

Acknowledgements

Heritage is one of the key concepts of this book. As it happens, heritage can also be seen as a major force behind this book. In 1975 my father Kalervo Hovi published his dissertation *Cordon sanitaire or barriere de l'est?: The emergence of the New French Eastern European alliance policy, 1917–1919*.

Some thirty years later, a young Romanian scholar became interested in my father's dissertation and subsequently invited him to give a lecture on the subject at the Valahia University of Târgoviște in Romania. My father decided to ask if I was interested in accompanying him on this trip, to which I instantly agreed.

During this trip in 2002 I found my future research subject, Dracula tourism. This discovery led to a short seminar paper, a master's thesis, several conference papers, a dissertation and finally to this book. Whether one likes to call it a coincidence, fate or even providence, it is nevertheless true that there is a direct link between my father's dissertation from 1975 and this book, although the subject matter is quite different.

Because of this personal heritage and a myriad of other reasons I want to dedicate this book to my father Kalervo and also to my mother Ritva-Liisa Hovi. They both have helped and supported me in many ways during my research career so far.

I would also like to thank all the people who have helped me with my research. Unfortunately there are too many to thank individually, so I offer a collective thank you to all my colleagues who have commented my work during the years. I would especially like to thank all my colleagues at the department of Folkloristics at the University of Turku, and everyone at the Finnish Graduate Programme for Russian and East European Studies.

For financial support I wish to thank the following foundations and institutions, in chronological order: the Turku University Foundation, the Finnish Literature Society (the Martti Haavio and Aale Tynni Fund) and the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters (Jutikkala Fund). I would also like to thank the Turku Centre for Medieval and Early Modern Studies for travel grants that have enabled me to do much of my field work.

Thank you also to the “young Romanian scholar” professor Silviu Miliou, who has helped with my research in Romania and supported and encouraged me throughout my investigation.

In addition to dedicating this book to my parents, I also want to dedicate it to my wife Kristiina and to our lovely and beautiful daughter Anni.

Turku, November 2016
Tuomas Hovi



The Map of Romania. Pekka Tolonen 2014.

1. Introduction

Heritage and Dracula.¹ The pairing of these names might seem odd and even ridiculous at first, and yet, they both appear in the title of this book. Heritage can be related to both tangible and intangible culture, ancient monuments or urban environment, nature, or many other aspects of living culture. Heritage is that part of culture which is seen as especially important and worthy of protection, preservation and emphasis.

Dracula is a vampire character known from popular culture. Although he is one of the best-known fictional characters, he can hardly be seen as heritage. Dracula can also refer to a Romanian historical ruler called Vlad the Impaler, whose importance to Romanian history and culture is great. In this book, Dracula – both the historical and the fictional version – is the main attraction of Dracula tourism, the principal subject of my research. Within Dracula tourism, tourists can visit places connected to either the fictional vampire Dracula or the historical Dracula, Vlad the Impaler. In this book, I am interested in the interplay between heritage and fiction, and between tradition and tourism. How and why heritage and Dracula tourism are connected will be revealed and thoroughly analysed in this book.

Heritage and tradition are used in tourism all over the world. Heritage and tradition may come from within the culture of the visited location or outside of it, it varies nevertheless. Tourism is a global and also a globalising phenomenon, and that is why questions regarding the power relations when dealing with tradition, culture and heritage in tourism are becoming more and more topical. These power relations are often visible through stereotypes and stereotypical images, which are cultural generalisations or cultural models that are commonly shared. Stereotypes have the tendency of standardising cultures, and because Westerners are the largest consumer group in the travel industry, the standardisation of cultures is often done on Western cultural terms and stereotypes. These stereotypes are often also based on popular culture. The origins and the subsequent demand for Dracula tourism are rooted in Western popular culture. However, Dracula tourism in Romania is not just Western fiction and fantasy projected onto Romania. Dracula tourism in Romania is

1 This book is based on my doctoral thesis *Heritage through Fiction: Dracula Tourism in Romania* (2014).

a much more versatile form of cultural tourism, combining fiction, tradition, history, and culture. In fact, Dracula tourism can be seen as a way to promote Romanian heritage through Western popular fiction.

Why Dracula tourism?

Dracula tourism as well as tourism in general is an important field for research, especially from a cultural point of view. Researching tourism from a cultural study point of view, I find interesting that tourism functions as a promotional and marketing tool for countries, and for local actors and travel agencies to promote and market their destinations. It is interesting to see what kinds of cultural and historical aspects are promoted and highlighted, and what is perhaps left out. Depending on the point of view, tourism can be seen as a preserving, developing, or threatening force regarding cultural traditions. Tourism has an important economic, cultural and sociological impact in the world. Measured in numbers, according to the information on the webpage of The World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO)², tourism is one of the world's largest economic sectors accounting for one in every 11 jobs in the world and generated 937 billion euros in 2014. The number of international tourists is also large; in 2014 they numbered over 1,135 million. Since the global economic crisis of 2009, tourism has been growing every year.³

Dracula tourism in Romania is an important research subject for a variety of reasons. Dracula tourism combines tradition, history, culture, and fiction into an interesting whole, and therefore I find it an intriguing subject for cultural research. Dracula tourism in Romania is tourism where tourists visit sites and places that are associated with both the historical Dracula, Vlad the Impaler, and the fictional vampire, Count Dracula (Hovi 2008a, 73). Although there is also some Dracula tourism in Great Britain, Dracula tourism is mainly connected with Romania. In Great Britain it is associated solely with the fictional Dracula, the locations visited being in Whitby and London, whereas Dracula tourism in Romania covers both the fictional and the historical Dracula. Tourists may visit the Dracula locations on their own, but most Dracula tourists go on Dracula tours organised by various travel agencies. These tours differ in their length and in their choice of locations associated with either Dracula. (Hovi 2014, 64–65.) Although the emphasis

2 UNWTO is the United Nations agency responsible for the promotion of responsible, sustainable and universally accessible tourism.

