



“This unfortunate book”: Bram Stoker and the Edwardian publishing industry

William Hughes

To cite this article: William Hughes (2021) “This unfortunate book”: Bram Stoker and the Edwardian publishing industry, *Irish Studies Review*, 29:1, 1-14, DOI: [10.1080/09670882.2021.1880114](https://doi.org/10.1080/09670882.2021.1880114)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09670882.2021.1880114>



Published online: 28 Jan 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 40



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



“This unfortunate book”: Bram Stoker and the Edwardian publishing industry

William Hughes 

University of Macau, Taipa, Macau, China

ABSTRACT

This article considers the later career of the Irish Gothic author, Bram Stoker (1847–1912), and interrogates the publishing history of his penultimate work, the non-fictional study, *Famous Impostors* (1910). Making use of the unpublished correspondence of Stoker’s British and US publishers, it charts the development of the work from its inception (where Stoker was actually paid the same amount as his agent), through the period of its writing, when Stoker was seriously ill, to its revision and final publication. To date, *Famous Impostors* remains probably the least studied of the author’s works. This article will address that gap in critical knowledge, as well as presenting new biographical materials associated with the author and his experience of publishing in the early twentieth century.

KEYWORDS

Bram Stoker; Gothic; imposture; biography; letters and manuscripts; publishing; book history

Reviewing a new French-language biography of the author of *Dracula* in 1990, the critic Alain Garsault queried, rather wistfully, “Qui ne connaît *Dracula* aujourd’hui? Qui connaît son auteur, Bram Stoker?”¹ Even thirty-one years ago, Garsault’s statement was surely little more than the repetition of a cliché – the enduring truism that Bram Stoker was still, despite the long attention of Hollywood and the more recent investigations of academic criticism, the least-known author of the best-known Gothic novel. Such an assumption is not unique to Garsault, however. It has been rehearsed over the years by biographers and critics alike. Stoker’s earliest biographer, Harry Ludlam, noted in 1962 how the fictional Count “had found a niche in most of the world’s reference books” where “his flamboyant creator did not merit a single mention”.² That occlusion, it was subsequently suggested, arose from the author’s own reluctance to share his feelings, motivations or aspirations with anyone beyond his immediate circle. Hence, the more meticulously referenced 1996 biography by Barbara Belford claims that Stoker’s “reticence was monumental”, and as late as 2001, the critic Clive Leatherdale was apparently convinced that, even following the publication of three Anglophone biographies, “Close acquaintance with Bram Stoker is not possible. His immortal creation lives on but the author remains elusive”.³

Such sentiments are rather misleading. Stoker, certainly, was a public figure with a highly visible profile during his late Victorian heyday.⁴ His words were recorded and his actions reported in the press, and these punctuated passing conversation, no doubt, in the contexts of the theatrical milieu he shared with his celebrity employer Sir Henry Irving

(1838–1905), and in clubs and drawing rooms across Britain.⁵ Stoker may well have been *personally* reticent – this being a word he is somewhat fond of himself – with regard to directly reporting his private life in his own words, though his voluminous correspondence, journalism and biographical publications all surely constitute an index to his activities that remains, even now, relatively unexplored in criticism.⁶ The presumed elusiveness of Stoker may thus not necessarily be a thing of his own making. It is, rather, arguably a consequence or product of how criticism has, over the past 60 years, dealt with, appropriated and interpreted the life and writings of the author of *Dracula*. It is a silence prompted not by material deliberately hidden or accidentally lost but one engaged by the critical process itself, and by the consistent focus of criticism upon a restricted range of highly speculative issues and a singular, spectacular fictional text.

Stoker was arguably at his most “elusive” during that long period when psychoanalysis and psychobiography dominated – and, indeed, *prioritised* – the interpretation of *Dracula*. The Stoker of psychoanalytical criticism is a coded man, obliquely expressing fearful motivations and unspeakable identities through the public-facing texture of his best-known fiction. This is a writer whose words are replete with that full repast so beloved of psychobiography – sexual deviance and repression, familial guilt and oedipal desire, castrated men and *vaginas dentata*, totemic bands of brothers occluding sibling rivalries. It is a Stoker thoroughly embedded in, expressed by and quoted through Count Dracula and his mortal opponents, an author himself rendered as a fiction by way of a process which prioritises symptomatic interpretation over the physical matter of wider cultural context.⁷

The primacy of *Dracula* in the critical gaze has, inevitably, both inhibited and distorted the expanse of the textual archive through which Bram Stoker, as public writer *and* private individual, has been interpreted. The present century has, thankfully, seen the rise of a more mature tendency in criticism, one which permits – despite Maurice Richardson’s claim in the earliest recognisably academic response to *Dracula* – the explication of a convincing interpretation for the novel beyond individual or cultural psychobiography.⁸ Hence, recent criticism has implicated Stoker in materialist fields as various as those pertaining to gender and sexual identity, to the national and racial rhetorics invested in Irish nationalism and imperial expansion, to the histories of theatre and of medicine.⁹ This still-ongoing dialectic regarding the appropriate methodologies which might be applied to *Dracula* has stimulated, in particular, an interest in the material cultures which surround the breadth of the author’s works, as well as a considerable expansion in the range of texts which may be drawn into sustained criticism.

