

Read Online ➔

Bram Stoker's Dracula

Fred Saberhagen , J.V. Hart

Bram Stoker's Dracula Fred Saberhagen , J.V. Hart

New York: Signet/Penguin/New American Library, 1992. First edition. 8vo. Hard cover binding, 190 pp. 8 pp. color plates from the Coppola film.

Bram Stoker's Dracula Details

Date : Published November 1st 1992 by Signet

ISBN : 9780451175755

Author : Fred Saberhagen , J.V. Hart

Format : Paperback 304 pages

Genre : Horror, Paranormal, Vampires, Fiction, Fantasy, Media Tie In, Movies, Novels

 [Download Bram Stoker's Dracula ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Bram Stoker's Dracula ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Bram Stoker's Dracula Fred Saberhagen , J.V. Hart

From Reader Review Bram Stoker's Dracula for online ebook

Jonathan Davison says

The story follows Prince Vladislaus Dracula from a Wallachian warlord prince to a vampire. A solicitor goes to meet his client and becomes his prisoner. The Nosferatu goes to Victorian in search of his wife, Princess Elisabeta now reincarnated as Wilhelmina Murray. Vlad's nemesis is Professor Abraham Van Helsing. The vampire hunter destroys coffins filled with soil of Romania and drives the prince of darkness back to his home land with help of Mina. Vlad is destroyed outside his castle by the hunters.

Jason Cooper says

Based on the movie, which I haven't seen all the way through. I really enjoyed the book...the historical glimpse into Dracula's beginnings and the storyline of him searching for his true love lost. Wanted to read the original, but this is the one that we have. Fun read.

Christine says

Based on the mislabeled but splendidly sumptuous Bram Stoker's Dracula (1992), this is fun, brisk reading. No, it does not belong among the worst books of all time.

Morningstar says

The movie was risible and absurd (not in the good, Monty Python way either.) The novelization is even worse, as to be expected. This being the book of a movie of a book, I guess you can hardly fault the author for not putting much sweat into it -- it reads like the half-witted lust-spawn of a toaster manual and Dracula fanfic. To this day, the name Mina still conjures the word "stupid" in my head (my sincere apologies to all the Minas out there.)

Believe it or not, this book was actually required reading in my high school English class, probably because the school board's budget was non-existent and the school got enough promotional copies for a whole class. I loved (and still love) my high school, but some classes just made me go "What the..."

Kiersten Friesner says

It was okay in my opinion. It's short which is good but I have read better romance and Gothic novels.

Paul says

Honestly haven't read it. A novel of a movie based on a novel? The movie itself was a departure from the original Stoker novel (despite its title) and Keanu Reeves still has the award for Worst English Accent Ever.

Moira Russell says

Oh, so very terrible. I HAD to read it for grad school, in which I was assigned a presentation on Dracula adaptations, which sounds fun, right? But that was the year Coppola's horrible movie came out. I wound up seeing that damn flick three times.

Jonathan Davison says

This version of Dracula is more of a romantic version of Bram Stoker's novel, Dracula. It tells of Prince Vlad Dracula who lost his wife in 1462. 1897 he stalks London in search of his wife only to reincarnated into Wilhelmina Harker, wife of a solicitor. The hunters led by Professor Abraham Van Helsing must destroy Vlad before he creates an army of Nosferatu.

Brittany says

Based on the movie, which I have to admit I've never seen. I really enjoyed the book though. It was a glimpse into Dracula's beginnings and his search for his lost true love.

michael glover says

the beginning in dracula's castle was frightening to me, like really i was all like let's leave this place. the rest of the book was kinda meh though til the end

Zach says

Pretty cool take on the movie that is about the original novel with some changes in it. I love movie tie ins and this one was pretty awesome.

Tom says

Slow, but very good. It's a shame that everyone knows the basic idea of what vampires are. The book was written way before everyone knew the stories, and is therefore hard to hold the suspense. The style is excellent though.

judo says

A classic. Villain well developed, twist, was hooked from the beginning, horror story character driven, wonderful.

Sean Carlin says

Bram Stoker's Dracula. Celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary this year. I recall seeing it in theaters the day it opened in November of 1992. It's been an enormous influence on my own horror fiction.

What made James V. Hart's screenplay so innovative was that it was the most true to the source material ever written (which is saying something, given how many stage and screen adaptations there'd been in the century between the original novel and this movie), augmented with an historical prologue (based on the research of Raymond T. McNally and Radu Florescu) and a romantic subplot that, for my money, actually *improves* the story, imbuing it with a greater connective tissue and thematic resonance.

And what subsequently made the film Francis Ford Coppola directed from Hart's script so one-of-a-kind was his operatic take on the material, drawing from influences as varied as F. W. Murnau, Jean Cocteau, Gustav Klimt, and so on, to create something with an aesthetic sensibility like nothing before or since! In-camera effects, sumptuous costume and production design, stellar performances (Keanu Reeves notwithstanding), and Wojciech Kilar's haunting score all helped elevate an already terrific screenplay into a gorgeously phantasmagoric horror experience. It is one of the most original takes on the legendary character/fable known as *Dracula*.

So, absent all of the cinematic flourishes Coppola and his collaborators brought to the table, this novelization -- though well-written by Fred Saberhagen -- essentially amounts to a prose retelling of Bram Stoker's epistolary novel. In other words: There isn't much point to it. It's a novelization of a movie that itself is a faithful adaptation of a classic novel. You're probably better off reading Stoker, watching Coppola, and skipping this.

But... if you're a diehard fan of *Dracula* and/or this particular movie, the novelization *does* provide some nice supplemental detail (pulled from overlooked elements of the original novel) that help better explain certain character motivations and plot machinations. But logic was never really the point of *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, and what this novelization offers in clarifying insights it lacks in Coppola's hallucinatory sleight-of-hand. Sad to say, it's a second-rate retelling of the story, sans the distinct point of view of either Stoker or Coppola. Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is a great story that inspired a brilliant film, but this novelization doesn't really do either justice.

Laura says

I re-watched the movie recently and then re-read the book for the first time in years. Compared to the movie the book is actually quite good, but I still disagree with Coppola's words that this would be the most true version of Bram Stoker's novel. In fact, I can't see where in the novel he has gotten the characters and the interpretations from: the slutty Lucy, the Dracula full of feelings and sympathy and whatnot, the ridiculous vampire sex scenes and other forced and underlined eroticism. This is like a Harlequin version of Dracula. Yes, features like that have later been added to vampires in popular culture which has its roots in Bram Stoker's novel, and the novel gives tons of possibilities for diverse sexual interpretations, but drawing a straight line between the campy Lucy The Slut and the innocent, naïve Lucy of the novel is just... a sacrilege? I don't really mind the vampire image of the movie/book, but calling it *Bram Stoker's* vampire image makes me wonder if I've read the same book as Coppola has.
