

2021

Kazikli Voivode: Turkey's Nationalist Version of Dracula as Traced Through an Onomastic Journey

David Hansen
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/dracula-studies>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hansen, David (2021) "Kazikli Voivode: Turkey's Nationalist Version of Dracula as Traced Through an Onomastic Journey," *Journal of Dracula Studies*: Vol. 23: No. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/dracula-studies/vol23/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Research Commons at Kutztown University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Dracula Studies* by an authorized editor of Research Commons at Kutztown University. For more information, please contact czerny@kutztown.edu.

Kazikli Voivode: Turkey's Nationalist Version of Dracula as Traced Through an Onomastic Journey

Cover Page Footnote

David Hansen recently completed his Ph.D. in English Studies from Illinois State University, with a focus on Literacy and Cultural Studies. His scholarship focuses on vampires, monster studies, transmediation, and global-gothic storytelling. He has recently begun research into gothic First Nation storytellers so as to bring these narratives into his classroom and help broaden the diversity of the literary canon. He is currently an Instructional Assistant Professor at Illinois State University as well as acting as an adjunct instructor for Bay de Noc Community College in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

***Kazikli Voivode: Turkey's Nationalist Version of
Dracula as Traced Through an Onomastic
Journey***

David Hansen

[David Hansen recently completed his Ph.D. in English Studies from Illinois State University, with a focus on Literacy and Cultural Studies. His scholarship focuses on vampires, monster studies, transmediation, and global-gothic storytelling. He has recently begun research into gothic First Nation storytellers so as to bring these narratives into his classroom and help broaden the diversity of the literary canon. He is currently an Instructional Assistant Professor at Illinois State University as well as acting as an adjunct instructor for Bay de Noc Community College in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.]

**Onomastic Trajectory and the Fears of
Colonization**

While it can be reasonably assumed most scholars know something of Stoker's Victorian classic, it is doubtful many have heard of, much less read, its Turkish progeny by Ali Riza Seyfi, *Kazikli Voivode*. Seyfi's work is part of the literary tradition of taking a classic story and recontextualizing it. We see this in Shakespeare's reworking of *The Jew of Malta* into *The Merchant of Venice*, where, despite becoming problematic through the centuries, the Shylock character is made far more sympathetic than

his trap-door wielding predecessor. Another example is Goethe's take on the legend of *Faust*, the first part of which was itself reshaped into operatic form by Gounod and his librettists. These two examples recontextualize the original narratives and give new insight to aspects that were only hinted at in those earlier works. This holds true for Seyfi's text, which we will cover in detail later.

In brief, in 1928 Turkish historian and author, Ali Riza Seyfi published what has been commonly decried as an "unauthorized version" of *Dracula*. Titled *Kazikli Voyvode*, Seyfi's book replaces London with 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 from Stoker's vampire story but incorporates a Turkish sensibility to the events of the narrative, especially regarding the titular character. At the time of Seyfi's writing, the War for Turkish Independence had finally been won against European occupation following England and Greece taking up residence after WWI. In Stoker's novel, Seyfi must have found a representation of that struggle for cultural retention in the echoes of the Ottoman Empire's earlier assault by a 15th-century European dictator, the focus of Stoker's story. In it Seyfi may have seen the English author, unintentionally, supporting the European title of the noble in question; legitimatizing the self-given family name of a man as part of an order dedicated to the end of Seyfi's ancestors and their identity. To the Turkish mindset, this may have lent some

humanity to a figure whom the Turkish people knew primarily by only his title and his beloved form of executing those same people. It is this clash of cultural identity concerning the connotations placed on how this controversial figure was being perceived that is at the core of the onomastic focus and why we need to start at the roots of the name in question to understand the stakes¹ involved and why terms such as “unauthorized” or “pirated,” as used on the 2017 English translation’s 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 historical literary review.

Turkish Name for the Historical Vlad Dracula

In the Ottoman Empire, the historical names of Vlad Tepes, Vlad III, and Dracula were fairly meaningless to the general population. The reason for this is that around the year 1500, Ottoman writer and historian, Tursun Beg, established what became the main Turkish nomenclature for Vlad Tepes when he wrote *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror* in honor of that leader’s military conquests and eventual overthrow of Constantinople. In the few pages he dedicated to Mehmed I’s campaigns against the Wallachians, he only referred to Vlad Dracula as *Kazıklı Voyvode*.

This *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, however, was a very tyrannical man. If an individual from a certain village were to commit a crime, he

¹ Pun not intended.