In addition to the recovery of published, though effectively “lost” fictions – most notably through the scholarship of John Edgar Browning – the hitherto unexplored manuscript archive bequeathed by Stoker has also been exposed far beyond the modest intimations provided by early biographers such as Harry Ludlam, Barbara Belford and Stoker’s great nephew, Daniel Farson.¹⁰ Some of this latter work is structurally organic in its original form, and has been reproduced verbatim – with a necessary transliteration of Stoker’s notoriously Byzantine handwriting – in volumes such as *Bram Stoker’s Notes for Dracula* (2008), edited by Elizabeth Miller and Robert Eighteen-Bisang, and the *Lost Journal of Bram Stoker* (2012), edited by Miller and Dacre Stoker.¹¹ Other materials are more disparate in their location, with Stoker’s letters being widely disseminated across various institutional and private collections, and but three of his literary manuscripts

currently available to scholars at the University of Leeds, Trinity College Dublin and the Folger Shakespeare Library.¹² It is this significant body of correspondence, as diverse in its thematic compass as it is scattered in its present physical locations, which remains arguably the last great resource to be exploited in the gradual critical evolution of Bram Stoker from a repressed and sexually single-minded tortured soul to a rounded, and essentially humane, Victorian gentleman. Indeed, it could be suggested that recent criticism has begun to restore an author whose writings consistently stress male honour, deference to women and a Protestant work ethic tempered by politically Liberal sympathies, to an image that might well be recognised by the man himself.

Stoker's surviving letters, a correspondence which may almost certainly be numbered in tens of thousands, is scattered both widely and in many cases outside of the accessible curtilage of research libraries and archives. A great deal, to be sure, resides in private collections, valued no doubt primarily for the fame of the writer or of the recipient rather than for its content. This, indeed, was the fate of much of the material disposed of following Stoker's death, the author's widow having entrusted Stoker's correspondence and autograph collection to Sotheby's for disposal alongside his extensive library. Sotheby's, in turn, dispersed Stoker's books to a variety of private collectors, and the drafts of a number of the author's novels and much of his collected correspondence to commercial manuscript dealers such as Maggs Brothers. These dealers in turn sold the holograph material on to collectors who remain, to this day, for the most part unidentified. Though there are now several significant repositories of Stoker correspondence across the world, the largest single cache – identified on its original containers as "The Bram Stoker Collection of Autographs" – is archived in the Brotherton Collection at the University of Leeds, England. Other significant repositories of correspondence include the Bodleian Library, the Library of Trinity College Dublin, the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust and the British Library's Manuscripts Division. Other institutions – including the National Library of Scotland, the Garrick Club in London and Colby College, Maine – hold smaller clusters of letters.

As might be expected of a man who was for twenty-seven years the trusted assistant of Sir Henry Irving, London's most successful actor and theatrical impresario, the largest body of extant correspondence concerns the management of the Lyceum Theatre. This material is, certainly, a telling index of *who* visited the theatre, even to the extent of recording individual requests for seats, private boxes and, on occasions, personal audiences with the actor himself on performance nights. It would be dangerous to stress the significance of much of this matter outside of a strictly theatrical context, however. Many of the letters were addressed to Irving rather than to Stoker, or else to Stoker as Irving's intermediary and custodian of notably scarce seats on opening nights. Though the letters frequently confirm the long list of celebrities which populates one volume of Stoker's *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* (1906), they are in themselves an index of their writers' interests in Irving and his art, rather than a reliable guide to Stoker's own intimate (rather than professionally theatrical) acquaintances. We may never know, for example, whether Thomas Hughes (1822–1896), author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857) discussed manly behaviour and muscular Christianity with Stoker, even though it is a perceptible preoccupation in both of their fictions. The only surviving correspondence between the two, from 1879 and 1880, concerns an invitation

from Irving to visit the Athenaeum Club and Hughes's request, annotated in Stoker's own hand, for a box at the Lyceum.¹³

If Stoker's theatrical correspondence thus fails to provide a ready index to his fiction, a more reliable resource to that end might be found in those letters which relate specifically to the author's writing career. Some of these are quite specific with regard to content. To note but a couple of examples, a 1908 letter from the explorer and imperial personality Archibald Ross Colquhoun (1848–1914) provided Stoker with a reading list in support of his 1909 novel *The Lady of the Shroud* – as well as with the surname of Sent Leger for his gallant British hero.¹⁴ Likewise, two letters sent to Stoker by the Anglican bishops John Dowden (1840–1910) and William Boyd-Carpenter (1841–1918), clarified the difference between Scots and English marriage laws in 1901, contributing to the legal accuracy of *The Mystery of the Sea* (1902) and *Lady Athlyne* (1908).¹⁵

Letters such as these confirm, to be sure, that which is already known: that Stoker was a careful researcher, and sought confirmation for the details of his fictional plots beyond the pages of reference works. The shaping and reshaping of Stoker's biographical as well as fictional output, however, was determined not just by research but also by his relationships with a number of publishers. These relationships are, again, evidenced by letters between the author, editors, printers, and, on occasions, the owners of commercial presses themselves. Less obviously attractive to collectors and biographers, these letters remain an almost totally unknown context to Stoker's writings specifically, and the late-Victorian and Edwardian publishing industries more broadly. There is little of this correspondence in the public domain. The two letters from Stoker to Cassell and Company held at the British Library refer not to the author's own works, but Irving's *The Souvenir of Macbeth*, produced by the Lyceum Theatre in 1889 and illustrated by Charles Cattermole and Bernard Partridge.¹⁶ A later letter from Stoker dated 27 April 1903 and archived in the Library of the University of Reading, concerns another proposed publication under Irving's hand.¹⁷ Of the other relevant letters in the public domain, two – in Stoker's hand – concern an unpublished and at present untraced short story "Jack Hammon's Vote", rejected on 23 September 1875 by *Blackwood's*.¹⁸ Another, written to Stoker by the Bristol publisher James Williams Arrowsmith (1839–1913), rejects – gently – the first draft of the romantic novella *Seven Golden Buttons*, which was eventually revised and published in 1898 as *Miss Betty*.¹⁹

The most substantial body of relevant extant correspondence does not, however, concern Stoker's fiction. The Bodleian Library, Oxford, houses the archive of Sidgwick and Jackson, British publisher of Stoker's topical study of fraud and imposture, *Famous Impostors* (1911). In this archive may be found carbon copies of a number of typed letters issued by the proprietors of the firm, Frank Sidgwick (1879–1939) and R. C. Jackson (1882–1917) to Stoker, to his widow, Florence (1858–1937), and to Sturgis and Walton, the US publishing house which produced *Famous Impostors* in a virtually identical edition in the same year.²⁰ Taken together, these various communications chart the progress of this book – which remains rarely read, even by Stoker scholars – from the submission of the manuscript to the distribution of finished volume.

