



Romeo Juliet Vampires

Claudia Gabel , William Shakespeare

Download now

Read Online [➔](#)

Romeo Juliet Vampires

Claudia Gabel , William Shakespeare

Romeo Juliet Vampires Claudia Gabel , William Shakespeare

"You are deluded, Romeo. Vampires do not have the capability to love. They are heartless."

The Capulets and the Montagues have some deep and essential differences. Blood differences. Of course, the Capulets *can* escape their vampire fate, and the Montagues can *try* not to kill their undead enemies. But at the end of the day, their blood feud is unstoppable. So it's really quite a problem when Juliet, a vampire-to-be, and Romeo, the human who should be hunting her, fall desperately in love. What they don't realize is how deadly their love will turn out to be—or what it will mean for their afterlives. . . .

This riotous twist on the ultimate tale of forbidden romance is simply to *die* for.

Romeo Juliet Vampires Details

Date : Published August 31st 2010 by HarperCollins

ISBN : 9780061976247

Author : Claudia Gabel , William Shakespeare

Format : Paperback 231 pages

Genre : Paranormal, Vampires, Young Adult, Fantasy, Romance

 [Download Romeo Juliet Vampires ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Romeo Juliet Vampires ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Romeo Juliet Vampires Claudia Gabel , William Shakespeare

From Reader Review Romeo Juliet Vampires for online ebook

Reading Vacation says

REVIEW

This book mixes the classic Romeo and Juliet story with the current vampire trend. While I have read other retellings of classics, this is the first one I've read that takes on vampires.

I liked the way that Claudia Gabel kept the setting as the late 1500's, but did not write it with Shakespearean-speak. I was easily able to read everything and understand it. I am glad that the time frame was not changed to the present times, because it would have totally changed the classic.

My favorite scene is the very beginning when Romeo and Juliet first meet. It's so romantic and their feelings for each other have not yet been tainted by the feud between their families. I wish they had moved a little slower in deciding to get married, but I suppose that was in keeping with the original. Maybe couples moved quickly back in those times?

I liked this book and think it was an interesting retelling. Thank you to We Love YA! for sending this arc for me to review.

RATING

4 Plot

5 Characters

4 Attention Grabbing

4 Girlie Meter

5 Ending

22 TOTAL

5 STARS

Claudia Gabel says

I learned that writing about classic literary characters and adding a strong supernatural element is crazy fun! I really hope that people love it.

Avery says

I always try to avoid DNFing books, but there's always one every year that just drives me crazy. Sure, there's a lot of teenage angst in the original (presented differently for the time) but this book drove me crazy. I didn't like the writer's take on either of the main characters. I love original vampires. Red eyes, floating, having to kill someone and drink their blood to survive. That's all fine and dandy, but overall I only got to chapter 12 of this book and couldn't make myself read any farther no matter how many times I tried.

Rachel says

This book is a wonderful retelling of Romeo & Juliet ... With a vampire twist , of course !

I chanced upon this thin book and anticipated myself for a mindless retelling of the famous romance but surprisingly I really liked it . The fact that Romeo & Juliet DIDN'T die tragically helped too (:

Thumbs up !

Susanna - Censored by GoodReads says

Exits, screaming.

Abbie says

This is actually pretty funny, I enjoyed it.

Cait • A Page with a View says

This was actually painful to read. I think I only kept reading out of some weird horrified fascination that *this exists*.

It's not in iambic pentameter, so it's just a butchered story of the same old angsty teens... PLUS VAMPIRES

Except these vampires float instead of sparkle? It was too cheesy & painful to even describe. The overall plot looks something like:

"What else could come between us?"

"What else? I am turning into a vampire! In three days, no less." Juliet looked directly at Romeo to see his reaction...

"If you were turning into a fish or a monkey or a chicken in an hour, I would not care."

The dialogue swings back and forth between an attempt to be formal and people calling each other dillweeds & douchebags. It's a mess all around.

Avoid this at all costs if you like Shakespeare.

And I just saw that there's another one of these books about Little Women! LITTLE VAMPIRE WOMEN.