3 UNWTO Annual Report 2014; UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2015 Edition.

on these tours is obviously on history and traditions about Vlad the Impaler as well as the fiction connected to Bram Stoker's book and vampires in general, much more gets related on the tours (Hovi 2014, 73–74). Outside Romania, Dracula is a well-known character from popular culture and has become so famous and so integrated into Western culture that 'Dracula' has come to refer to vampires in general. The reactions to Dracula tourism in Romania have always been mixed. Some people are against it, some are in favour and some are indifferent towards it. Those who oppose Dracula tourism see it as something that could be harmful for Romanian culture and history. (Light 2012, 135–136.) Because Dracula tourism is a combination of Romanian history and fiction deriving from mainly Western popular culture, Dracula tourism is in a way in a state of constant negotiation between local cultural and historical values and outside expectations. Although there are many cases within the tourism industry where the local tourist industry has to negotiate between outside expectations and local cultural values, I find some aspects of Dracula tourism to be quite unique.

Dracula tourism is unique, or at least unusual, in its combination of a known historical figure with a fictional character that derives completely from outside the history and culture of the original historical figure. Although many historical and mythical figures have been absorbed into Western popular culture like Robin Hood, William Wallace (*Braveheart*), King Arthur or the many characters of the Wild West, this has all been done more or less within the same Anglo-American culture and on the culture's own terms. The combination of the historical character and the character from popular culture has often been done with the interest and understanding of the culture where they came from. In the case of Dracula tourism, the character of Vlad the Impaler has been 'forcefully' attached to the Western vampire Dracula without any input from Romanian culture. (Hovi 2014, 61–62.)

One other factor that makes this case unique is Romania's recent history. Because Romania was a socialist country for the last half of the twentieth century (from 1948 to 1989), and therefore many times in a juxtaposition with the West, the prominently Western fictional Dracula character and its use and attachment to Romania adds another dimension to the phenomenon.⁴ During the 1980s the attitudes toward Dracula tourism in Romania started to shift from reluctant approval to reactions that were a little more hostile. (Light 2012, 53–54, 82.) For some, the Dracula from literature and its link to Vlad

4 By West and Western I am here referring to the East–West division of the Cold War era and even though I realise that this division is not a black-and-white one, I feel that it is appropriate for this topic.

was even seen as an attack on Romanian history (Ionescu 1986, 24). Remnants of this attitude towards Dracula tourism can still be found in Romania today. During the socialist years Dracula was seen as a Western cultural threat against Romanian history. After the 1989 revolution Dracula was no longer treated as a negative word in Romania, and Dracula was quickly adopted as a brand name by many entrepreneurs in the private sector. (Light 2012, 113–115.) Vampires and Dracula were among other ‘Western’ influences that found their way into Romania after 1989. However, the reactions toward Dracula tourism were and are mixed, and some people, echoing the concerns from the socialist era, still feel that by giving in and embracing the foreign character of Dracula, Romanian culture and history are threatened. It is interesting that the attitudes toward Dracula tourism in Romania have often reflected Romania’s contemporary relations and reactions with Western Europe and the United States. I will elaborate on this more thoroughly in chapter 3. Dracula tourism can therefore also be seen as one case with which to view the cultural impacts of the fall of socialism on a formerly socialist country and the ways the country imagines itself and tries to find its position vis-à-vis the West from a cultural point of view.

The main research questions and key concepts

This research deals with the use of tradition and history in Dracula tourism in Romania. The key concepts of this research are tourism, tourist, tradition, history, fiction, hybridisation, authenticity and heritage. Although most people, if not all, have a general understanding of what tourists and tourism are, the actual definition of both of these concepts has been very challenging, because of the multiplicity of disciplinary and paradigmatic approaches that have been connected with the tourism phenomena. Tourism has been seen in a relationship between leisure, recreation and other social practises and behaviour and also as an industry. (Hall, Williams & Lew 2004, 4–7.) As an industry, however, tourism is widely regarded as a fundamentally different type of industry from other forms of commodity production because as such tourism is not a simple product but a wide range of products and services that interact to provide an opportunity to fulfil the touristic experience (Debbage & Ioannides 2004, 100). Following the definition given by the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) in 1995, Stephen L. J. Smith defines tourism as a ‘set of activities of a person travelling to a place outside his or her usual environment for less than a year and whose main purpose of travel is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited’ (Smith 1995, 22). Tourism

can similarly be seen as 'the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business or other purposes' (Holden 2008, 3).

One classic definition of tourism has been linked with the purpose of the trip and the difference between leisure and work-related trips (Ryan 2003, 24). This definition is not without its limitations because there are usually also some kinds of leisure activities on work-related trips and sometimes also vice versa. Chris Rojek and John Urry have responded to criticism about the problematic nature of tourism as a theoretical category by encouraging those who criticise it to operationalise tourism. As an example they mention the definition of tourism involving a certain amount of time for staying in a country without trying to see whether these stays have the same significance to the visitors. By ignoring this, the researcher is placing together quite different social practices into one operational category and thereby possibly ignoring the reasons that the visitors have for their visits. (Rojek & Urry 1997, 2.) In my view one of the most important factors for defining tourism (and a tourist) lies precisely in the reasons that the visitor has for his or her visit and whether or not he or she defines the visit or parts of it as tourism.

Tradition is understood in folklore studies as being the 'past in the present'. Tradition is something that is created through human action with thought and imagination and then handed down from one generation to the next. Tradition becomes meaningful and important when the link between the present and a past that is invested with ethnic or national significance becomes topical. (Siikala & Ulyashev 2011, 20.) As a concept, tradition is also confined to the present. According to Richard Handler and Jocelyn Linnekin, although tradition is a model of the past, it is inseparable from the interpretation of tradition in the present (Handler & Linnekin 1984, 276). Like tradition, history is also a wide concept that has many definitions. What I mean by history are the shared and widely acknowledged interpretations of the past, within given groups. These interpretations may also differ within the community and between academia and laymen. The main point is to understand that history is not the same as the past, but consists of interpretations of the past. I am interested in how and what kind of tradition and history are used in Dracula tourism and why and also what kind of tradition and history are seen as important in Dracula tourism. Because the use of history is always a subjective decision in tourism, I want to find out what eras of history are highlighted in tourist sites and what are left out. These decisions are made by actors that include national tourist boards, ministries of tourism, travel agencies (both foreign and Romanian), the owners of locations and tour guides. I am therefore researching the way Romanian travel agencies use history and tradition in their tours. I am

especially interested in history and tradition that is used that is not connected to Vlad or Dracula. I will also look at Dracula tourism and see if it can itself actually be called tradition and even Romanian tradition.