Early correspondence in the archive suggests that Stoker was unable to find, in the first instance, a British publisher for a work so markedly different to the novels he had most recently published with William Heinemann. Stoker's biographer, Paul Murray, suggests that the author "was asked to write it by the London publisher, Sidgwick and Jackson",

though it appears that the project was introduced to the firm by W. F. Payson (1876–1939), an employee of Sturgis and Walton, a New York publishing house.²¹ On being approached by Payson in January 1910, Sidgwick and Jackson admitted “We rather like the idea” and intimated that “We should like first to see his list of Impostors, and if that falls in with our idea of the book, I have small doubt that we shall take up the proposition”.²² This list presumably proving satisfactory, Sidgwick and Jackson moved towards commissioning a British edition of the volume. Their proposed terms, as outlined in a letter dated 3 February 1910, again emphasise the volume’s apparently American origins. The form proposed to Payson that “We should propose to draw up a regular agreement with you regarding the details of the arrangement, and leave it to you to make your terms for the British and Colonial market with Mr Bram Stoker”. Payson was to be advanced £40 on the anticipated royalties of *Famous Impostors* – this being the same fee as was eventually advanced to the author himself.²³ Stoker received no further royalties from the publication of the volume, and the payment of the advance by way of a succession of £10 cheques issued from 31 March 1910 would suggest that the author was in need of ready money to pay off his regular domestic expenses.²⁴ To accept royalties in arrears – even at the generous rate of 15% proposed initially by the publisher to Payson – would have seen the author’s remuneration from *Famous Impostors* pass far more slowly, and with a less guaranteed regularity, into Stoker’s hands.²⁵ This convenient arrangement was to prove disadvantageous to the publisher. Some seven months following Stoker’s death in 1912, Sidgwick and Jackson wrote to his widow requesting her to agree to the publication of a cheap reprint of *Famous Impostors* in order to recoup the loss of £9 8/2d they had made on the author’s advance associated with the First Edition. Florence Stoker appears to have rejected the offer, or else the publisher’s enthusiasm waned, for the proposed half-crown cheap edition was never printed.²⁶

Stoker signed the contract for *Famous Impostors* on 22 February 1910.²⁷ Having negotiated a submission date of 1 July 1910 for a manuscript of between 80–100,000 words, he delivered his first copy – five biographies of “Pretenders” – to the London offices of Sidgwick and Jackson on 31 May 1910.²⁸ Further copy was supplied by the author with credible industry, but not to the proposed schedule. The receipt of Chapter 3, “The Wandering Jew”, was acknowledged by R. C. Jackson on 2 July 1910 and forwarded to Payson in New York on the same day.²⁹ At this point, the author appears to have departed from the linear programme of writing he had initially adopted, wherein the chapters were delivered in the order in which it was proposed they appear. Receipt of “The Bisley Boy”, the tenth and final chapter of *Famous Impostors*, was acknowledged on 3 July 2010, with Jackson’s postscript that “I have taken a note that the B.B. has to come last in the book”.³⁰ Jackson was later to write to Stoker that he “thought the Bisley Boy section is excellent”.³¹ Indeed, he intimated to Sturgis and Walton three days later that “The great hit in the book will be the Bisley Boy”.³² The chapter retells a Gloucestershire legend regarding the gender and identity of Queen Elizabeth 1 and, with its speculation regarding the gender of the Virgin Queen, might indeed be read as a controversial conclusion to *Famous Impostors*.³³

Stoker’s health appears to have been compromised at this time, for the letter is addressed to him not at his London home in Durham Place, Chelsea, but rather care of Miss Cay, Whinnyfold, Port Erroll. This seasonal village in Aberdeenshire was used as a holiday base by Stoker, who had earlier written at least part of *Dracula* at the nearby

Kilmarnock Arms.³⁴ Whinnyfold may have proved a cheaper refuge in financially difficult times, and Jackson concludes “I am glad to hear the change is doing you good and I hope the weather will continue fine during your holiday”.³⁵ An undated letter from Jackson to Payson confirms that “Stoker’s plans for delivery were upset owing to his illness”, and that the author was hoping to “complete” by the end of August.³⁶

Whatever the state of his health, Stoker was writing to a demanding schedule. Chapter 5 was despatched to New York on 9 July 1910.³⁷ A further letter to Sturgis and Walton, dated 13 August 1910, intimates that Chapter 2, which depicted Paracelsus, Cagliostro and Mesmer as “Practitioners of Magic” had been despatched with Chapter 3, “The Wandering Jew” three days earlier, and that the present letter contained the typescripts for Chapter 1, Chapter 4 on “John Law”, further matter for Chapter 5, and “The Bisley Boy”. Sidgwick, Jackson’s fellow director, concludes, confidently, that “Mr Stoker promises the whole of the remaining copy for this we [sic] week, and we hope to let you have the complete copy for the printer a day or two later”.³⁸ Certainly, the project was sufficiently advanced for Stoker to supply a draft of the Preface to his London publisher on or around 23 August 1910.³⁹ The ailing author had, indeed, completed his task to the revised schedule he had proposed.