Cathryn says

All right, people. I almost never do this. In fact, I can't think of a book I've read other than the one I'm about to review where I've done this. But I actually picked up a book, read about 30 pages, and then debated whether to set it on fire or feed it to my deadly piranhas. This is the only book that's ever provoked me that way. And I have read many a book that was badly done, but never one that disappointed me so much.

I am referring to *Romeo and Juliet and Vampires*, supposedly adapted from Shakespeare by Claudia Gabel.

Now, I'm sure we all remember that big craze from a few years back, starting with *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies*, followed by books like *Little Vampire Women*, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and the Undead*, and *Wuthering Bites*. I haven't read all of those, but I have read *P&P&Z* as well as *Little Vampire Women*, and they were cute and well done and really funny.

This book was not cute. This book was not funny. This book was not well done. This book was stupid, and I do not use that word lightly in a professional review.

Here's why I couldn't get past the first thirty pages.

1) The language. Romeo, Benvolio, and Mercutio are horsing around in a very early scene and Mercutio calls Romeo a fat cow. I'm serious. He calls him a fat cow.

Now, these are boys. Girls call each other cows, and guys call girls cows, but I have never heard of a boy calling another boy a fat cow. If a boy did call another boy that, they'd be laughed at and humiliated for coming up with such a pathetic piece of not-so-witty repartee.

Not only that, but during this time period, these boys were considered to be on the cusp of becoming men. So you'd expect a little more maturity in their insults. I mean, it's not like Romeo and Mercutio don't rag the crud out of each other. They did. Hence why Romeo says things like, "They jest at scars but never felt the wound" (referring to their teasing about his being in love). But it would be on the level of a man, not a three-

year-old at their first day of preschool.

Also, people did not speak back then as modern teens speak now. Romeo did not use words like "douche bag" and Mercutio did not use words like "dill-weed." That's just common sense. Not that the dialogue has to be all thee, thou, thy, and wherefore, but there's a way to blend the two. Historical fiction is popular among teens, so it's not like people can't get into a slightly more formal language style.

And you can modernize a historical story without destroying its authenticity. Look at *A Knight's Tale* with Heath Ledger. Quite a bit of modernizing in that, but the language was old-style in a lot of it, and yet it was still popular! Not only that, but the modern dialogue in this book didn't even feel like natural dialogue anyway. So what was the point of having it in the first place?

I'm sorry, but this author's insertion of (pathetic and improperly applied) modern slang feels like condescension to the reader to me, as if she thinks we're too uneducated to understand what the characters are saying unless she brings it down to basically a preschool level. I rarely get offended by a book, but the badly done language bugged the heck out of me.

2) The incredibly hokey portrayal of vampires. In *R&J&V*, Juliet and all the Capulets are vampires. I'm okay with that. I love vampires. But the vamps in this book are more ridiculous and campy than even the 1930's *Dracula* with Bela Lugosi and the rubber bat. The effect is muted in *Juliet*, because she's not a full vampire yet, but you see it in *Lady Capulet*.

First of all, *Lady C* has crimson eyes. By itself, I could take it. But she's also got a prominent widow's peak, dark hair, fangs that don't retract, and she's so pale that she's sallow. She's like, tallow-colored. She's jaundiced-looking.

Also, she dresses like *Elvira* or *Morticia Addams* in the clingy dress with the tendrils on the hems, including a little cape that serves no purpose except to look vampy and doesn't even fall all the way to her feet.

Add onto that the way she enters and leaves the room during the scene where in the play *Juliet's* mom is like, "Speak briefly: can you like of Paris's love?" In the book, she comes in with her cape draped along her forearm and her forearm in front of her face, floating six or so inches off the ground. Why is she floating? I have NO idea. And she never really stops. It's said that *Juliet* will start floating too after she becomes a full-fledged vampire.

So basically *Claudia Gabel* grabbed every schticky, icky, vampy stereotype from those campy movies made in the 1930s-70s and smushed them all together. Maybe she meant it to be funny, like a parody or something...but it wasn't. It wasn't satirical, it wasn't parody-funny, it wasn't funny in any way. It was ridiculous. It's like if one of those caricature sketch-artists off the street looked at *Lady Capulet* and she said, "Draw me as one of the fiendish undead!"