Because of the nature of Dracula tourism I am also interested in the interplay and negotiations between tradition, history and fiction in Dracula tourism and how Romanian tradition and history coexist with Western fiction in Dracula tourism. What I mean by fiction in this case is everything that is connected with Bram Stoker's Dracula, vampires and with the image of Romania and Transylvania in (mainly Western) popular culture in general. It is somewhat difficult to differentiate between fiction, history and tradition because the line between them is not always very clear. The history of Vlad the Impaler that is used in the tour-guide narrations, for example, is partly based on the legend tradition about Vlad, which, although to an extent based on historical events, has many fictitious elements in it. What I mean by fiction here is both what the tour guides themselves call fiction and my own interpretation, but the actual definition and distinction between fiction, tradition and history is more based on the tour-guide narrations and the webpages of various travel agencies than on my own interpretations. Furthermore I will discuss whether the dichotomy of fiction and tradition in Dracula tourism is as black and white as it seems. Is it really purely the case of popular culture from outside of Romania vs. Romanian culture or inside culture vs. outside culture or global culture vs. local culture? I investigate this through the concepts of hybridisation and creolisation. These terms both refer to the same process of the mixing and adaptation of cultural elements into new forms of culture (Baron & Cara 2003, 4; Kapchan & Strong 1999, 241). I am also interested in the idea of how Dracula tourism could be used as a gateway into Romanian history and culture and whether Dracula tourism can also be seen as a channel for expressing cultural differences.

All of the above questions lead in their own way to my main research question, which is how can Romanian heritage and culture be shown and promoted through a seemingly superficial Dracula tourism which is based on Western popular culture? Is it possible to find Romanian heritage through popular fiction in Dracula tourism? In addition to the concepts mentioned and explained above, the three main ideas of this research that need to be more thoroughly explained are authenticity, heritage and popular culture.

Authenticity

As a discipline, folkloristics has a long history in dealing with the concept of authenticity. Authenticity has been used as a defining and legitimising factor in the formation of the discipline, especially in the United States, and for many decades the dichotomy of 'authenticity versus inauthenticity' was one of the driving forces behind this definition. In the 1950s American folklorist Richard Dorson introduced the term *fakelore* to depict the use of folkloric elements in a fictional setting. According to Regina Bendix, Dorson initially used the popular Paul Bunyan stories and later Benjamin A. Botkin's successful *A Treasury of American Folklore* series as examples of *fakelore*. Dorson wanted to distinguish between properly documented oral folklore and rewritten materials among which he counted Paul Bunyan stories and Botkin's work. (Bendix 1997, 23 & 190.) After Dorson the dichotomy between real and fake folklore started to crumble with the static, text-oriented approach yielding to a process- and performance-oriented folkloristics (Bendix 1997, 194). In the 1970s and 1980s such researchers as Dell Hymes and Dennis Tedlock both took stands on authenticity, with Hymes attaching truth and authenticity to performances and Tedlock arguing for authenticity to be captured by critiquing past treatments of native literatures and using new techniques to record narratives. (Bendix 1997, 201–204.)

According to Bendix the emergence of the concept of ethnicity and its research in folklore studies challenged the unreflective use of authenticity in the mid 1980s; 'Ethnicity studies forced folklorists to question their dichotomous practices, articulated most fruitfully by Abrahams and Susan Kalčik, who spelled out why Dorson's exclusion of *fakelore* hampered effective study and participation in the multicultural politics of the 1970s' (Bendix 1997, 208). In a multicultural world the idea of the authenticity or the 'pureness' of folklore was no longer seen as useful or even as achievable in folkloristic research. By the late 1980s such concepts as the invention of culture or tradition and the 'imagined' had become central concerns of scholarship and the talk of authenticity faded into the background. According to Bendix, Alan Dundes saw that *fakelore* might be just as integral an element of culture as folklore, and it should be studied like other folklore. Since the early 1990s the constructed nature of authenticity has been more or less fully acknowledged and problematised. (Bendix 1997, 214–217; Briggs 1993.) The questions about whether some subject of folkloristic research is authentic have more or less changed to questions about the need for authenticity, who are the actors who need authenticity or how authenticity is used (Bendix 1997, 21).

Even if authenticity is not as visible in folklore research as it used to be, it is still evident in tourism and therefore also in tourism studies. In tourism the words 'authenticity', 'genuine' and 'real' are used constantly to promote certain locations or events. According to Dean MacCannell, 'The rhetoric of tourism is full of manifestations of the importance of the authenticity of the relationship between tourists and what they see' (MacCannell 1999, 14). By marking a site as authentic, destinations have assured themselves a steady flow of tourists engaged in sightseeing (Richards 2007, 4). Because authenticity is so embedded in tourism, it is no surprise that authenticity is also frequently mentioned, discussed and defined in tourism studies. Actually authenticity is such a major theme that one can hardly find a book about tourism where the word and concept of authenticity is not mentioned. The role of authenticity in tourism experiences and expectations is, however, contested to a certain degree. In general the tourist- and tourism-related discourses have conveyed an idea that there are two opposing types of tourism and tourist places: those that enjoy the contrived sites and don't care about the inauthenticity and those that are seeking authenticity in real and natural settings (Tucker 2002, 144). According to Jillian M. Rickly-Boyd, D. J. Boorstin argued in 1961 that tourism is a pseudo-event in which tourists seek inauthenticity as a justification for their inauthentic lives, whereas MacCannell responded to these claims in 1971 by arguing that as a result of the alienation of modernity tourists seek authenticity. Since then some researchers have concluded that even though tourists might still be searching for authenticity on their trips, the authenticity is not objective authenticity but symbolic authenticity, and because symbolic authenticity is not based on an exact, discoverable original, it actually allows tourists to determine what is authentic. (Rickly-Boyd 2012, 272.) Similarly some researchers have come to the conclusion that while in earlier times tourists may have gone in search of the authentic, the postmodern tourist delights also in the inauthentic (MacCannell 2001, 24; Urry 2002, 12).