Despite this expedient output, the progress of Stoker’s work from manuscript to printed volume was not to be an easy one. The work was, at one stage, over length and a letter in the archive intimates that sections on the Pigott Forgeries and Parnell, on the Humbert Case and on Religious Impostors were excised by the author around 6 July 1910.⁴⁰ There were practical difficulties, also. Sidgwick and Jackson had outsourced the printing of the unbound sheets for the British edition to Sturgis and Walton. Delays were therefore inevitable as copy crossed and re-crossed the Atlantic by steamship, and the American typesetters repeatedly failed to correct those elements identified by British copyeditors.⁴¹

Famous Impostors was deliberately scheduled to catch the lucrative British Christmas market, and Richard Dalby asserts that the book was published in mid-December 1910.⁴² The Sidgwick and Jackson correspondence, however, suggests that *Famous Impostors* did not reach British booksellers until early 1911. With no printed sheets received from America by early November, Jackson complained bitterly that the delay “makes it quite impossible for us to issue the book this year, which is extremely annoying, as we have been counting upon it for Christmas and have announced and advertised it very widely.”⁴³ Two advance copies of *Famous Impostors* were received from New York on 12 December 1910, and a nominal sale was made on Sidgwick and Jackson’s books to secure copyright and assert simultaneous publication with the US edition.⁴⁴ Receipt of the remaining printed sheets was acknowledged on 20 December 1910 and, even though these were sent immediately to the binder, the publisher observed tersely that “it is too late to issue the book this year”.⁴⁵ A letter from Sidgwick and Jackson dated 13 January 1911 advised the author of the impending delivery of the remainder of his gratis copies through Carter Paterson – the carriers mentioned in *Dracula* – and confirmed that “The book will be p [sic] published on Monday” – that day being 16 January 1911.⁴⁶

It is worth pausing for a moment to consider the significance of *Famous Impostors* in Stoker’s oeuvre and thus, also, its relationship to the closing years of both his writing career and his life. *Famous Impostors* is Stoker’s penultimate publication, and it was – like its successor, *The Lair of the White Worm*, which was published in November 1911 –

written rapidly by an author in relatively straitened financial circumstances and increasingly poor health.⁴⁷ Stoker's application for a small grant from the Royal Literary Fund – a request which was endorsed by William Makepeace Thackeray's daughter, the novelist Anne Ritchie (1837–1919); the barrister Henry F. Dickens (1849–1933), eighth son of Charles Dickens; and the Savoy librettist W. S. Gilbert (1836–1911) – betrays just how serious the author perceived his situation to be.⁴⁸ On his application form, Stoker claimed to have “No source of income except from work as author”. Even this latter was unreliable. The application continues: “No regular income last year 1910 except dividends from small investment totalling £409 capital rec'd in all £166. 1. 1. for literary work including advance payments”.⁴⁹ The author's health was clearly compromised, too. His letter of petition to the Fund's Committee, which is dated 25 February 1911, recalls his recovery from a paralytic stroke in 1906 before intimating that

Just over a year ago I had another break-down from overwork which has incapacitated me ever since ... For a whole year already I have been unable to do any work with the exception of completing a book begun some time before and the preparatory study for which has been largely done. This book, “Famous Impostors”, has been just published but I shall not derive any substantial benefit from it for about a year.⁵⁰

Lady Ritchie, in her supporting statement, further noted that Stoker

is now attacked by a terrible illness. He is losing the use of his limbs & can hardly walk even with a stick. He is wonderfully brave and cheerful, but he can no longer work & things are more & more difficult.

Such were the privations of the closing year of the author's life that, Ritchie confides, the family was forced to sublet part of their home in Chelsea and to keep only one servant.⁵¹ The Committee's grant of £100 on 9 March 1911 no doubt provided a significant element of relief. Stoker died just over twelve months later, on 20 April 1912: the telling and poignant word “exhaustion” appears on his death certificate.⁵²

Stoker was, in the years 1910–1911, demonstrably not a literary celebrity of any great public weight, notwithstanding the respect and affection he undoubtedly commanded amongst his friends and professional associates. *Dracula* had not yet obtained the reputation (or notoriety) it was to enjoy later in the twentieth century, and the author's more recent works were, for the most part, unreprinted at the time of his death.⁵³ As one anonymous obituarist intimated in *The Times* in 1912, the author of “*Dracula* and other novels” was more likely to be remembered for his *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* than for his romantic, adventurous or Gothic fiction.⁵⁴ It is quite possible that Stoker never really enjoyed a *primarily* literary reputation in his own lifetime, and was considered mainly through the filter of his theatrical activities – an occupation which, though physically and mentally demanding, admitted him into fashionable drawing rooms, introduced him to celebrities and political patriarchs, and ensured his constant presence in words and pictures in the popular press – at least during Irving's lifetime.

All of this is relevant to Stoker's direct relationship with Sidgwick and Jackson and his more oblique association with Sturgis and Walton. It is clear that, even as late as 1910, Stoker still enjoyed some residual reputation as a writer, though he was apparently not considered a novelist whose established reputation might carry a work unscathed and unaltered across the editing process. This much is evidenced by a truculent exchange of

letters in July 1910. The substantially complete manuscript of *Famous Impostors* appears to have been the subject of a form of reader's report at the hands of Payson and another Sturgis and Walton associate, Horatio Sheafe Krans (1872–1952), who reported on 11 and 8 July respectively.⁵⁵ Neither letter is extant in the Sidgwick and Jackson files, though Jackson's response – which is highly equivocal on the subject of Stoker's style and reputation – is archived. Jackson's response, dated 20 July 1910, begins:

We are in general agreement with your criticism, which none the less comes very late, as you have already had part of the "copy" some months. Mr Stoker was your discovery for this book, and we accepted him without building any high hopes on his literary style; and, therefore, we feel that your criticisms are for the most part too carping. We do not think Stoker such a Famous Impostor as you appear to.