I love vampires. I love all the different variations found in literature. I've read "*The Night Flyer*" by Stephen King, *PN Elrod's* novels about her vampire detective, *Anne Rice's Vampire Chronicles*, *Fred Saberhagen's Dracula* books, *Nina Kiraly's Mina*, *Jessica's Guide to Dating on the Dark Side*, even the totally adorable novel *Bloodthirsty*. And I've watched all kinds of movies, from *The Hunger* to *The Lost Boys* to *Van Helsing* to *Dracula 2000*. And they were all so much better than this. *BBC's Young Dracula*, *The Little Vampire*...even *Twilight* was better, and the sparkly bloodsucking dudes in *Twilight* aren't even real vampires. That's just sad.

3) Finally, how Juliet has to become a vampire: she has to bite and kill someone. So basically she's given a choice by the author to either give up everyone she loves - her parents, her other family - as well as the life she's known all this time in order to do what's right and not murder an innocent person (it never occurs to her to go after a rapist or a killer)...or she kills someone and becomes evil.

Now, if this book wasn't so hokey, this plotline would be perfect. It would be fine. It would totally work. But you can't take a serious plotline like this, one fraught with emotional introspection and seriously tough choices, and then be like, "And now let's add some crack-acid to liven things up even though it makes people wanna say, 'Go home, book. You're drunk.' Just 'cause we can."

You can't take a plotline this serious, this potentially dynamic, this potentially beautiful, and slather it with all the stupidity heaped up in the first chapter. And if that's the author's way of being like, "Ha, you must wade through the crud to get to the good stuff," well then shame on her, because that's not how it works, since someone had to shell out money for that book to be available (in this case the library, or whoever donated the book). So I hope that wasn't why she did that. I doubt it was, actually, but I like to cover my bases. Whatever her reason - she just didn't know any better, she didn't care, whatever - I couldn't finish this book.

So, I'm sorry but this book is 0 stars from me. I literally would have to be paid in order to read it, and it would have to be upwards of \$30 because I'm a really busy individual. The only thing I've ever read that was worse than this was a fanfic (the infamous "My Immortal" about Harry Potter). That's saying a lot.

- LA Knight

Reading Teen says

3.5 out of 5

This is not the type of book that I normally pick out to read. Especially after my mom read *Pride and Prejudice* and *Zombies* and was cringing the entire book. But I have to say, I actually had fun reading this. I think it may be because I'm not a huge "classics" reader, so I'm not going to be offended by the changes that Claudia made to the original script. It only took me a day to read, and I enjoyed revisiting the world of *Romeo and Juliet*. This twist on it just made all the more fun for me to read. I'm the type who loves remakes with a twist, though. (I loved the Claire Danes version of this play!)

The storyline follows pretty closely to the original story, with small changes splattered across the pages. Yes, I say "splattered" because many of those changes involve blood. Not surprising, considering Juliet's entire family, the Capulets, are vampires, who would love nothing more than to be let loose on the human population. However, they have to deal with the vampire-hunting Montagues, who are just as eager to dole out death and punishment to all the vampires. The writing is prose instead of verse, and it used more modern day language, though it was still set in 1462. But this time the story takes place in Transylvania instead of Verona.

All of the same characters appear in this book. Mercutio and Tybalt are just as rash and infuriating, Romeo and Juliet are just as love-sick and ridiculous, and the Montagues and Capulets are just as blind to the destruction they are causing in their families. There were some difference though. Romeo and Juliet were

much less self-absorbed in this book. They actually cared about the feud going on between their families before they even met. And Juliet would do anything to escape killing a human, because she believed that it was wrong, regardless of what her family told her. Then there was the blood....let's just say the "sword fight" between Mercutio and Tybalt had a little livelier end to it!

Even though I have known this story most of my life, I still found myself rooting for Romeo and Juliet. Hoping that somehow, this time, they would find a way to be together and make it work. But in this book, it seemed even more impossible than ever. Did they change their fate and live happily ever after? I guess you'll just have to read it to find out!

