

*Dracula* has been the bestselling late Victorian novel which has been read through the lens of the theories of Freud and Freud's followers. Stoker's novel has become synonymous with the vampire trope within not only English literature but many others literatures in India and elsewhere. The huge and varied exegesis that this book has elicited is now canonical and yet this entire body of criticism has not seen *Dracula* as a critique of Immanuel Kant's works like *What is Enlightenment?* And Kant's notoriously dense works, *The Critique of Pure Reason* and *The Critique of Judgement*. Later, Stoker goes on to incorporate the skepticism of Søren Kierkegaard within the now cult-horror, *Dracula*.

While Kierkegaard-infused skepticism is to be found throughout the text, the narrative in *Dracula* moves from being a manifesto for rationality to an unquestioning acceptance of the irrational if we are to accept the premises of Kant's works. So *Dracula* is skeptical in the manner that Kierkegaard is skeptical about Christianity without dismissing the core beliefs of Christianity; it is certainly a rebuttal of neo-Kantian rationality as well as a proper rebuttal of original Kantian rationality.

This is a students' working paper. And the fundamental ideas are put out to the public and any further reference to this idea of Kant and *Dracula* needs proper citation to this very brief working paper.