Eric Cohen argues that authenticity is a socially constructed concept and its social connotation is not given, but negotiable (Cohen 1988, 374). Therefore authenticity in tourism, as in folklore research, is flexible and negotiable. Authenticity is largely based on preconceived stereotypic images that the tourists have of the visited locations and is therefore a negotiation and a combination of the expectations of the tourists and the supply and explanations given by the tourism organisers. The focus on authenticity in tourism research seems to be moving from the concept of authenticity as something one can possess or as a state of mind towards a concept of authenticity that is experienced, felt or performed (Knudsen & Waade 2010, 1). Authenticity is a major factor in Dracula tourism regarding, for example, the tradition that is used

and the combination of history and popular culture. In this work I investigate how authenticity can be redefined and used in tourism research as well as in folkloristics. I am interested in dividing authenticity into experienced authenticity and historic authenticity. I will return to these questions in chapter 5.

In Europe and especially in Germany the questions and discussions of authenticity have mostly focused on the term *folklorism* (*folklorismus*) which was used prominently by Hans Moser in the 1960s. Moser saw folklorism as second-hand folklore or second-hand mediation and presentation of folk culture. (Bendix 1997, 176–177; Šmidchens 1999, 52.) Although Moser intended the term to be an objective and non-judgemental characterisation, the terms he used to describe folklorism like ‘genuine’, ‘falsified’, ‘second-hand’ and ‘breathing originality’ made the objectivity of the term questionable right from the start. Folklorism was very quickly linked to the debate concerning the genuine versus spurious or authentic versus inauthentic. (Bendix 1997, 177&182.) According to Hermann Bausinger, folklorism meant the use of material or stylistic elements of folklore in a context which is different and foreign to the original tradition (Bausinger 1984:1405). Folklorism has traditionally been linked to either economic motives, with tourism being the most obvious example, or with politic and ideological motives like nationalistic celebrations (Šmidchens 1999, 57). Although the illusions of authentic folklore and the search for the authentic might no longer be valid themes in research that focuses on folklorism (Bendix 1997, 186), and some scholars feel that folklorism should be used and perhaps redefined (Šmidchens 1999), I find that the use of the concept is not without its risks. The problem with the term folklorism is that it does make the distinction between folklore and its use (or folklore and non-folklore), and therefore is inevitably evaluative by nature. By labelling something as folklorism the researcher may belittle and downplay the cultural value and significance of the actual performance that he or she is researching. The problem with folklorism lies also in its determination. As the Finnish folklorist Lauri Honko stated,

A lament performed during an interview or on a stage is folklorism of the basest order, even though the performer puts her whole heart into it, whereas the chat between lamenters in an interview or in the dressing room is genuine folklore. Such distinctions make no sense. (Honko 2013, 49.)

Honko was of the opinion that folklorism is an example of how a term or concept that has acquired pejorative overtones can even paralyse research. According to Honko the term folklorism should be disregarded and forgotten altogether because of its connotations of inauthenticity. (Honko 2013, 49.) In

its place Honko offers the folklore process and division of folklore into many life stages and into folklore's two main phases of life. According to Honko, folklorists should 'try to restore the research value of events in the second life of folklore to something approaching their indisputable cultural value' (Honko 2013, 49). By folklore process Honko meant the stereotypic life-history of folklore in any culture which begins in the era before the birth of the concept of folklore and ends with the present-day assessment of the meaning of folklore in its culture (Honko 2013, 38). Honko divided the folklore process into 22 stages. The first 12 stages belong to the first life of folklore or are subordinate to it and the remaining 10 belong to the second life of folklore. The model of folklore process is evolutionary and the stages have an order of their own, but it is also multilinear and the order of the stages can in reality be different. Some stage might also run parallel to another or even be omitted. (Honko 2013, 38–39.) I will deal with the folklore process in more detail in chapter 5.

Invented traditions

A concept that has been often mentioned in relation to authenticity is the concept of 'invented traditions' by Eric Hobsbawm in *The Invention of Tradition*, which was first published in 1983 and was edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. As 'invented traditions' Hobsbawm counted both such tradition as was actually invented, constructed and formally instituted, and tradition that emerged in a less easily traceable manner within a brief and dateable period (Hobsbawm 1983,1). Hobsbawm's ideas have been debated and criticised within folklore studies and they have also been intertwined with the scholarly debates about authenticity (Bendix 1997, 211 & 216; Cohen 1988, 380; Wang 1999, 354–355). Authenticity and the idea of invented traditions are also more widely connected, for example in tourism studies. In tourism questions about authenticity and invented traditions have been raised when for example researching tourist places which are known from popular culture and are based solely on fiction (Peterson 2005, 1085). There are, however, numerous examples of invented traditions in tourism. Besides popular culture, these inventions can, for example, deal with different musical styles, musical performances or folk art.

Heritage

Heritage or cultural heritage has become a popular field of research in cultural studies. This is especially the case in studies dealing with tourism. The concept of heritage is used in political agendas, in the affirming of national identity, in preserving buildings, customs and traditions that are seen as important and in justifying economic interests. Because of the popularity of the concept of heritage, there is a phenomenal amount of literature about it. Despite, or maybe because of its universality, the term heritage has become harder to define. One might even say that there are as many definitions of the concept of heritage as there are heritage practitioners, although many commentators also leave the definition as broad as possible. (Harvey 2007, 25.) The best-known example of preserved cultural heritage is of course UNESCO and its list of World Heritage sites. Heritage can be officially and politically defined on a global level from the outside as in the case of UNESCO or it can be defined within a country, community or small group. According to Dallen J. Timothy, the heritage tourism experience can be categorised into four types of heritage: world, national, local and personal. These categories are not, however, absolute, for there is shared heritage experience which can be seen as overlapping between these categories. (Timothy 1997, 752.) Similarly, heritage itself can be divided into the same four categories: world heritage, national heritage, local heritage and personal heritage. Even in the case of UNESCO and its list of World Heritage sites where the decisions are made outside the country where the site to be is located, the sites must be put forward by local governments or delegates. (Eriksen 2001, 2; Leask 2006, 8–10.)