Jessica says

Clever twist on Shakespeare's Romeo & Juliet. I don't usually read retellings of classics but I'm very interested in the vampire trend & I thought that it would be a good read. I loved the writing style but I do think that classics should be left as they are. ??

Cathryn says

All right, people. I almost NEVER do this. In fact, I can't think of a book I've read other than the one I'm about to review where I've done this. But I actually picked up a book, read about 30 pages, and then debated whether to set it on fire or feed it to my deadly piranhas. This is the only book that's ever provoked me that way. And I have read many a book that was badly done, but never one that disappointed me so much.

I am referring to Romeo and Juliet and Vampires, supposedly adapted from Shakespeare by Claudia Gabel.

Now, I'm sure we all remember that big craze from a few years back, starting with Pride and Prejudice and Zombies, followed by books like Little Vampire Women, The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and the Undead, and Wuthering Bites. I haven't read all of those, but I have read P&P&Z as well as Little Vampire Women, and they were cute and well done and really funny.

This book was not cute. This book was not funny. This book was not well done. This book was stupid, and I do NOT use that word lightly in a professional review.

Here's why I couldn't get past the first thirty pages.

1) Romeo, Benvolio, and Mercutio are horsing around in a very early scene and Mercutio calls Romeo a fat cow. I'm serious. He calls him a fat cow.

Now, these are boys. Girls call each other cows, and guys call girls cows, but I have NEVER heard of a boy calling another boy a fat cow. If a boy DID call another boy that, they'd be laughed at and humiliated for coming up with such a pathetic piece of not-so-witty repartee.

Not only that, but during this time period, these boys were considered to be on the cusp of becoming men. So you'd expect a little more maturity in their insults. I mean, it's not like Romeo and Mercutio don't rag the crud out of each other. They did. Hence why Romeo says things like, "They jest at scars but never felt the

wound" (referring to their teasing about his being in love). But it would be on the level of a MAN, not a three-year-old at their first day of preschool.

Also, people did not speak back then as modern teens speak now. Romeo did not use words like "douche bag" and Mercutio did not use words like "dill-weed." That's just common sense. Not that the dialogue has to be all thee, thou, thy, and wherefore, but there's a way to blend the two. Historical fiction is popular among teens, so it's not like people can't get into a slightly more formal language style.

And you can modernize a historical story without destroying its authenticity. Look at *A Knight's Tale* with Heath Ledger. Quite a bit of modernizing in that, but the language was old-style in a lot of it, and yet it was still popular! Not only that, but the modern dialogue didn't even feel like natural dialogue ANYWAY. So what was the point of having it in the first place?

I'm sorry, but this author's insertion of (pathetic and improperly applied) modern slang feels like condescension to the reader to me, as if she thinks we're too uneducated to understand what the characters are saying unless she brings it down to basically a preschool level. I rarely get offended by a book, but the badly done language bugged the heck out of me.

2) The incredibly hokey portrayal of vampires. In *R&J&V*, Juliet and all the Capulets are vampires. I'm okay with that. I love vampires. But the vamps in this book are more ridiculous and campy than even the 1930's *Dracula* with Bela Lugosi and the rubber bat. The effect is muted in *Juliet*, because she's not a full vampire yet, but you see it in *Lady Capulet*.

First of all, *Lady C* has crimson eyes. By itself, I could take it. But she's also got a prominent widow's peak, dark hair, fangs that DON'T retract, and she's so pale that she's sallow. She's like, tallow-colored. She's jaundiced-looking.

Also, she dresses like *Elvira* or *Morticia Addams* in the clingy dress with the tendrils on the hems, including a little cape that serves no purpose except to look vampy and doesn't even fall all the way to her feet.

Add onto that the way she enters and leaves the room during the scene where in the play Juliet's mom is like, "Speak briefly: can you like of Paris's love?" In the book, she comes in with her cape draped along her forearm and her forearm in front of her face, FLOATING six or so inches off the ground. Why is she floating? I have NO idea. And she NEVER really stops. It's said that Juliet will start floating too after she becomes a full-fledged vampire.

