

(Get free) The Encyclopedia of Novels Into Film (Facts on File Film Reference Library) by Professor John C Tibbetts (2005-03-01)

The Encyclopedia of Novels Into Film (Facts on File Film Reference Library) by Professor John C Tibbetts (2005-03-01)

From Facts on File

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

 Download

 Read Online

1849 #File Name: B01FGNQXNI | File size: 37.Mb

From Facts on File : The Encyclopedia of Novels Into Film (Facts on File Film Reference Library) by Professor John C Tibbetts (2005-03-01) before purchasing it in order to gage whether or not it would be worth my time, and all praised The Encyclopedia of Novels Into Film (Facts on File Film Reference Library) by Professor John C Tibbetts (2005-03-01):

3 of 4 people found the following review helpful. Brilliant concept poorly executedBy just JackEntirely justified in its conception, now into it's second edition, "The Encyclopedia of Novels into Film" will stand the test of time. No doubt it will improve with each edition. As yet it is an incomplete encyclopedia.The book will improve if the authors adopt some of the simple techniques of novelists. Such as reviewing their own work by reading aloud. The style is academic, with excessively long sentences and unfamiliar words. Not suited to the material of novels and films or its readership.The Appendix is really a conclusion. Parts of it are almost intelligible on first reading. The same is true of the the Introduction. The first object of writing novels or making films is to communicate. The authors would do well to study the Forward by Robert Wise.The substantial number of novels/films included are alphabetically listed. Cross reference by genre would be useful. A large number are classics of their day. Cross reference by popularity, sales and critical review would be useful.No rational is given for the selection of novels made into film nor for the length of space devoted to each. By the authors own admission, a number of pertinent novels/films are omitted. All to often the synopsis of the novel and/or film is inadequate for the uniformed reader. The occasional gross factual inaccuracy must

be embarrassing for those portraying themselves as academic authorities presenting an encyclopedia. Nevertheless "...Novels into Film" should be a valuable resource for novelists who want their stories to transfer to film and film makers who want to enact use novels as a resource for stories. It is a fascinating account of the frequent disagreements between novelists and film makers on how a story should be told. just Jack 0 of 0 people found the following review helpful. Novels into Film By Debbie M. Howdeshell I enjoy this book because I can use it in my English classes that I teach in high school. It helps in introducing books to my students. 3 of 3 people found the following review helpful. Does Decent Job in Discussion, Commits Serious Mistakes in Details By T. NAKAJIMA This is a review of "The Encyclopedia of Novels into Films" Second Edition (Paperback Copyright 2005), by John C. Tibbetts and James M. Welsh. The first entry of the second edition doesn't look good; you will see these on p. 1 of the book: ADAPTATION (1876) See THE ORCHARD THIEF What??? The source material for the Nicholas Cage film was written in the 19th century? But hadn't Susan Orlean contributed her original article to New Yorker like 10 years ago? ...No encyclopedia is proof against the accusation of omission. I know some things must go if others should remain. But there is still something we can do to make our books better, something like proofreading. I thought it might be helpful to read this book for I am working on my homepage where I need information about films and novels. Maybe I am mistaken. In each entry the book's contributor(s) discuss the novels and the films based on them. The methods of discussion are not always the same, but they are mainly about the differences between the book and its adaptation with summary of the plot. Brief references are attached to each of the discussion, but not much, and sometimes the discussion seems too intent on pointing out the changes done to the original book, but that is not a big problem. Any encyclopedias, even Wikipedia, are only a starting point for further research, and basic data will do. And it is certain that the summary of the novels and films comes in handy when you read or saw them long time ago. What I disagree with this encyclopedia is that it omits most of the made-for-TV adaptations. The decision would be understandable if the book is written strictly for academic purpose, like the hard cover study published by university press. Scholars have to narrow down the theme, and there is a difference between 'film' and 'TV.' But as I said, this is an encyclopedia, gateway to more information and wider perspectives. However, the book does not list many important works. In 'Pride and Prejudice' the writer mentions briefly the outstanding Colin Firth version, giving only one phrase, which is 'a 1985 British Broadcasting Corporation adaptation' (p. 360) That's it. And look, 1985? The correct year is of course 1995 (or the same company's older 1980 version). Either way, this is another incredible mistake and negligence that are unforgivable. In the page 'How to Use This Book' the book goes: "Not only many of them (made-for-TV adaptations) of inferior quality, but they are usually difficult to obtain (either for general viewers or researchers). Both statements are absolutely wrong. As to the quality of some of the made-for-TV adaptations, I don't have to add anything more; as to the availability of the material, perhaps some people have never seen the recently released titles of DVDs. But what I disliked about the book is ... I cannot find the right word, but ... its lack of enthusiasm, See the column of 'Oliver Twist' for instance. About the Monogram version made in 1933, the book says, 'Prints are not available for viewing' (p. 329) but this is not simply true VHS is available for nearly 9 years, and I obtained a copy of several years ago. Of course this alone is not a big mistake, but if considered together with some other omissions, misprints (or misinformation) and questionable policy of the editing, it starts to look much bigger. Did they really do thorough research? Are they really thinking about the possible readers or researcher who might rely on the book? I admit I got some information from this book, and that's the reason for giving three stars. But I was not impressed. I was and am more impressed with the numerous reviewers you can find at IMDb, which might have already superseded this kind of book.