Heritage can be seen as a cultural process rather than a physical artefact or record. Heritage is not inert or static and people constantly engage, rework, appropriate and contest it. Heritage is part of the way that identities are created and disputed and this can be done by an individual, a group or a nation state. (Harvey 2007, 37.) Stuart Hall has described heritage as referring to the whole complex of organisations, institutions and practices devoted to the preservation and presentation of culture and the arts, such as art galleries, specialist public and private collections, museums of all kinds and sites of special historical interest (Hall 2007, 87). Heritage can be both tangible and intangible culture. The meaning of heritage has broadened to encompass ‘ancient monuments, the built urban environment, aspects of the natural environment and many aspects of living culture and the arts.’ (Timothy & Boyd 2003, 3–4.) Heritage is associated with efforts to preserve and celebrate ethnicity, locality and history. According to Regina Bendix, heritage is used as a concept and practice that local groups can rally behind with pride and at the same time it allows one

to attract outsiders to come to visit and admire it for a suitable price. (Bendix 2000, 38.) Heritage can be used and seen as a cultural, political and economic resource (Tunbridge & Ashworth 2007, 207–233).

One place where heritage is seen as an especially important resource is the travel industry, where heritage is heavily used and promoted. Heritage and culture have become so important in the tourism industry that cultural heritage has become an independent part of tourism called heritage tourism (Timothy & Boyd 2003, 1). Heritage tourism can be personal and associated with one's family or community heritage or it can be shared and collective heritage. It is also possible that places of personal heritage can simultaneously be national or even world heritage sites. (Marschall 2012, 329.) In fact heritage and tourism have become inextricably linked all over the world (Hall 1994, 180). This link has been viewed in both a negative and positive light. It has been seen as producing inauthentic and falsified tradition (as for example folklorism or even fakelore), something that is not 'real' and authentic. According to some researchers the whole premise of heritage already includes fabrication and falsification and the question of authenticity is therefore not a problem (Lowenthal 2007, 111). Tourism can also be seen as a threat to cultural heritage (Kalay, Kvan & Affleck 2007, xv). On the other hand the link can be seen as a positive thing, as something which helps to preserve heritage, culture and folklore in a changing and globalising world. In short, heritage is a part of culture or history that someone has defined as especially important to preserve.

One way to try to explain heritage is to compare it with the concept of history. According to Dallen J. Timothy and Stephen W. Boyd if history is ideally the recording of the past as accurately as is possible in so far as it can be accurate given present-day limitations of knowledge, then heritage includes a range of aspects such as culture, language, identity and locality which have been defined as especially important and worth saving. So history is what historians and to some degree society regard as worth recording, and heritage is what contemporary society chooses to inherit and to pass on. (Timothy & Boyd 2003, 4; Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 6.) Heritage has been heavily criticised, usually by opposing it to history. Heritage has been called bogus history or viewed as something processed into a commodity through mythology, ideology, nationalism and marketing. David Lowenthal argues that heritage should not be confused with history at all because the two concepts are very different in nature. Lowenthal argues that while history seeks to convince by truth and succumbs to falsehood, heritage exaggerates, omits, invents, forgets and thrives on both ignorance and error. (Lowenthal 2007, 111.) And although selection, alteration and invention also happen in history, the premise in history is to conform to accepted tenets of evidence, a premise that heritage does

not have (Lowenthal 1998, 112; Lowenthal 2007, 111). Bella Dicks argues that if history is also seen as embedded in ordinary people's memorial activities as well as in academic texts then the distinction between heritage and history may be seen as more complex. (Dicks 2004, 134.)

Heritage is also seen as more strongly tied to the present and the future than to the actual past, and is in fact viewed as the contemporary use of the past (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000, 2). Barbara Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, for example, has argued that 'heritage produces something new in the present that has recourse to the past' (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 149). Therefore the definition of heritage actually comes close to the definitions of tradition given earlier in this work. Like heritage, tradition is also something that is chosen and selected from the past and interpreted in the present. The difference between tradition and heritage is that tradition as such is not heritage, but it can become heritage if it is seen as important enough for the group, society or nation that uses and defines it. Heritage is not something that exists on its own; it is something that always has to be defined as such by someone. To draw a short conclusion, heritage is parts of our history and culture which at the present time are seen as important enough to showcase for people in the present and to preserve for the future. This safekeeping does not, of course, exclude the political or commercial use of heritage; quite the opposite. In this work I will show how heritage is manifested in Dracula tourism, what kind of heritage can be found there and why it is found and used.

Popular culture

Popular culture, like many other widely used concepts, is hard to define precisely. Popular culture can be viewed as folk culture, as mass culture, as the 'other' of high culture, as postmodern culture and as global culture (Storey 2003, vi–vii). Popular culture has historically been produced under conditions of subordination and 'the popular' has been determined by forces of domination. Historically popular culture has been seen as degraded mass culture of the common people in comparison to the high culture of the men and women with social and political power. (Fiske 2011, 35–37; Storey 2003, 1.) This distinction between high and popular culture is often thought to have been in existence since the beginnings of human history, but in reality it is of rather recent origin. According to John Storey it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that high culture started to become a significant institutional space (Storey 2003, 32). Because of the mass production and commercialisation behind popular culture, it was deemed as having no innate value

and there was no value seen in studying or examining the patterns and norms embedded in its products. Of course, at least since the middle of the twentieth century the values and cultural meanings of popular culture have been acknowledged, and popular culture has become a suitable area for academic research. According to Lane Crothers, popular culture offers insights into the meanings and values that its users attribute to it as well as providing a way for researchers to learn about the values, needs, concerns and standards by which different communities of people live. Consequently Crothers sees the adoption or rejection of a particular product of popular culture as fraught with political and social meaning and thus as valuable for explaining patterns of belief and behaviour within societies. (Crothers 2013, 13–14.) There is, however, no need to divide culture into high or low, or into good and bad. For a folklorist and a cultural researcher all forms of culture are valid objects for research and therefore there is no need to place value judgements on different forms of culture.