So basically *Claudia Gabel* grabbed every schticky, icky, vampy stereotype from those campy movies made in the 1930s-70s and smushed them all together. Maybe she meant it to be funny, like a parody or something...but it wasn't. It wasn't satirical, it wasn't parody-funny, it wasn't funny in any way. It was ridiculous. It's like if one of those caricature sketch-artists off the street looked at *Lady Capulet* and she said, "Draw me as one of the fiendish undead!"

I love vampires. I love all the different variations found in literature. I've read "The Night Flyer" by Stephen King, PN Elrod's novels about her vampire detective, Anne Rice's *Vampire Chronicles*, Fred Saberhagen's *Dracula* books, Nina Kiraly's *Mina*, Jessica's *Guide to Dating on the Dark Side*, even the totally adorable novel *Bloodthirsty*. And I've watched all kinds of movies, from *The Hunger* to *The Lost Boys* to *Van Helsing* to *Dracula 2000*. And they were all so much better than this. BBC's *Young Dracula*, *The Little Vampire*...even *Twilight* was better, and the sparkly bloodsucking dudes in *Twilight* aren't even real vampires. That's just sad.

3) Finally, how Juliet has to become a vampire: she has to bite and kill someone. So basically she's given a choice by the author to either give up everyone she loves - her parents, her other family - as well as the life she's known all this time in order to do what's right and not murder an innocent person (it never occurs to her to go after a rapist or a killer)...or she kills someone and becomes evil.

Now, if this book wasn't so hokey, this plotline would be perfect. It would be fine. It would totally work. But you can't take a serious plotline like this, one fraught with emotional introspection and seriously tough choices, and then be like, "And now let's add some crack-acid to liven things up even though it makes people wanna say, 'Go home, book. You're drunk.' Just 'cause we can."

You can't take a plotline this serious, this potentially dynamic, this potentially beautiful, and slather it with all the stupidity heaped up in the first chapter. And if that's the author's way of being like, "Ha, you must wade through the crud to get to the good stuff," well then shame on her, because that's not how it works, since SOMEONE had to shell out money for that book to be available (in this case the library, or whoever donated the book). So I hope that wasn't why she did that. I doubt it was, actually, but I like to cover my bases. Whatever her reason - she just didn't know any better, she didn't care, whatever - I couldn't finish this book.

So, I'm sorry but this book is 0 stars from me. I literally would have to be paid in order to read it, and it would have to be upwards of \$30 because I'm a really busy individual. The only thing I've ever read that was worse than this was a fanfic (the infamous "My Immortal" about Harry Potter). That's saying a lot.

- LA Knight

Jennifer says

Romeo & Juliet is *the* classic tragic love story. Whether they've read the play or not, everyone knows exactly what happens. I'm a big fan of William Shakespeare. I feel that his his plays transcend time and readers can easily find situations and themes in them that apply to modern life. I am also a big mash-up fan. I believe that the current trend of adding monsters to classic works is an entertaining way of dusting them off and wowing new readers. But mash-ups need to do more than add monsters to be successful. They need to add them in a way that enriches the story and makes it as good if not better than the original.

Having said that, Romeo & Juliet & Vampires takes the original play and rewrites it in novel format. I like this change. The novel format gives readers an insight into the thoughts and motivations of the characters that just can't be as clearly conveyed in a play. The wording in Romeo & Juliet & Vampires is also changed from the original. This updating into a more modern method of speech may appeal to those new to Shakespeare's works, but I believe it will disappoint long-time fans. What is Romeo & Juliet without memorable phrases like "What's in a name? That which we call a rose, By any other name would smell as sweet."?

The very general, very basic idea of Romeo & Juliet is all that is left of the original. The vampires take over this reinvention, completely changing the entire story line. Even the famous, unforgettable ending is completely different. In the end, the book isn't even a tragedy anymore.

Romeo & Juliet & Vampires is very easy to read. It could have been more enjoyable if it didn't veer so far from the original or even if it had went a completely different direction making it more paranormal historical

fiction. As it is, the book is too close to the original while being very far away from the message the original was trying to convey.