Jackson's testy tone is, perhaps, in part defensive with regard to an author whom he knows to be ill and who he has met on more than one occasion. Despite the disparaging remark regarding the author's "literary style", Jackson is moved to assert that "The title and Stoker name ought to carry the book even though you find the style crabbed and heavy. The section on the 'Bisley Boy' alone is bound to create a lot of interest." An ultimatum is issued: Jackson threatens to "print it here ourselves, and try to find another American House to take it up", and demands an assurance of continued participation on those terms by return cable. He receives it.

Stoker, it appears, was "at once interviewed" upon receipt of Krans' and Payson's hostile missives, and if he was prepared to confess to "a certain degree of roughness in his 'copy'", he was probably powerless to resist Sidgwick and Jackson's no doubt more temperate request for corrections.⁵⁶ These latter appear to have been made progressively across August and September 1910, and with great (and explicitly acknowledged) resistance on the part of the author.⁵⁷ By 10 August 1910, Jackson confided to Krans that "we have cut a good deal of the extraneous matter and corrected the punctuation freely", explicitly aspiring to "sacrifice the style" to ensure "that the meaning is clear". Finally, Jackson admits

We agree that the MS is not as good as we had hoped for from Mr Stoker, but we think that your censures thereon are somewhat strict. You will doubtless find that it looks better in type; and for our part we think that the book, though not as creditable as we hoped, will pass muster when compared with plenty of similar works.⁵⁸

Jackson's trust in the author's willingness or ability to effect the proposed changes, whatever their degree, must be seen as somewhat conditional. In a letter dated 21 September 1910, he informed Sturgis and Walton that "We rewrote the introduction and sent it to Mr Stoker who returns it with a slight alteration."⁵⁹ The introduction as originally drafted by Stoker survives at Trinity College Dublin and it is, indeed, frequently couched in phrases more elaborate and extensive than those of the preface as finally printed.⁶⁰ Certainly, an economy with regard to overall length appears to have been exercised at the editing stage.

Famous Impostors is, perhaps, not the most significant of Stoker's writings, and the laborious process through which it reached print certainly justifies the publisher's woeful description of the volume as "this unfortunate book".⁶¹ It lacks the excitement of the author's earlier romances and Gothic texts and eschews the polemic of his later journalism. Even its relative economy of form – which contrasts so markedly with the final,

rambling novel that is *The Lair of the White Worm* – may be largely the product of another hand, and the consequence of decisions rooted in the physicalities and economics of book production rather than the whimsies of personal aesthetics. Despite this, *Famous Impostors* should be regarded as a significant work within the extensive canon of Stoker's writings. Through its association with an accessible and substantial archive of communications, *Famous Impostors* facilitates a unique insight into Stoker's working practices and provides an intimation of the tense relationship between the author's writing and his financial circumstances in the declining years of his career. The somewhat lukewarm reception of *Famous Impostors* by Stoker's American publisher in particular, and the modest sales the book generated in both Britain and the United States, are similarly a telling index of the eclipse of that career. Clearly the Stoker name did not by itself "carry the book", to recall Jackson's optimistic words, and it is debatable whether the cheap edition tentatively proposed by Sidgwick and Jackson to Stoker's widow in 1912 might have generated substantial sales. Reports of Stoker's death failed to revive a popular interest in the fiction which had – with the exception of the timely *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* – always proved more popular and saleable than his factual writings. It is quite possible that the relatively poor financial return from *Famous Impostors*, along with the difficulties encountered in its publication, prompted the author's return to Gothic fiction at the very close of his career. That *The Lair of the White Worm* was placed with the relatively minor British house of Rider rather than with William Heinemann, who had produced Stoker's novels in his most productive period of twentieth-century writing, may also be significant.⁶² Such might be the strategy of a writer wholly conscious that his output must now be associated with rapid remuneration rather than lasting reputation.⁶³ There is a certain truth in Hall Caine's assessment that Stoker "wrote his books to sell", and this would appear to be an imperative that dominated his output following the death of Irving in 1905.⁶⁴

With so much already written on Stoker's fictions, the time has surely come to address critical attention in the direction of those other works which – like *Famous Impostors* – hold the potential to provide a fresh insight into the author's life as a writer and as a participant in the political and social issues of his day. The very factual imperatives which underwrite such works as *The Necessity for Political Honesty* (1872), *The Duties of Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland* (1879) and *A Glimpse of America* (1886) surely demand attention in their own right. The same might be said, also, of Stoker's biographical work – not just the often imaginative biographies of *Famous Impostors* but the author's interviews for *The World* and *The Daily Chronicle*, his articles on Irving in *The Nineteenth Century* and in the volumes *Sir Henry Irving and Miss Ellen Terry* (1899) and *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* (1906). Similarly, Stoker's extensive contact with his publishers, like the frequent communication he enjoyed with other productive authors of his day – such as Arthur Conan Doyle (1859–1930), Hall Caine (1853–1931) and Israel Zangwill (1864–1926), to name but three – remains relatively unexplored. There is material here germane to the history of the book and to that of publishing more broadly which may both considerably enhance and condition the critical response to Stoker exhibited in academic discourse to date. With such a vast resource of unused – or, at best, underused – material awaiting those scholars who are willing to pursue their work in the archival environment, the next phase of Stoker criticism must surely lie not so much *Dracula*, but in writings beyond the author's fiction.