What I mean by popular culture in this investigation is the mainly Western popular culture related to Count Dracula, vampires, Transylvania and to a certain extent Vlad the Impaler. This popular culture includes books, movies, games, TV-shows and theatre plays, but the emphasis is on books and movies. I see popular culture as just that, popular. That means that it is widely shared, global and easily adoptable; simplifying somewhat, I find books and movies within the chosen field of research to be just that. Popular culture relating to Dracula started in the Gothic literature of eighteenth and nineteenth-century Britain and more precisely in 1897, when Bram Stoker published his novel *Dracula*. Since then the character and the story have gone through multiple variations and metamorphoses in different forms of popular culture, namely films and books. The impact of *Dracula* on Western popular culture has been immense. According to Duncan Light, Stoker's publication sealed the 'place myth' of Transylvania as the social and spatial *Other* of the West, which is still to some extent alive today. Stoker's book was not the first in Western literature to feature Transylvania, but it did have a lasting impact on popular culture, which in turn affects Dracula tourism (Light 2007: 749; Miller 2000: 44). In the Western imagination, Transylvania (and indeed, the whole of Romania) has become the home of the vampire Count Dracula, Dracula's country. This image of Transylvania is so strong that many foreigners think that it exists only in the minds of fiction-writers and film-makers, and express surprise when they learn that Transylvania actually exists as a real region (Hupchick 1995, 49). The popular culture of Dracula has affected Dracula tourism enormously; after all, without it Dracula tourism would not exist.

Although Bram Stoker's book is the natural starting point for Dracula tourism, the countless movies that have been made since 1931 have had an even bigger impact on Dracula tourism in terms of visual imagery and the preconceived images about Dracula and Transylvania that the tourists might have. This is easily explainable because Dracula is the second-most portrayed fictional character on screen (Skal 2004, 299).

Popular culture focusing on vampires does not end with Bram Stoker's Dracula. There have been several vampire booms since the late twentieth century. In addition to the Dracula movies of the 1950s and 1960s, the books by Anne Rice have greatly influenced the genre. Her first major vampire novel, *Interview with a Vampire* (1976), is often seen as starting the second wave of vampire literature where the character of the vampire developed from a monster of folklore towards a more versatile and more humanlike character. This development can be seen as reaching its peak in the recent (c.2005–c.2013) vampire boom following Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight* books and the subsequent films as well as such TV-series as *True Blood*. (Hillabold 2013, 79–80.) Yet for some reason this newer vampire popular culture is not used and is not visible in Dracula tourism in Romania. I will deal with this issue in more detail in chapter 6.

Hybridisation

Hybridisation is a term which describes different cultural elements combining and possibly producing a new form of culture. The mixing of cultural elements is not a recent phenomenon. What has changed is the pace and scope of this mixing. Nowadays cultural elements move and are borrowed quite rapidly because of the media, the internet, increased travel and so forth. There are multiple examples of hybridised forms of culture all around the world. Jan Nederveen Pieterse has mentioned Thai boxing by Moroccan girls in Amsterdam, Asian rap in London or Chinese tacos as emphatic examples of hybridisation of cultures (Pieterse 2001, 19). Popular culture and tourism are also very much examples of hybridisation. Dracula tourism, with its roots in popular culture, is also a good example of hybridisation, as I shall show.

Methodology and research material

This research is mainly empirical in nature. My main sources are the fieldwork that I have done in 2010 and 2011 and the webpages of ten Romanian travel agencies that offer Dracula tourism. I use the narrative corpora and a

folkloristic perspective as my primary starting points. The stories and images used by the tour guides and found on the webpages form the bulk of my research material. The emphasis and perspective of my research is folkloristic. The theoretical approach is heavily influenced by my research material. I use critical discourse analysis and more specifically multimodal discourse analysis to analyse the webpages of the travel agencies. Discourses can be explained as manners of speaking, ways of thinking and ways to represent a subject. Discourses are not neutral and are often used to strengthen and to promote a cause. (Hall 1999, 98–102.) According to Teun A. van Dijk, critical discourse analysis is used to study ‘the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context’ (van Dijk 2001, 352). Furthermore, critical discourse analysis is used to study the relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships (van Dijk 1993, 249). By using critical discourse analysis I am looking for certain texts or ‘written ways of speaking’ that recur over and over on the webpages. Discourses are used for a specific reason. By searching for these discourses I am able to identify what kinds of attitudes, ideas and mental images the providers of tourism want to give to the tourists. In this study the relations between power, dominance and inequality manifest themselves in the way certain aspects of culture are brought up within the discourses. Through critical discourse analysis it is possible to focus on the role that discourses have in the production, reproduction and challenging of dominance. Dominance can be defined as the exercise of social power by institutions or groups that result in some form of inequality. (van Dijk 1993, 249–250.) In this research the questions of dominance and inequality are about the way Romania and Romanian culture are portrayed in Dracula tourism.

Unlike discourse analysis, which approaches discourses through language, multimodal discourse analysis is an approach which focuses on how meaning is made through the use of multiple modes of communication (Jones 2013, 1). By combining multimodal discourse analysis with critical discourse analysis, I am able to get better and more comprehensive results from my research. According to Richard W. Hallet and Judith Kaplan-Weinger the discourse of tourism is a discourse of identity construction, promotion, recognition and acceptance that it is created through the manipulation of both linguistic and visual texts (Hallet & Kaplan-Weinger 2010, 5). Hallet and Kaplan-Weinger used multimodal discourse analysis, which incorporates both visual semiotic analysis, and critical discourse analysis to research the websites in their work (Hallet & Kaplan-Weinger 2010, 11). Because the internet is a very visual form of sharing information, it is also important to focus on the imagery that is used

on the websites of the travel agencies that offer Dracula tourism. Sometimes the text and the images may also have different or even contrasting meanings and therefore they are both important to research (van Leeuwen 2004, 15). By combining critical discourse analysis and multimodal discourse analysis and focusing on both the imagery and texts it is possible to get a better understanding of the discursive formation and of the promotion of identity that the provider of the website wants to offer.