I believe those who have never read the original will find *Romeo & Juliet & Vampires* very satisfying, but I doubt who loved the tragedy will feel anything other than disappointment. Perhaps *Romeo & Juliet* was better left untouched.

Denise Villarreal says

I would have enjoyed it more were it not aggressively trying to BE *Romeo and Juliet*, well a modern re-telling. The author could have even done a poor restructuring of a vampire story into the storyline of it without actually trying to be it and it would have been better. Perhaps *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* work so well because it was told in the style of Jane Austen and the original material was not a tragedy by arguably the best writer in the English-speaking world. Big shoes and it's a tragedy. They're supposed to die! While technically, they die, they don't. It destroys the beauty and ache Shakespeare emphasized in his work. The trouble with imitating a great is that you can't avoid being compared to it. You have to make a parody and it's hard to make a parody of a tragedy.

Additionally, it was very hard to read things like how Romeo "was going to punch [someone's] lights out." Seriously? I couldn't even get into it. You set it as a period piece. Use period language or at least avoid clearly modern idiomatic expressions.

Do not recommend, even for angsty teens. No lie, *Twilight* was better.

Bücherfresserin says

"Mainstreamwelle erobert altbekannte Klassiker ..."

Inhalt:

"Dein Blut auf meinen Lippen" handelt von Romeo und Julia, die einander lieben, obwohl sie verfeindeten Familien angehören. Julia gehört hier zu der Vampirfamilie der Capulets, in der sie mit 16 Jahren zum vollwertigen Vampir werden soll. Allerdings will sie kein Vampir werden und Blut trinken müssen, anderen Menschen Gewalt antun. Als sie sich Hals über Kopf in den jungen Romeo verliebt, der den Vampirjägern der Montagues angehört, ist sie sich sicher, kein Vampir werden zu wollen und beschließt alles auf eine riskante Karte zu setzen. Die weltbekannte Tragödie von Shakespeare einmal anders, mit Vampiren und Biss ...

Meinung:

Bei "Dein Blut auf meinen Lippen" handelt es sich um eine "Romeo und Julia" Adaption von Shakespeare. Der Roman hält sich an die wichtigsten Gegebenheiten und Charaktere der Tragödie und unterscheidet sich im wesentlichen nur durch den Fantasyanteil, denn hier sind die verfeindeten Familien einmal Vampire und einmal Vampirjäger. Das es sich um eine veränderte Variante von "Romeo und Julia" handelt, ist im Laufe der Geschichte sehr wichtig zu wissen, damit man auch die rasche Szenenfolge und die etwas altbackene Handlung nachvollziehen kann.

Im Grunde geht es wie bei der Tragödie von Shakespeare um die Liebe zwischen Julia und Romeo, deren Familien miteinander verfeindet sind. Allerdings gehört Julia einer mächtigen Vampirfamilie, den Capulets an. Die Gegenspieler sind die Montagues und in diesem Fall brutale Vampirjäger. Dennoch verlieben sich beide Hauptcharaktere unsterblich ineinander, auch wenn ihnen bewusst ist, dass sie ihre Liebe streng geheim halten müssen. Die weiteren Szenen sind gut aus der originalen Tragödie übernommen worden, ebenso wie die weiteren Charaktere Mercutio, Benvolio, Tybalt etc. ... Natürlich wurde die Geschichte stark minimiert, sodass einige Charaktere aus dem Drama fehlen, was aber nicht stört. Ansonsten ist ein weiterer Unterschied der Ort, da "Julia und Romeo" im Original ja in Italien spielt, diese Vampivariante jedoch in Transsilvanien abläuft, was natürlich beim Thema Vampir ungemein gruseliger wirkt, aber auch recht klischeehaft.

Mit Klischees ist die Geschichte auch durchweg gespickt. Die originale Handlung ist schon Drama und Schnulz pur und erscheint in der heutigen Zeit ziemlich altertümlich, aber die dazu geschriebenen Klischees über Vampire sind dann doch etwas zu viel. Vampire schweben, ihnen wachsen bei der Verwandlung Krallen, ihre Augen sind natürlich blutrot. Dazu kommen weitere Aspekte, wie das Vampire magische Kräfte haben können, gegen Weihwasser und Kreuze allergisch reagieren und sie ihr Spiegelbild nicht mehr sehen können. Alles in allem benutzt die Autorin wirklich jedes Vampirklichee, um die magere Story zu füllen.