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).

The origin of the term Kazıklı Voyvoda has two parts. Meaning the Impaling Warlord, the first part, “kazikli”, was the Ottoman term for Impaling. The second word, “voyvoda” (also sometimes spelled as “voivode”) was the Wallachian term for Prince or ruler. Interesting to note is that voyvoda may have its roots in the Russian word, “voevoda”, or “leader of the army.” It is possible to have originated from the Slavonic voji “warriors” and voda “leader.” Considering the potential for cross-linguistic pollination between Russia and Wallachia there may not be a definitive answer of which term came first.

At no point in the remaining history does Tursun Beg refer to Dracula by any other name. In short, the Ottoman name 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 is 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. 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 descriptor for Vlad Tepes since he was called The Impaler both within Wallachia and abroad during his reign, the title in his homeland was almost always made in conjunction with his given name, as in Vlad the Impaler. Only in the Ottoman Empire was he denied the application of his proper name or even his chosen sobriquet of Dracula. This striking of a common, one may say a “human” name, from 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 ², would have little significant meaning in Turkey until the 20th century. One last point must be included. Stoker demonstrates his understanding of the title the real Dracula ruled under and yet still chose that nom de guerre. In Chapter 18 Van Helsing states of the Count, “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. This term is one of the few

² While the word voyvoda is Wallachian term and not purely “Turkish”, it was the historical term used as essentially a proper name and can be interpreted as being grandfathered in.

points in common with Turkish sensibilities concerning the appropriate way of addressing the would-be colonizer. We see how Seyfi was building off of the seed Stoker planted concerning the historical nomenclature of the character. We will come to understand how this seed would eventually sprout its own vines and reach towards new aspects of onomastic research; specifically understanding Seyfi's vampire creation in the context of a cultural and linguistic revolution that was occurring in his country at that time.

Turkish Language Revolution

Central to this exploration of the onomastic interests of Stoker's novel are the roots of the Turkish identity. The molding of a new national identity out of the ashes of a once dominating empire laid the foundation for Seyfi's exploration of the issues surrounding language, most importantly the use and adoption of familiar names. Seyfi found inspiration when he read of Count Dracula's colonial intentions with respect to England, and he then simultaneously added critical context to the history between Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire (the time and place where the real Vlad Tepes *Dracula* came into the lives of the then Sultan, Mehmed II) while also touching on names of cultural identifiers.

In the early 20th century the disillusioned ex-Ottoman youth, the soon-to-be-renamed Young Turks, fought essentially a civil war known as The Turkish War for Independence following the country's occupation by Western forces after the

cessation of World War I in 1918. In the intervening years, a new national identity began to form, and in 1923, Turkey claimed these changes as a 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 named ‘Turkey,’ and qualifies as intellectual property of a discipline known as ‘Turcolog’” (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 in a war with Greece when that country attempted to take Ottoman lands until 1922 when both sides agreed to a truce that recognized Turkish sovereignty over its lands and peoples. The effects of constant warfare left Turkey in a weakened state with little sense of national identity. One way to rectify that, in Ataturk’s opinion, was to establish a new Turkish language utilizing the Latin alphabet. 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 history. These foreign “loan words” were to be replaced by others deemed more in line with the notion of purifying the language are, essentially, rebooting it to an earlier state of purity free from foreign linguistic contaminations. As a curious note, it appears Atatürk’s purge was seen as insufficient: in May of 2019, Turkey’s President Recep Tayyip Erdogan called for the further removal of foreign words in the wake of an attempted coup to his regime. As the onomastic³ lens reveals, now as then, language is often seen as a foreign infection and must be excised as a form of social and cultural control.

In 1965, 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 were adopted by the

³ According to authors Grace Alvarez-Altman and Frederick M. Burelbach, “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”) ...”. (Alvarez-Altman pg. III-IV)

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.

Turkish Remediation: From Book to Book

Shortly after the 1934 Regulations on Family Names, Ali Rıza Seyfi 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 of 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 is fascinating to examine is how Western authors and publishers labeled Seyfi's work as a "bootleg" of Stoker's novel and called it a "pirated work" and "unauthorized", giving the impression that it is a simple case of plagiarizing. The cover of the English translation of Seyfi's, *Kazikli Voyvoda*, is a misstatement of information and shows the fingerprints of a possible Western-based mindset. The book is titled *Dracula in Istanbul*, labeled as "The Unauthorized Version of the Gothic Classic", and is attributed first to Bram

Stoker and secondly to Ali Rıza Seyfioğlu, whose name is placed beneath Stoker's.