I also approach my research material by using the concept of intertextuality. This means that all texts are read in relationship to others and this range of textual knowledge is used when reading a text. These relationships do not, however, need to take the form of specific allusions from one text to another and the reader does not have to be familiar with specific texts to be able to read intertextually. (Fiske 1987, 108.) In literary criticism intertextuality is used to describe the variety of ways in which texts interact with other texts. It focuses in particular on the interdependence between texts and not on their discreteness or uniqueness. (Montgomery, Durant, Fabb, Furniss & Mills 2000, 191.) Although originally a concept of literary theory, intertextuality can also be adapted to many other fields of culture like cinema, paintings, music, architecture, photography and virtually all cultural and artistic productions (Allen 2000, 174). Tourism is also a field where intertextuality can be adopted. Especially in literary tourism, movie-induced tourism and media tourism in general intertextuality can be a very helpful tool to understand both the appeal of the particular form of tourism and the tourist's experiences. By looking at the tourist experiences as texts, I use the concept of intertextuality as a way to understand the reasons behind tourists' expectations as well as the actual experience. I find Dracula tourism especially well suited to this kind of approach because it utilises literature, movies, fiction, history and tradition and is therefore intertextual in nature.

The third theoretical or analytical tool that I apply is the folklore process outlined by the late Finnish folklorist Lauri Honko. In short, this is the stereotypical life-history of folklore in any culture, which begins in the era before the birth of the concept of folklore and ends with the present-day assessment of the meaning of folklore in its culture (Honko 2013, 38). I look to see if it is possible to use, redefine and improve Honko's original idea and use it to counter and obviate the questions regarding authenticity and folklorism in tourism. I am especially interested in seeing how it can be applied when dealing with concepts like authenticity, tradition and tourism.

Finally, I use social constructionism as a theoretical frame for this research. As with many widely used concepts, there is no singular view or school of social constructionism. According to Andy Lock and Tom Strong, social

constructionism is concerned with meaning and understanding as the main feature of all human activities which have their beginnings in social interaction; the ways of meaning-making are specific to particular times and places. (Lock and Strong 2010, 6–7.) Similarly, Dave Elder-Vass argues that social constructionism is not a single synthesis, but rather a large field of social constructionisms balancing between traditional sociological arguments and post-modernist innovations. Elder-Vass finds one definite categorisation that fits all the different views about social constructionism: that the ways in which people collectively think and communicate about the world affects the way the world is. One of the most significant implications of a claim that something is socially constructed is that it could also be constructed differently. (Elder-Vass 2012, 4–5.) Social constructions are therefore fluid and can be deconstructed and constructed again differently. Social constructionism has been used in various fields of research and on varied themes and research topics; Ian Hacking mentions several books and research with different topics where social constructionism is mentioned, arguing that it has been used when talking about for example postmodernism, gender, emotions, homosexual culture, deafness and mind. (Hacking 1999, 1–2.) Hacking's point is to show and also criticise how widely the concept of social constructionism is used.

According to Dave Elder-Vass, language and discourses are most often cited as being the tools used in the social construction of the world (Elder-Vass 2012, 10–11). Of these two factors, I am more interested in discourses that are used to construct something. In my research what is constructed is of course Dracula tourism in Romania. The myriad of topics where social constructionism has been used includes the study of tourism. Research on social construction in tourism has focused on, for example, how tourist destinations have been constructed, experienced and marketed (Koivunen 2010, 158). Tourism is socially and culturally constructed. For example, tourism in Finnish Lapland is constructed mainly around Christmas and Santa Claus, around Lappish nature in general, around skiing or around all of these (Hall 2008, 61; Pretes 1995, 5 & 8). Similarly Dracula tourism is very much a construction, whether focused on fiction, tradition, history or all of them, depending on the providers of the tourism, which in this case are the tour agencies. Social and cultural constructionism in tourism is done through discourses and images. Tourism is largely based on the production, re-production and re-enforcement of images which serve to project the attractiveness of the destination to the tourists (Ringer 1998, 10). The production, re-production and re-enforcement of images are also very much present in Dracula tourism in Romania. In this investigation social constructionism will serve as a frame which combines the different elements of this study, namely the discourses and images, and the

tradition, that are used and constructed in Dracula tourism, the heritage that is brought out and the authenticity that is constructed.

The research material consists of my fieldwork and the websites of ten Romanian travel agencies that offer Dracula tourism. I have made three separate fieldwork trips to Romania, participating in a week-long Dracula tour on each occasion. My main research method here was participant observation. In addition I conducted interviews with the tour guides and with the other tourists. My first fieldwork trip was in April 2010; the tour was organised by the Company of Mysterious Journeys. On this tour I was alone with the tour guide because the other participants had cancelled for various reasons. This gave me a good opportunity to talk freely with the tour guide and ask his opinions about Dracula tourism, the tour and the sites to be visited. During this trip I conducted four interviews with three employees of the Company of Mysterious Journeys.⁵ The second trip was in October 2010; this was a Halloween-themed tour, again organised by the Company of Mysterious Journeys. There were eight other participants on the tour; I had the opportunity to compare this trip with the previous, where I was alone with the guide. I also interviewed the other tourists in my group.⁶ The third fieldwork trip was in October 2011; this was also a Halloween-themed tour, but with another tour agency, Transylvania Live. On this tour I conducted one interview with the guide.⁷ Although I got permission to use the names of the guides that I interviewed, I decided not to do so in this work. The guides had all worked with their companies for several years and were all experienced tour guides. In April of 2016 as a part of a university course I took some folklore students to Romania. Although this trip was not a fieldwork trip, it enabled me to see what changes, if any, had been made in and to the Dracula sites we visited. During this trip we visited Bucharest, Snagov, Braşov, Sighişoara and Poienari.

