


Novels Into Film: The Encyclopedia of Movies Adapted from Books

John C. Tibbetts, James M. Walsh

*audiobook | *ebooks | Download PDF | ePub | DOC*



DOWNLOAD



READ ONLINE

#2677738 in Books 1999-10Original language:EnglishPDF # 1 .60 x 7.36 x 9.18l, #File Name: 0816039615320 pages | File size: 54.Mb

John C. Tibbetts, James M. Walsh : Novels Into Film: The Encyclopedia of Movies Adapted from Books before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised Novels Into Film: The Encyclopedia of Movies Adapted from Books:

0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. A look into the art of writing a screenplayBy Maurice LockieThis is a must read for anyone who is interested in the making of films, how a film must necessarily condense much of what the author of a novel has the luxury of writing in a book.0 of 1 people found the following review helpful. Short and SweetBy Hoo-Zen!!This is an excellent book for those who want a snappy and accurate summary review of the book's reception and the associated films'impact.Enables a synoptic overview and a gives an indication of the cultural climate at the time of the book's writing and the films being first distributed.10 of 10 people found the following review helpful. Great idea; poorly executedBy Scott Andrew HutchinsBeing more of a "browser book," I did not feel the need to read the entire thing to get a glimpse into its quality. Instead, I read its comparisons of three novel-film counterparts

in which I was especially familiar--_Frankenstein_, _Jurassic Park_, and _The Wonderful Wizard of Oz_. None of these comparisons contained much substance and were frequently loaded with factual errors. At least the writer of the Oz essay was familiar with Baum's other works, although there many factual errors about them, including the first, as there were for _Frankenstein_ and _Jurassic Park_. The comparisons were very simplistic, and the Oz entry in particular argued for the superiority of the film to the novel, referring mainly to another essay to explain why. While even the best argument probably could not convince me, if it had been better thought out I could at least understand why the writer felt that way. Alas, I could not, as so much of the argument was based on severe factual errors suggesting a very poor memory of the literary counterpart. The Oz entry even cited the Henry Littlefield Populism analogy as fact, despite Littlefield retraction and strong evidence about L. Frank Baum to the contrary. Using only three entries may seem an unfair litmus test for the book, but my justification is as follows: if the books I'm familiar with are discussed with gross errors about the facts of the texts, how am I supposed to know that other essays, for films and novels I am not familiar with, don't contain erroneous junk that negate their usefulness? I would love to see a new edition of the book with much more well-thought out essays. Granted, this is published as a "popular" text, but even a popular text should be credible, and this, alas, isn't.

Spanning comedy, drama, film noir, science fiction, westerns, action adventure, suspense and children's literature, this book offers a detailed survey of adaptations of film adaptations of novels.

"Serves up a satisfying plateful of thought-provoking material for filmgoers as well as readers of fiction. . . . a welcome addition to any film lover's library." --Nicole Robertson -- The Oakland Press, November 17, 1999
From the Publisher
Publisher's Note: Please note that the entry on *From Russia With Love* was written by Dr. Michael Given, Professor of English at the University of Southern Indiana. It was misattributed to another contributor, and the credit will be corrected in future editions.