Seyfi never wrote a book called *Dracula in Istanbul*. In both editions of his book, the first using Arabo-Persian and the second a translation of his previous work using the Latin alphabet following the Language Reform, the title was *Kazikli Voyvoda*. *Dracula Istanbul'da* was the name of a Turkish film adaptation that worked to visually replicate the 1931 United States film starring Bela Lugosi. This can be seen as lessening the cultural memesis that uniquely situated the Seyfi novel for the Turkish audience.

Only in the first edition did Seyfi use his pre-Language Laws name of Seyfioğlu, and that edition was very limited in number and now remains hard to come by. The translators appear to have used either his original second edition book or the 1997 re-issue⁴ retitled as *Drakula Istanbul'da*. This version was far more closely tied to the film in that it used stills from the movie as well as additional pictures of other personifications of Dracula, namely in the images of Bela Lugosi and Christopher Lee. In short, while one can argue Seyfi had used his pre-reform name originally, he changed it for cultural ideological reasons. The translation thus does not honor the evolution Seyfi, as represented by his name, went through. A Western publisher ignoring, or completely ignorant of, the cultural significance of the name reminds one of colonizers imposing

⁴ In my research, I have not been able to discern which edition was used as both editions are essentially identical with only differences in some formatting taking place between them.

language ideologies supplanting native identities. The application of the word “unauthorized” again suggests the stigma of plagiarism and is reductive concerning the time, setting, history, and reforms integral to the novel’s creation that Seyfi was channeling into his Turkish creation. The factors Seyfi was working with were of sufficient difference that one could make the case it was transformative in nature and was, at its core, a unique entity. In contrast to this labeling, journalist and novelist Kim Newman⁵ 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). “Adaptation” rhetorically suggests a legitimacy to *Powers of Darkness* not afforded to Seyfi’s work. Stoker had indeed created a business arrangement with *Powers of Darkness*’s author Valdimar Asmundsson, but caution should be taken when considering how accurate that label is as there is no record Stoker read Asmundsson’s work as it was being published in serial form and was likely unaware of just how “free” an adaptation it was. In brief, only the opening bears a resemblance to Stoker’s novel, after which the Icelandic version takes its own wholly unique course. If something that has very little in common with its source can be awarded the title of adaptation without modifiers such as pirated or bootleg, why was this not true for Seyfi who, one can argue, was more faithful while still making it a unique Turkish

⁵ Himself an author of a several vampire novels, the *Anno Dracula* series.

story? I suggest Seyfi's work better 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 1922 film representation of her husband's work, *Nosferatu, Eine Symphonie des Grauens*. Translated as *Nosferatu, A Symphony of Horrors*

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. The current scholarship has been unable to discover how Seyfi came to be aware of the book and whether he decided to remediate the text, or if it may have been Ataturk himself who made the selection.

In 1928, Seyfi created what is considered to be in Turkey an indigenous novel in accordance with the historical name the Ottoman Empire interacted with Vlad Tepes under. I will further explore this point shortly. 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 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 zeitgeist 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 vampire'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 the United States, the intended audience 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 form 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 colonial invader who was a metaphorical blood-drinker, Vlad Tepes reportedly having dined while watching his enemies being impaled and merely dipping his bread in their blood, Seyfi's novel now created a literal full-bore 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 official 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 bite⁶. 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 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 the United States following WWI. These concerns for self-preservation, both

⁶ See Matthew Gibson's *Dracula and the Eastern Question*, Cristina Arteni, and Dragos Moraru's *Dracula: the postcolonial edition*, and Jimmie E. Cain's *Bram Stoker and Russophobia*.

inside and out of the novel, were clear threats to the newly born Turkish identity and would have compelled the Turks into taking action, just as the hunters in Seyfi's transcultural adaptation of Stoker's novel were compelled to take up arms against their own un-dead colonizer.