Three interviews were conducted in a vehicle while driving between locations, one was made in a café and one was carried out in a hotel restaurant. The interviewees were Romanians but the language used was English. The reason for using only English was that because the interviewees used English in their

- 5 The interviews are of different lengths, the shortest of twenty minutes and the longest a little over an hour long.
- 6 The interviews with the other tourists were conducted via a questionnaire, which I handed to the other participants of the tour. In addition I made three separate interviews. I have used these interviews very sporadically, mostly as background information for this research.
- 7 This interview lasted a little over forty minutes. All the interviews have been transcribed and are in the possession of the author.

work, I found it appropriate to conduct the interview in the same language that they used in guiding the tourists. The web pages that I am researching are also written almost exclusively in English and therefore I feel that the use of the same language also with the interviewees is justified. The first tour was done by car with just me and the tour guide, the second on a bus with eight other tourists, a driver and the guide, and the third was done by car with two other tourists and the guide.

During all three trips I made field notes and kept a research diary, which in addition to the interviews and websites functions as the main research material in my work. As I am interested in the way Romanian travel agencies use tradition and how they deal with the fictitious side of Dracula tourism, I decided to investigate only Romanian travel agencies that offer Dracula tours. I look into the discourses and imagery, and the traditions about Vlad the Impaler (if any), that are to be found on the websites, and how the interplay between tradition, heritage and popular culture manifests itself. The ten travel agencies whose websites I use are the Company of Mysterious Journeys, Transylvania Live, Adventure Transylvania, Atlantic Tour, Ciao Romania, Cultural Romtour, Go Romania Tours, Quest Tours and Adventures, Club TRAVElescu (Ultramarine Travel International Agency)⁸ and Visit Transylvania Travel. Of these agencies, seven offer tours that can vary in length and in theme and three offer only one basic Dracula tour. Seven agencies offer special Halloween themed tours. All of the agencies also offer other tours of Romania in addition to Dracula tours. (See Table 1.)

Although my research material, field notes, websites and interviews all seemingly differ, they complement each other and through their variance offer a better understanding of my research topic. The use of multiple sources in one study is not new; data triangulation has been widely used hitherto. Triangulation means simply looking at the same research question, or phenomenon, from more than one source of data. (Decrop 1999, 158; Denzin, N. K. 1978, 301.) I use my field notes mostly as background information and a way to align my own experiences and interpretations with what is said on the websites and in the guide interviews. From the guide interviews I derive information about the attitudes and objectives of the guides and the agencies. Both written and visual forms of information on the websites are considered.

8 From now on referred to as Ultramarine Travel.

Tour agency	Dracula tours	Halloween tours	Other than Dracula tours
1. Company of Mysterious Journeys	12	1	11
2. Transylvania Live	9	4	10
3. Adventure Transylvania	2	1	11
4. Atlantic Tour	1	0	(in Romania) 1
5. Ciao Romania	2	0	30
6. Cultural Romtour	1	1	28
7. Go Romania Tours	11	4	over 50
8. Quest Tours & Adventures	3	0	6
9. Ultramarine Travel	2	0	10
10. Visit Transilvania Travel	4	1	over 30

Table 1. The different tours organized by the different travel agencies.

Ethical questions and research position

Researchers have a responsibility for the quality of their work, for the individuals, groups and societies studied and to those who provide information for the researchers. These responsibilities are commonly referred to as research ethics. (Alver & Øyen 2007, 11 and 17.) Bente Gullveig Alver and Ørjar Øysen argue that ‘research ethics concerns the assessment of how certain boundaries of research ought to be drawn’ (Alver & Øyen 2007, 17). In general, the research-ethical questions, problems, risks and dangers in humanities are less crucial than in some research fields, such as biomedicine. Yet the concepts of risk and damage are ambiguous and sometimes the consequences of research are difficult to predict. Humanities research, especially within cultural studies, usually deals with people’s everyday life and can therefore highlight risks concerning for example the privacy of the subject of research. Certain types of information may acquire protection against trespassing of privacy, such as information about religious and political affiliation, or information concerning health or sexual matters. Usually these questions are dealt with by stressing that consent to participate in the research is free and voluntary, and by the promise of anonymity. (Alver & Øyen 2007, 21–28.) Sometimes the subject of research may not fully understand what is implied by their consent and here the researchers’ responsibility is crucial. The researcher must explain what he is doing, how the material will be used and whether or not the material will be archived. I have tried to acknowledge these problems in my research.

I have positioned myself as a participant observer during the fieldwork and I have always told everyone involved of my position and intentions, and have asked and received permission to use the interviews as I see fit. I asked permission beforehand from both the companies to do my work and explained to them and to the tour guides, as well as to the other participants of the tours, about my work and my aims.⁹ I also paid for the trip and was also therefore an equal member of the touring groups. Although I have received permission to use and mention the names of the tour guides that I have interviewed, I have decided not to do so:¹⁰ this is in case (unlikely as it may be) something that the tour guides have told me may not be shared by their employers; I would not wish to cause any problems for my interviewees. I realise that as a researcher with a possibly wide audience, I am in something of a position of power regarding the research into the travel agencies. Because Dracula tourism is a source of income and livelihood for many, the results of this research are not meant to be used for purposes of comparison between the travel agencies; they are purely of academic interest and should not be taken as harbouring criticism towards any specific tour agency. The results are as objective as possible, although I do realise that no research, at least in the humanities, can be purely objective. The researcher is a subject and therefore whatever he or she does is subjective to a degree. This research is done by me, and therefore the results are subjective reflections of my point of view. Another researcher might have asked different questions, chosen different travel agencies or different research methods and therefore might also have ended up with different results. The research is always dependent on the researcher.

9 This permission is audible from the interviews as well as documented on the emails between me and the travel agencies in question.

10 Because I did not explicitly ask for a permission to archive my research material, I have decided not to do so. All my research material (interviews and field notes both in original form and as transcribed) are in my possession.