifier itself and that the translating process would allow him to use that power to bolster cultural pride. He was going to bring the rhetorical history of Vlad Tepes back into line with the name Dracula.

Unlike England and America, the intended audiences of Stoker's novel, Seyfi's readership was a people who had previous cultural interactions with the real *Kazıklı Voyvoda*. Since one of the motivating factors for Seyfi's work was to find and establish connections from a glorified Ottoman past to the modern Turkish identity, the power of the symbol of Dracula as a

historical figure would have been sizable. Seyfi made the most of his new linguistic construct when creating the hybrid signifier that he did. The Ottoman-centered name with its historical associations with the Wallachian prince easily combined with the legendary monster crafted by Stoker, an inhuman vampire. In place of Tursun Beg's 15th-century national invader who was a metaphorical blood-drinker, Dracula reportedly having dined while watching his enemies being impaled and dipping his bread in their blood, Seyfi's novel now created a literal blood drinker to threaten the new blood of the emerging Turkish nation.

Aiding in the union of signified aspects of the vampire and Kazıklı Voyvoda, the titular characters were invaders focused on subjugating the Turkish people and their Muslim religion, replacing it with a religious ideology identical to their own. The nature of Stoker's specific vampire genre has the monster turn people into copies of itself through its violating bite. Seyfi harnessed that imagery and utilized it to represent his society's growing fears of Turkey becoming a vassal power to a larger "western" power through their using guns rather than their teeth. These fears were not unfounded as was demonstrated in The Greco-Turkish War of 1919–1922 when Greece invaded Turkey to claim lands they felt had been promised to them by England and America following WWI. These concerns for self-preservation, both inside and out of the novel, were clear threats to the newly born Turkish identity would have compelled the Turks into taking action, just as the hunters in Seyfi's remediation of Stoker's novel were compelled to take up arms against their own un-dead invader.

Moving aside the idea of a physical return of Kazıklı Voyvoda, or even the existence of a real vampire, the fears of western occupation and corruption of the Turkish culture had already been playing itself out in a very real, very current way through the European occupation of Turkey after the First World War. Beyond repelling physical aggressors, Ataturk had made his

policy of maintaining a self-sustaining autonomous Turkey abundantly clear and was concerned about foreign economic influences overriding national interests. Karl Marx had written in his 1867 work, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy Volume I*, “Capital is dead labour which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks.” (Marx, pg. 342) One can equate an imposed system of business practices, especially unfair trade arrangements with the Allied forces post WWI which caused Germany’s own economic devastation to fester, to capital-draining the very life-blood of the working forces. The vampire in *Kazıklı Voyvoda* was resurrected by Seyfi to stalk the people of Turkey once again as a way to unite his people against a common threat.

Turkish Transmediation: From Book to Film to Book:

Despite the work undoubtedly having been chosen for its historical connotations and potential for themes of Turkish nationalism, *Kazıklı Voyvoda* received only a limited printing after its initial release in Turkey. One possible reason for this is that in light of more pressing social and political concerns, a work of fiction simply fell out of the public eye. While the signifier of the titular character still held cultural significance, the overall gothic esthetic inherent in the original novel, as well as Seyfi’s Mimetic Remediation, may simply have not hit the overall zeitgeist of a population recovering from the horrors of war. By 1946, there appears to have been a renewed interest in the text, and it was reissued. By that point, however, due to the Language Reform started by Atatürk the physical appearance of the signifier *Kazıklı Voyvoda* was altered.

In 1946, the novel (*Kazıklı Voyvoda*) was reprinted in the Latin alphabet. The second edition preserved the content and structure of the first edition, while the Ottoman vocabulary was modified to reflect the changes the Turkish language had undergone in the eighteen years that had elapsed. (Seyfi, pg. viii)

In 1951, Turkey's film industry was experiencing a sizable expansion, and it was apparently decided by Turkish filmmaker, Mehmet Muhtar, to adapt Seyfi's story of Turkish ideology to the cinema. The new Latin alphabet edition was used for the remediation from book to a screenplay. However, the title was radically altered for the film from either of the two editions. Muhtar renamed the film, *Drakula Istanbul'da*, i.e., *Dracula in Istanbul*. Of note is that the spelling of the name is a reflection of the historical reality where the consistency in the spelling of the name varied during the reign of Vlad Dracula. Tepes himself spelled his name with both a "c" as well as with a "k," apparently depending on what mood he was in at the time. Besides the push for a touch of European accuracy in the spelling of the name, we see for the first time a deliberate shift away from titling the work under the name most recognizable to the Turkish people and more towards Stoker and the Count's Wallachian ancestry. The character had been named Dracula in the novel itself, but it had not been the name used to grab people's attention on the book cover to draw them in until the cinematic remediation.