Turkish Transcultural Remediation: The Inherent Turkishness of *Kazıklı Voyvoda* and its Differences with *Dracula*

Let us investigate how Seyfi's text demonstrates its Turkishness to where it is considered an indigenous novel in that country and how it "qualifies as intellectual property of a discipline known as 'Turcology'." The first change is that crucifixes are not used to ward off the vampire; rather, garlic and part of the Quran are held to be far more effective. However, Seyfi suggests it is the nature of belief itself that wards off evil. Fascinating to note, and little mentioned in vampire scholarship, Seyfi makes a direct comment on the nature of the crucifix as opposed to a plain cross, something that had long been treated as interchangeable in vampire narratology. Throughout Protestant Stoker's novel, it is always specified that a crucifix is used to ward off evil, with the word "cross" never appearing in the book concerning the religious symbol. Azmi Bey, Seyfi's Johnathan Harker, is offered a crucifix by a peasant woman before going to Castle Dracula. "Then, as if suddenly remembering something, she handed me a small crucifix... Aside from being difficult and embarrassing for a young Muslim, it was also a

distasteful position for a rational man. Even a Protestant Christian, were he in my place, would hotly refuse” (Seyfi pg.10).

Seyfi clarifies that Azmi is not non-religious. “I had a uniquely-crafted ‘Enam Serif’⁷...that my mother hung around my neck. I not only wore that Enam until she died, but I carry that family heirloom with me to this day, thanks to that poor devout woman’s pleading and her dying wish” (Seyfi pg. 11). Talking to the peasant women, Azmi says, “Madame, do not worry. See, I have the holy word, the book of the great God around my neck. This will protect me” (Seyfi pg. 11). Seyfi addresses a point of debate regarding the position of the crucifix in different branches of Christianity, specifically the position of graven images in differing belief systems. In a way, he builds off of that pre-existing contention of holy symbols and introduces his Turkish counterpoint, using a miniature piece of the Koran as a blessed deterrent⁸. Next in the Turkification of Dracula is that the character is explicitly connected to Vlad Tepes through the inclusion of additional historical details. Dr. Resuhi, the Turkish Van Helsing, talks about the time three Turkish envoys were sent to Vlad Tepes and ended up having spikes

⁷ From the book’s footnote, “A miniature extract from the Quran containing some of its most popular and important chapters, or *surahs*.”

⁸ This is reminiscent of a similar point raised in a scene from the film, *The Fearless Vampire Killers or: Pardon Me, But Your Teeth Are in My Neck*. A serving woman, Magda, holds up a cross to ward off her Jewish boss turned vampire, Shagal. He looks at her, looks at the cross, and right before he bites her says, “Oy! Have you got the wrong vampire!”

driven into their heads for the offense of not removing their turbans in his presence. Seyfi's retelling of that story adds a new dimension to the original tale about Tepes. Historically, when Vlad had been an "honored" hostage of the Ottoman empire, he was trained in the customs and beliefs of the nation to be a better vassal lord to the Emperor⁹. "He knew well that Turks would never uncover their heads in his presence... Unsurprisingly, the three envoys did not heed his order, and they refused" (Seyfi pg. 130). He had purposefully set them up to offend in such a way as to justify their execution. "'If,' [Dracula] said, 'these Turks love their turbans so much, then nail them to their heads!'" This was no empty threat" (Seyfi pg. 130). This and other historical elements inserted throughout the novel add a core of Turkish nationalism to Seyfi's story which was not present in Stoker's novel.

There are no non-Turkish main characters. Except for the invading vampire, all of our main characters are Turks. No Dutch metaphysicians with their broken English and no American cowboys with their "Won't you just hitch up alongside of me and let us go down the long road together, driving in double harness?"¹⁰ ; only Turks. The closest deviation occurs in the character of the Turkish Quincy Morris, Ozdemir Oguz Bey. Ozdemir is from Anatolia, a major crossroads between Europe and Asia. While he is firmly a Turk, his background

⁹ He learned his signature impaling from the Ottomans. That form of torture was not being practiced in Eastern Europe at that time, certainly not to the extent he employed the technique.

¹⁰ May 24th entry in Chapter 5, *Dracula*.

establishes him as a nationalistic combination of an American cowboy and Che Guevara. Speaking of his time during the War for Turkish Independence, Seyfi has Sadan, our Lucy for this version, tell us: “Turan Bey (Arthur Holmwood) speaks constantly of what Ozdemir Oguz Bey did at the Usak front and in rear support... Raised in the ‘Efe’ culture¹¹... This young man from Aydin has also had a good education. His wealthy father sent him to Germany during the Great War” (Seyfi pg. 53).

There is something very suggestive about how this alteration reflects on Stoker’s novel. While often cited as a book rooted in deep fears of the conquering of England by foreign powers, Stoker does not fall into the mindset Seyfi was adopting. There is no Rule Britannia sentiment as opposed to Seyfi’s Turkology. By comparison to the Turkish Dracula, Stoker’s work seems more international in its approach and suggests a proto-United Nations. The English, Dutch, Americans, Russia (at least their sailors), and even the natives of Transylvania who begged Harker not to go to the castle all having a common enemy; a non-human apex predator.