Mit magerer Story meine ich natürlich, dass die Geschichte kaum etwas neues bietet. "Romeo und Julia" kennen wohl die meisten und die Autorin übernimmt einfach ungemein viel, aber nicht unbedingt positiv. Auch dieses "Wer da?" taucht immer wieder auf, erinnert an die originalen Laute, die jedoch in diesem moderneren Roman ziemlich unpassend wirken. Meiner Meinung nach hätte man mehr aus der Geschichte rausholen können, denn das Buch ist gerade einmal 240 Seiten stark. Die Geschichte bleibt sehr oberflächlich, schnell und vereinfacht, dass man dann auch lieber gleich zum Originalen greifen kann.

Das Ende ist dann irgendwie auch der einzige Punkt, der wirklich anders ist in der Adaption. Aber ob ich das Ende gut finde? Wohl weniger, denn "Romeo und Julia" ist nicht umsonst eine weltbekannte Tragödie und wenn man schon großräumig abschreibt, sollte man dies vielleicht bis zum Schluss beibehalten, denn ein Happy End scheint mir hier von der Autorin als viel zu einfach gewählt. Man möchte anscheinend, dass dieses Buch mit dem Mainstream Vampirbüchern mithalten kann und zerstückelt somit skrupellos eine wundervolle Tragödie, zu einer Happy End Lovestory von vielen.

Ganz schlimm finde ich dann auch, dass der eigentlich Knackpunkt der Tragödie hier total abhanden kommt. Zwar ist "Romeo und Julia" im Original tragisch und auch traurig, aber letztendlich finden beide verfeindeten Familien dadurch wieder zusammen und schließen Frieden. Dieser überaus wichtige Punkt wird total beiseite geschoben, für ein schnulziges und übertriebenes Happy End. Deshalb auch nur 1 Stern, für eine nette Idee, aber mangelnder Umsetzung.

Der Schreibstil ist einfach. Der Plot hält sich strikt an die originale Tragödie und die Autorin übernimmt immer wieder originale Wortlaute wie "Wer da?". Das hat mir weniger gefallen. Vielleicht hätte man hier lieber noch etwas mehr Wert auf eigene Arbeit legen sollen, denn "Dein Blut auf meinen Lippen" ist nicht mehr, als eine abgeschriebene und ummodellerte Fassung. Wirklich gelungen ist die Romanvariante dann auch nicht, da die ansonsten so starken Dialoge ihre Wirkung verlieren. Das einzig gute fand ich, waren die Perspektivenwechsel zwischen Julia und Romeo von Kapitel zu Kapitel.

Das Cover ist kitschig, passt aber. Mich hat es weniger angesprochen. Durch die zwei ineinander verschlungenen Personen, bekommt der Leser aber immerhin einen guten Eindruck von dem Buch, da die Geschichte allgemein beschrieben, verändert und verkitscht wurde. Der englische Titel lautet übrigens "Romeo & Juliet & Vampires", was noch schlimmer ist, als das deutsche "Dein Blut auf meinen Lippen".

Fazit:

Muss man lesen? Meiner Meinung nach weniger. Wieso? Ganz einfach, die Autorin hat zu wenig eigenes mit eingebracht. "Dein Blut auf meinen Lippen" ist eigentlich nur eine einfach abgeschriebene Fassung von "Romeo und Julia" in Romanformat, deren Charaktere zu Vampiren oder Vampirjägern mutieren, um auf der Welle des Mainstreamerfolgs mitreiten zu können. Schade, ich hätte eindeutig mehr erwartet.

SyaSy Syed Nasir says

4.5 stars. Everything was okay. I love how the plot goes and how they didn't change much from the real concept. However, I'm very quite disappointed with how it ends. It seems like the author was rushed to finish the book. Full review will be in my blog.