Notes

1. "Who does not know *Dracula* today? Who knows its author, Bram Stoker?"; and Garsault, "*Bram Stoker: Prince des Ténèbres*", 128.
2. Ludlam, *A Biography of Dracula*, 7. Ludlam is wrong in his generalisation: see items 7, 9 and 15 in Dalby and Hughes, *Bram Stoker*, 138–9.
3. Leatherdale, *Dracula*, 54.
4. See, for example, the opinion of Horace Wyndham (writing under a pseudonym) regarding Stoker's visibility on Lyceum opening nights: Auberon, *The Nineteen Hundreds*, 126–30.
5. Stoker subscribed to a press-cuttings service, receiving copies of articles and reports which mentioned his name. See Belford, *Bram Stoker*, xiv.
6. Stoker, "The Censorship of Fiction", 159.
7. See, for example, Astle, "Dracula as Totemic Monster"; Bierman, "A Crucial Stage in the Writing of *Dracula*"; Lapin, *The Vampire, Dracula and Incest*; Mulvey-Roberts, "*Dracula* and the Doctors"; and Roth, *Bram Stoker*.
8. Richardson, "The Psychoanalysis of Ghost Stories," 427.
9. See, for example, Deane, "Land and Soil"; Gibson, *Dracula and the Eastern Question*, 69–95; Hughes, *Beyond Dracula* 139–77; Ledger, *The New Woman*, 100–6; Smith, "Demonising the Americans"; and Wynne, *Bram Stoker, Dracula and the Victorian Gothic Stage*.
10. See, in particular, Stoker, *The Forgotten Writings of Bram Stoker*.
11. Stoker, *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula: A Facsimile Edition*; and Stoker, *The Lost Journal of Bram Stoker*.
12. Leeds University holds *Miss Betty* (under the title of *Seven Golden Buttons*), Trinity College Dublin has *Famous Impostors* and the Folger Library, *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving*. Six of Stoker's manuscripts were sold at Sotheby's on the first day of the sale of the author's library: Stoker, *The Forgotten Writings of Bram Stoker*, 239.
13. Thomas Hughes to Henry Irving, 3 November 1879 and 2 February 1880. Stoker Correspondence Box 19, Brotherton Collection, Leeds University.
14. Archibald Ross Colquhoun to Bram Stoker, 10 June 1908. Stoker Correspondence Box 8, Brotherton Collection, Leeds University. Colquhoun recommended Stoker to peruse the works of Louis Léger (1843–1923).
15. William Boyd-Carpenter to Bram Stoker, 24 February 1901. Stoker Correspondence Box 5, Brotherton Collection, Leeds University; John Dowden to Bram Stoker, 20 January 1901. Stoker Correspondence Box 11, Brotherton Collection, Leeds University. Dowden, a graduate of the University of Dublin and Bishop of Edinburgh from 1886, was the elder brother of Professor Edward Dowden (1843–1913), Stoker's tutor at Trinity.
16. Bram Stoker to Cassell & Company, 1 March 1889 and 4 March 1889. British Library, Department of Modern Manuscripts RP2687; Henry Irving, *Souvenir of Macbeth*.
17. Bram Stoker to Mr Jacobi, 27 April 1903. University of Reading Library, MS 90/3/1.
18. Bram Stoker to *Blackwood's*, 6 October 1874 & 19 August 1875. National Library of Scotland MS 4325/240.
19. J. W. Arrowsmith to Bram Stoker, 8 October 1894, Stoker Correspondence Box 2, Brotherton Collection, Leeds University. Arrowsmith was the publisher of, among other titles, Anthony Hope's *The Prisoner of Zenda* (1894) and *Rupert of Hentzau* (1898), Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat* (1889) and George and Weedon Grossmith's *Diary of a Nobody* (1892).
20. Dalby and Hughes, *Bram Stoker*, 76–9.
21. Murray, *From the Shadow of Dracula*, 255. Payson, it appears, was a published author with the firm as well as an employee or intermediary: see Farquhar Payson, *Periwinkle*. A British edition of *Periwinkle* was published by Gay and Hancock in the same year.
22. Sidgwick and Jackson to W. F. Payson, 31 January 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 253.
23. Sidgwick and Jackson to W. F. Payson, 3 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 279.

24. See R. C. Jackson to Bram Stoker, 31 March 1910 and 30 April 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 8, f. 33 & 8, f. 235.
25. Payson's original contract was amended in order to grant him a royalty of "5% all round" on the First Edition: see Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 22 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 374.
26. Sidgwick and Jackson to Mrs Bram Stoker, 28 October 1912, Oxford, Bodleian Libraries MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 20, ff. 74–5; Sidgwick and Jackson to Mrs Bram Stoker, 7 November 1912, Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 20, ff. 193–4. The original contract incorporated a clause preventing the publication of a cheap edition by the publisher in the event of the First Edition being remaindered. The financial disincentive for the author of any cheap reprint was, explicitly, an issue addressed during negotiations between Jackson, Payson and Stoker: see Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 16 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 338.
27. Stoker was shown – and commented upon – a draft contract as early as 16 February 1910, and the final document, accompanied by a letter of agreement by the author, was sent to Payson for signature six days later: see Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 16 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 338; Jackson to Stoker, 22 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 375; and Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 22 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 374.
28. Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 3 February 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 7, f. 279; R. C. Jackson to Bram Stoker, 31 May 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 8 f. 451. The chapters concern Perkin Warbeck; Sebastian, King of Portugal; Stephan Mali; the dauphin, Louis XVII; and Olive Serres, who posed as the daughter of the Duke of Cumberland in 1817.
29. Jackson to Stoker, 2 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 9, f. 151; R. C. Jackson to Payson, 2 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson, 9, f. 152–3. This latter suggests that Stoker had already completed Chapter 4, "John Law".
30. Jackson to Stoker, 3 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 295.
31. Jackson to Stoker, 11 August 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 323.
32. The letter notes the imminent publication of a book on the same subject and asserts that "we must do all we can to get our book out first". F. Sidgwick to Sturgis and Walton, 6 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 179–80.
33. See Stoker, *Famous Impostors*, 283–345.
34. The village in which the Kilmarnock Arms is located is variously known as Port Erroll and Cruden Bay. For a popular view of the association between the author and the region see Drummond, "Bram Stoker's Cruden Bay".
35. See note 30 above.
36. Jackson to Payson, undated. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 138.
37. Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 9 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 194.
38. Sidgwick to Sturgis and Walton, 13 August 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 326–7.
39. Jackson to Stoker, 23 August 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 384. The introduction was rapidly revised by Sturgis and Walton, and returned to Stoker in Chelsea on 9 September 1910 to be approved for inclusion in both British and American editions. Jackson intimated that "We are anxious to lose no more time and shall be much obliged if you will kindly return the 'copy' so that it reaches us in time to catch the American post on Wednesday": Jackson to Stoker, 19 September 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 494. Receipt of the revised introduction was acknowledged by Jackson on 21 September 1910, in a letter which also informed Stoker that "We hope to receive a batch of proofs shortly". Jackson to Stoker, 21 September 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 9.

40. Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 6 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 179–80. The Humbert Case occurred during the French Third Republic: see Spurling, *La Grande Thérèse*.
41. Sidgwick and Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 8 October 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 109; Sidgwick and Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 12 October 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 126; Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 15 October 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, ff. 162–3.
42. Dalby, *Bram Stoker*, 60; cf. Dalby and Hughes, *Bram Stoker*, 76.
43. Sidgwick and Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 12 November 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 366. R. C. Jackson advised one of his firm's travellers that "Our latest disappointment is that 'Famous Impostors' will not be ready in time for publication this year": Jackson to R. W. Sketchly, 14 November 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 373–4.
44. Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 12 December 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 11, f. 39.
45. Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 20 December 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 11, f. 101.
46. Sidgwick and Jackson to Bram Stoker, 11 January 1911. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 11, f. 223.
47. Dalby, *Bram Stoker*, p. 63.
48. Ritchie, apparently, at the time paid Stoker's wife a small amount each week for the nominal duty of reading to her in the evening. See Farson, *The Man Who Wrote Dracula*, 227.
49. Application Form for Abraham Stoker commonly called Bram Stoker, Correspondence of the Royal Literary Fund – File 2841. British Library, Department of Modern Manuscripts M1077/177.
50. Bram Stoker to the Committee of the Royal Literary Fund, 25 February 1911. Correspondence of the Royal Literary Fund – File 2841. British Library, Department of Modern Manuscripts M1077/177.
51. Anne Ritchie to Llewellyn Roberts, 20 February 1911. Correspondence of the Royal Literary Fund – File 2841. British Library, Department of Modern Manuscripts M1077/177.
52. The cause of Stoker's death has been the subject of some debate, following Daniel Farson's suggestion in the "Postscript" (233–5) of *The Man Who Wrote Dracula* that the author was syphilitic, the most extensive discussion being that in Skal, *Something in the Blood*, 490–3. For an alternative perspective to that of Farson and Skal see Shepard, "A Note on the Death Certificate of Bram Stoker".
53. The American (and in some cases Continental and/or Colonial) editions of Stoker's novels were normally released simultaneously with the British First Edition, or within a year or two of first issue. Actual reprints, however, in a new format or by different publishers, were for the most part issued only following Stoker's death in 1912, and may well have been negotiated by Florence Stoker (1858–1937), the author's widow, or her legal advisors. Of the author's twentieth-century novels, *The Mystery of the Sea* (1902) was reissued in a new edition in 1913; *The Jewel of Seven Stars* (1903) in 1912; *The Lady of the Shroud* (1909) in 1914; and *The Lair of the White Worm* (1911) in 1925. Only three novels were reissued during the author's lifetime: *The Snake's Pass* (1890) was reissued in 1909; *Dracula* (1897) in a paperback version revised by the author in 1901; and *The Man* (1905) as a heavily reduced American edition entitled *The Gates of Life* (1908).
54. Anon., "Obituary: Mr Bram Stoker". A similar opinion was expressed by the author's close friend, the Manx novelist Hall Caine (1853–1931), in a tribute published two days later than the notice in *The Times*: see Caine "Bram Stoker."
55. Krans was an essayist and editor, with a specific interest in Irish fiction.
56. Sidgwick and Jackson to Payson, 20 July 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 234–5. Jackson, notably, undertakes the process of revision and correction explicitly in a manner "consistent with not irritating Mr Stoker".