Not only was the title altered, but so too was the physical appearance of the Count, which became based directly off of the 1931 Universal film adaptation starring Bela Lugosi. This look, formal eveningwear with billowing cape, was itself had been taken by Universal Studios from the popular English and American touring stage productions rather than matching the description from either of Stoker's or Seyfi's books. This appearance was, however, directly in accordance with Western expectations of what Dracula should look like and may have been a bid on Muhtar's part to enter the growing global film market by creating an adaptation visually similar to established vampire conventions. He may have been wishing to hedge his bets and capitalize on the power of the more commonly known name as well as the popular image of Dracula in

order to carry his film on to post WWI Western-dominated cinemas as well as on the national front.

Shortly after its release, the film received relative success on the national front, and the novel was again put into print. This last edition, edited by film critic, Giovanni Scognamillo, included pictures, drawings, and notes taken not only from the film itself but also borrowed from western adaptations of *Dracula*. If there had been a hint before about embracing a more global presence in the inclusion of the signifier of Dracula, it was apparent through the additional application of western visual rhetoric. Scognamillo's *Dracula Istanbul'da* is, much as Seyfi's original Mimetic Remediation, a Turkish-Western hybrid of a story that offers a look at a time and place of great fear and of great opportunity. The rhetorical issues suggested in the fusing of two ideologies into the one title of a remediated text are rich and complex.

The problem of the possible deeper affinities between Turkey and the West is of more than passing interest. In recent years, the achievements and hopes of the whole reform movement have once again been brought into dispute and even, so it seems for a while, into jeopardy. (Lewis, B. Pg. 17)

In recent years Turkey has embraced the Global Gothic aesthetic, including the vampire genre. In 2018 Turkey produced an original series for Netflix titled *Yasamayanlar*, translated to *Immortals* for English audiences. In the storyline, a repentant vampire named Mia begins working with a group of young vampire hunters to kill the evil overlord of Istanbul, Dmitry, to hopefully regain her humanity. Beyond embracing the global vampire phenomenon, the first episode is set sometime in the past and makes a very clear reference to the Kazıklı Voyvoda who is at the center of the vampire's rise to power.

Final Thoughts

By examining the onomastic travels of the signifier for the historical Vlad Dracula from book to book, book to film, and back to book, we can see how Turkey, through the efforts of Seyfi, was attempting to help situate its newly minted identity on the world stage. Starting with Rome's conquering of northern lands through to a modern Netflix series, I hope I have created a pathway to examine the creation, remediation, mimetic remediation, and transmediation of the sign for the character of Dracula across cultures and mediums. While there are multiple paths, this review could have taken I have chosen to focus on the one that has received the least attention and has been designated, even on its official English release, as a pirated version. Tracing the name along the pathways of history, connecting it to Vlad Tepes' real-world military exploits and following it through the culture of his enemies, I wanted to examine the rhetorical onomastic power contained there. This specific linguistic and literary lens illuminates nuanced aspects associated with this vampire count and his historical roots. We see how names have evolved to entrench the signified holder firmly in their country's patriotic panorama. We have seen how the story of a fictional gothic creature represented a modern country's drive for independence and a national identity free from perceived foreign linguistic elements. And we have seen how even these widespread changes can return full circle to where it all began in the face of remediations and global trends. Dracula became known to an entire culture as Kazıklı Voyvoda who, through the centuries, books, and film adaptations, become once again known as Dracula. What began with the work of Tursun Beg and his *The History of Mehmed the Conquer* has now, essentially, been undone. To end with a quotation from *Twelfth Night* that would have been well known to Bram Stoker in his professional capacity, "And thus the whirligig of time brings in his revenges."