Lastly, Renfield has been cut from the novel. This is possibly due to not wanting to suggest the possibility of mental instability occurring within the new Turkish nation. Or worse, showing a Turk who is made into such a societal outcast that he chooses to throw in with a foreign power who, at first, offers

¹¹ From the English translation notes: “The Efe were the leaders of bands of outlaws and guerilla soldieries in the southwestern Aegean region of the Ottoman Empire from the 16th to the early 20th centuries.”

him what he wants; a feeling of control over his own life. Turkey is portrayed as such a strong and unified nation that Dracula isn't even able to escape once he is trapped in the country. He is staked without ever even getting a chance to escape. Again, seeing how a truly nationalistic version of events could have been established by Stoker, there is plenty of room for acknowledging the flaws and mistakes made by the vampire hunters made in *Dracula*.

Dracula, as a character, is given an amalgamation of both Turkish and Western names within the context of the book itself. Azmi meets Dracula as a foreigner on his native soil and Seyfi has him use the non-Turkish name for the Count even if it is still acknowledged as foreign to the audience through the use of a visual cue. All given names with foreign roots are, in Seyfi's original text, offset by being placed in parentheses to illustrate their non-Turkish origin while acknowledging they are the given names for people or places outside the country. "(Transilvanya)", "(Karpāt)", and "(Bistric)" and just a few examples. The critical one to note is the parenthetical separation of the name (Drakola). While the Count is called both names, with preference given to Voivode later in the novel, it is visually indicated that "(Drakola)" is not Turkish while the title of Kazikli Voyvoda clearly is as it remains free of the confines of the parenthetical jail. The continued inclusion of the non-Turkish identifier for the Count rather than a wholesale replacement after the action moves to Istanbul is rather odd under the circumstances. However, a potential reason for using the word "Drakola" may

have been alluded to early in the text. After finally controlling himself after a sudden outburst while retelling the glories of his supposed ancestor, Vlad Tepes, Azmi comments that “This seemed only natural; could he behave otherwise with a Turk? He would not have felt it appropriate to vaunt or glorify his namesake, who perpetrated terrible, bloody cruelties and tortures on the Turks; who broke his oath, his word of honor many times and earned such sinister nicknames as Devil Voivode...” (Seyfi pg. 34).¹² Going back to the origins of the word Dracula, we know it picked up the connotation of meaning the devil around the time of the real Vlad III. In this context, it would make sense for Seyfi to continue to incorporate the foreign identifier of the character after he was revealed to be the historical warlord as it further identifies him as a literal “foreign devil.” **“There ARE such things!”**

After looking into how *Kazıklı Voyvoda* has been positioned to be adopted as an indigenous Turkish novel in that nation, I feel it has some claim to that position. The novel was written within the context of events and a cultural revolution that made it speak to its audience in a unique way that Stoker’s original simply wouldn’t have accomplished. While it may be easier to call *Kazıklı Voyvoda* an adaptation or a pirated text, we can see how Turkey, through the efforts of Seyfi, was attempting to situate its newly minted identity on the world stage. That rich cultural and linguistic context elevates it above easy

¹² In the Latin alphabet edition of *Kazıklı Voyvoda*, this was written on page 36 as *Seytan Voyvoda*.

categorization, much the same as was achieved by F.W. Murnau with *Nosferatu*. In *Kazikli Voyvoda* we are given a uniquely Turkish Count Dracula, placing the narrative in a non-Western vantage point and making him Turkey's real-life monster.

Works Cited

- 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. Burelback, 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., 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. Carl F. *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.
- Gibson, Matthew. *Dracula and the Eastern Question*. Palgrave Macmillian, 2006.
- 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*. New York, Farr, 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*. Reprinted ed., vol. 1, New York, Dover Publications, 2011.
- 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.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- 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 Roger Luckhurst. *Dracula*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Stoker, Bram, and Ali R. Seyfioglu. *Dracula in Istanbul*. 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*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 2016.
- Wolf, Leonard, editor. *The Essential Dracula*. Penguin Group, 1993.

Zabrodskaĵa, Anastassia, and Tommaso M. Milani. "Signs in Context: Multilingual and Multimodal Texts in Semiotic Space." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, vol. 228, 2014.