57. Sidgwick to Sturgis and Walton, 2 September 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 431–2; R. C. Jackson to Horatio S. Krans, 10 August 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 316–7.
58. Jackson to Horatio S. Krans, 10 August 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, ff. 316–7.
59. Sidgwick and Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 21 September 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 8. The letter makes a disparaging remark regarding the legibility of Stoker's handwriting. Jackson informed his American counterpart only a week earlier that "We are going to tackle the author about the Introduction and hope to send you a revised version of it on Saturday": Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 14 September 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 9, f. 466.
60. Library of Trinity College, Dublin: TCD MS 6168. The draft, in Stoker's own hand, is dated 18 August 1910.
61. Sidgwick and Jackson to Sturgis and Walton, 12 November 1910. Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, MSS Sidgwick and Jackson 10, f. 366.
62. Heinemann issued *The Mystery of the Sea* (1902), *The Jewel of Seven Stars* (1903), *The Man* (1905), *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving* (1906), *Lady Athlyne* (1908) and *The Lady of the Shroud* (1909).
63. Founded in 1908, Rider was particularly associated with the production of works of modern occultism, having absorbed the esoteric publisher Philip Wellby. Under the editorial direction of Ralph Shirley (1865–1946), Rider further developed the Wellby list and produced the *Rider-Waite Tarot* (1910), this still-popular deck being designed by Pamela Colman Smith (1878–1951) who produced the illustrations for *The Lair of the White Worm*. Smith, who was a long standing friend of the author, may well have aided him in securing the contract with Rider, a publisher which maintained a credible output of fiction well into the twentieth century. Rider produced posthumous and at times abridged reprints of *Dracula*, *The Mystery of the Sea*, *The Jewel of Seven Stars* and *The Lady of the Shroud*. For a brief note about Smith see Belford, *Bram Stoker*, 213.
64. Caine, "Bram Stoker," 16.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

William Hughes  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6221-060X>

Bibliography

- Astle, Richard. "Dracula as Totemic Monster: Lacan, Freud, Oedipus and History." *Sub-Stance* 25 (1980): 98–105.
- Auberon, Reginald [pseud. Horace Wyndham]. *The Nineteen Hundreds*. London: Forgotten Books, 2013.
- Belford, Barbara. *Bram Stoker: A Biography of the Author of Dracula*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1996.
- Bierman, Joseph. "A Crucial Stage in the Writing of *Dracula*." In *Bram Stoker: History, Psychoanalysis and the Gothic*, edited by William Hughes and Andrew Smith, 151–172. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.
- Caine, Hall. "Bram Stoker: The Story of a Great Friendship." *The Daily Telegraph* 24, April (1912): 16.
- Dalby, Richard. *Bram Stoker: A Bibliography of First Editions*. London: Dracula Press, 1983.

- Dalby, Richard, and William Hughes. *Bram Stoker: A Bibliography*. Westcliff-on-Sea: Desert Island Books, 2004.
- Deane, Seamus. "Land and Soil: A Territorial Rhetoric." *History Ireland* 2, no. 1 (1994): 31–34.
- Drummond, James. "Bram Stoker's Cruden Bay." *The Scots' Magazine* (April 1976): 23–28
- Farson, Daniel. *The Man Who Wrote Dracula*. London: Michael Joseph, 1975.
- Garsault, Alain. "Bram Stoker: Prince Des Ténèbres." *Positif* 353 (1990): 128.
- Gibson, Matthew. *Dracula and the Eastern Question: British and French Vampire Narratives of the Nineteenth-Century Near East*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1996.
- Hughes, William. *Beyond Dracula: Bram Stoker's Fiction and Its Cultural Context*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Irving, Henry. *Souvenir of Macbeth, Produced at the Lyceum Theatre, by Henry Irving, 29th December, 1888*. London: Cassell & Co., 1888.
- Lapin, Daniel. *The Vampire, Dracula and Incest: The Vampire Myth, Stoker's Dracula and Psychotherapy of Sexual Abuse*. San Francisco: Gargoyle, 1995.
- Leatherdale, Clive. *Dracula: The Novel and the Legend*. 3rd ed. Westcliff-on-Sea: Desert Island Books, 2001.
- Ledger, Sally. *The New Woman: Fiction and Feminism at the Fin De Siècle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Ludlam, Harry. *A Biography of Dracula: The Life Story of Bram Stoker*. London: Foulsham, 1962.
- Mulvey-Roberts, Marie. "Dracula and the Doctors: Bad Blood, Menstrual Taboo and the New Woman." In *Bram Stoker: History, Psychoanalysis and the Gothic*, edited by William Hughes and Andrew Smith, 239–246. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.
- Murray, Paul. *From the Shadow of Dracula: A Life of Bram Stoker*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2004.
- "Obituary: Mr Bram Stoker." *The Times*, 22 April 1912: 15.
- Payson, William Farquhar. *Periwinkle: An Idyll of the Dunes*, with illustrations by Thomas Fogarty. New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1910.
- Richardson, Maurice. "The Psychoanalysis of Ghost Stories." *The Twentieth Century* 166 (1959): 419–431.
- Roth, Phyllis. *Bram Stoker*. Boston: Twayne, 1982.
- Shepard, Leslie. "A Note on the Death Certificate of Bram Stoker." *The Bram Stoker Society Journal* 4 (1992): 34–36.
- Skal, David J. *Something in the Blood: The Untold Story of Bram Stoker, the Man Who Wrote Dracula*. New York: Liveright, 2016.
- Smith, Andrew. "Demonising the Americans: Bram Stoker's Postcolonial Gothic." *Gothic Studies* 5, no. 2 (2003): 20–31. doi:10.7227/GS.5.2.3.
- Spurling, Hilary. *La Grande Thérèse: The Greatest Scandal of the Century*. Berkeley: Counterpoint, 2000.
- Stoker, Bram. *Famous Impostors*. London: The Library Association, 1967.
- Stoker, Bram. "The Censorship of Fiction." In *A Glimpse of America and Other Lectures, Interviews and Essays*, edited by Richard Dalby, 154–161. Westcliff-on-Sea: Desert Island Books, 2002.
- Stoker, Bram. *Bram Stoker's Notes for Dracula: A Facsimile Edition*, edited by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008.
- Stoker, Bram. *The Forgotten Writings of Bram Stoker*, edited by John Edgar Browning. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012.
- Stoker, Bram. *The Lost Journal of Bram Stoker*, edited by Elizabeth Miller and Dacre Stoker. London: Robson, 2012.
- Wynne, Catherine. *Bram Stoker, Dracula and the Victorian Gothic Stage*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2013.