Bibliography

- Alter, Adam. "The Power of Names." *The New Yorker*, The New Yorker, 29 May 2013.
Accessed 18 Apr. 2018.
- Alvarez-Altman, Grace, and Frederick M. Burelbach, editors. *Names in Literature: Essays from Literary Onomastics Studies*. University Press of America, 1987.
- Anderson, Virginia, and Susan Romano, editors. *Culture Shock and the Practice of Professions: Training the Next Wave in Rhetoric & Composition*. Hampton Press, Inc., 2006.
- Auerbach, Nina, and David J. Skal, editors. *Dracula*. Norton Critical Ed ed., W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Beg, Tursun. *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*. Translated by Halil Inalcik and Rhodes Murphey, Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978.
- Bicakei, Tugce. "The Origins of Turkish Gothic: The adaptation of Stoker's Dracula in Turkish literature and film." *Lancaster University*, 2015.
- Boulton, D'arcy J. *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe 1325-1520*. St. Martin's Press, 1987.
- Chaplin, Dorothea. *Mythological Bonds Between East and West*. Einar Munksgaard, 1938.
- Danaci, Faith. "Kazikli Voyvoda, by Ali Riza Seyfi." *La Cripta*, 25 Nov. 2017.
- Eminescu, Mihai. *Laonikos Chalkokondyles: The Histories*. Vol. 2, New York, Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Florescu, Radu R., and Raymond T. McNally. *Dracula Prince of Many Faces*. 1 ed., New York, Bay Back Books, 1989.
- Gawrych, George W. *The Young Ataturk: From Ottoman Soldier to Statesman of Turkey*. I. B. Tauris, 2013.
- Gazioglu, Melike. "Turkish-English Translation and Analysis." *Mersin University Faculty of Education Foreign Language Teaching Department*, May 2010.
- Geeraerts, Dirk, and Hubert Cuyckens, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. 1st ed., Oxford University Press, 2007.

- Hakola, Outi. *Rhetoric of Modern Death in American Living Dead Films*. Chicago, Intellect, 2015.
- Hoeveler, Diane L., and Tamar Heller, editors. *Approaches to Teaching Gothic Fiction*. New York, The Modern Language Association of America, 2003.
- Hough, Carole, editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. 1st ed., Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Howard, Michael. *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*. Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Jurković, Tanja. "Blood, Monstrosity and Violent Imagery: Grand-Guignol, the French Theatre of Horror as a Form of Violent Entertainment." *Coded Realities*, Coded Realities, Dec. 2013. Accessed 19 Apr. 2018.
- Kahneman, Daniel. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. 1 ed., New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- Kalman, Bela. *The World of Names: A Study in Hungarian Onomatology*. Translated by Zsolt Viragos, Akademiai Kiado, 1978.
- Kennedy, George A. *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical Cross-Cultural Introduction*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Laird, Karen E. *The Art of Adapting Victorian Literature, 1848-1920*. Routledge, 2015.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 3rd ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lewis, Geoffrey. *The Turkish Language Reform A Catastrophic Success*. 1 ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Mark, Karl. *Capital*. Reprint ed., vol. 1, New York, Dover Publications, 2011.
- Martin, Nicole. "Sorry, Shakespeare: the Power of Naming." Eng 317: Digital Rhetoric and Networked Composition, edited by Daniel White, University of North Carolina. Accessed 18 Apr. 2018.
- McNally, Raymond T. *A Clutch of Vampires*. 1 ed., New York, Warner Books Inc., 1975.
- Nandris, G. "A Philological Analysis of "Dracula" and Rumanian Place-Names and Masculine Personal Names." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 37, no. 89, June 1959, pp. 371-77.

- Puzey, Guy, and Laura Kostanski, editors. *Names and Naming: People, Places, Perceptions and Power*. Multilingual Matters, 2016.
- Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. Reprint ed., New York, Open Court; 1998.
- Skal, David J. *Something in the Blood*. W.W. Norton & Company, 2016.
- Stoker, Bram. *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula: A Facsimile Edition*. Translated by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller, McFarland & Company Inc., 2008.
- Stoker, Bram, and Ali R. Seyfioglu. *Dracula in Istanbul*. 1 ed., New York, Neon Harbor, 2017.
- Szurek, Emmanuel. "To Call a Turk a Turk: Patronymic Nationalism in Turkey in the 1930's." *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, vol. 60, no. 2, Feb. 2013.
- Tursun Beg, İnalçık, Halil, Murphey, Rhoads, *The History Of Mehmed The Conqueror*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978
- Thon, Jan-Noel. *Transmedial Narratology and Contemporary Media Culture*. 1 ed., Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 2016.
- Van Oers, Bert, editor. *The Transformation of Learning Advances in Cultural-Historical Activity Theory*. 1 ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Wolf, Leonard, editor. *The Essential Dracula*. Penguin Group, 1993.