
Roger Ebert Harry Potter

*Roger Ebert Harry
Potter*

*Downloaded from
db.whlcarchitecture.com
by Hester & Raiden*

ROGER EBERT AND THE HARRY POTTER FILMS: A CRITICAL LEGACY

When the first **Harry Potter** film, *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, premiered in 2001, the world of cinema was about to witness a phenomenon. Among the many voices that weighed in on the adaptation of J.K. Rowling's beloved series, one stood out for its authority, wit, and uncompromising

standards: the legendary film critic Roger Ebert. Ebert's take on the Harry Potter franchise offers a fascinating window into how a serious critic grappled with blockbuster fantasy aimed at young audiences. In this article, we will explore **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** reviews, his overarching perspective on the series, and how his critiques remain relevant for fans and scholars alike.

Who Was Roger Ebert?

Before diving into his views on the boy wizard, it is essential to understand the man behind the reviews. Roger Ebert was the first film critic to win a Pulitzer Prize for criticism, and he became a household name through his long-running television show *Siskel & Ebert*. His writing combined sharp insight, accessible language, and an unapologetic love for cinema. Ebert did not shy away from popular films, but he held them to rigorous standards of storytelling, character development, and emotional impact. His reviews of the Harry Potter series reflect that careful

balance between appreciating mass entertainment and demanding artistic integrity.

Overall Impression: A Critic Who Appreciated Magic—But Not Blindly

When we examine **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** reviews collectively, a clear

pattern emerges: Ebert respected the films as competent, often charming adaptations, yet he never let his enthusiasm override his critical eye. He praised the casting, the visual effects, and the faithfulness to Rowling's world, but he also noted weaknesses in pacing, over-reliance on spectacle, and occasional lapses in emotional depth. His reviews are a masterclass in balanced criticism—acknowledging what works while pointing out what could have been better.

In his initial review of *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, Ebert wrote that the film was “an enjoyable, well-crafted fantasy” but expressed reservations about its length and the danger of “illustrating the book rather than adapting it.” This became a recurring

theme: Ebert valued cinematic storytelling over mere reproduction. He wanted the movies to stand on their own, not just serve as expensive illustrations of the novels.

Reviewing the First Film: A Solid Foundation with Minor Cracks

The first entry in the series set the tone. Ebert gave *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* three out of four stars—a respectable rating from a critic known for his stinginess with top marks.

He marveled at the casting of Daniel Radcliffe, Emma Watson, and Rupert Grint, calling them “exactly right.” The sets, the music by John Williams, and the whimsical tone all earned his approval. However, he noted that the film’s nearly two-and-a-half-hour runtime might test the patience of younger viewers, and he lamented that certain scenes—particularly those involving Quidditch—felt rushed.

Ebert also touched on a deeper issue: the film’s failure to fully capture the sense of wonder and danger that made the book so compelling. He argued that director Chris Columbus focused too much on “getting it right” and too little on “making it magical.” That criticism might sound harsh, but it reveals Ebert’s belief that film adaptation requires

transformation, not transcription. His **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** review for the first movie remains a classic example of how to critique a phenomenon without dismissing it.

The Chamber of Secrets: More of the Same, but Better

With *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*, Ebert again awarded three stars. He acknowledged that the sequel improved on its predecessor in some ways—the special effects were more

polished, the tone darker, and the performances more assured. Yet he still felt the film clung too tightly to the book's structure. In one memorable passage, he wrote, "The movie is a faithful adaptation, but faithfulness is not always a virtue in cinema. A film must find its own rhythm, and *Chamber of Secrets* often plods when it should soar."

Ebert also praised the introduction of Dobby the house-elf and the climactic basilisk battle, but he expressed mild disappointment that the film did not delve deeper into the psychological horror of Tom Riddle's diary. For him, the Harry Potter series had the potential to be more than just a series of events—it could be a meditation on fear, identity, and choice. That deeper dimension

would come in later installments, but at this stage, Ebert felt the filmmakers were still playing it safe.

Prisoner of Azkaban: A Turning Point (and Ebert's Highest Praise)

When Alfonso Cuarón took over directing duties for *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, Ebert's enthusiasm spiked. He gave the film three and a half stars—the highest rating he would give

any Potter film. His review gushed over Cuarón's visual flair, the mature performances, and the film's willingness to embrace ambiguity. Ebert wrote that this installment "finally feels like a movie, not a filmed book." He highlighted the time-turner sequence as a high point of imaginative cinema, and he praised the deeper themes of forgiveness and redemption.

This review is crucial to understanding **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** criticism: Ebert was not anti-fantasy; he was pro-art. When a director brought genuine vision to the material, Ebert responded with enthusiasm. He argued that *Prisoner of Azkaban* proved the series could be both a commercial juggernaut and a work of artistic merit. Many fans and scholars consider this the best film

in the franchise, and Ebert's review helped cement that reputation.

Goblet of Fire: Spectacle vs. Substance

Mike Newell's *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* marked a return to a more traditional blockbuster approach, and Ebert's reaction was mixed. He gave the film three stars, admiring the Triwizard Tournament set pieces and the growing darkness of the story. The graveyard scene—where Voldemort returns—was singled out as "genuinely chilling." Yet Ebert criticized the film for being

overstuffed, with too many characters and subplots crammed into two and a half hours. He noted that the romance subplots felt forced, and the emotional core of the story—Harry's struggle with grief and survival—was often lost amid the action.

Ebert's **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** review for *Goblet of Fire* also touched on the increasing violence. He acknowledged that the series was maturing, but he wondered if the filmmakers were leaning too heavily on spectacle to compensate for narrative coherence. This critique foreshadows the challenges the later films would face.

Order of the Phoenix: A Darker Turn, but Still Flawed

With *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, David Yates took the helm, and Ebert gave the film three stars. He appreciated the darker palette and the focus on Harry's isolation and anger. Imelda Staunton's portrayal of Dolores Umbridge was singled out as one of the series' best performances. However, Ebert found the film's pacing uneven, with the middle act bogged down by

exposition. He also noted that the climactic battle in the Department of Mysteries, while visually impressive, lacked the emotional weight of similar scenes in the earlier films.

Ebert's review of *Order of the Phoenix* reflected his growing concern that the series was becoming more about plot mechanics than character development. He wrote, "Harry spends much of the film looking angry, and we understand why, but we wish the screenplay gave him more moments of quiet reflection." That observation reveals Ebert's insistence that even blockbusters must carve out space for stillness and introspection.

The Half-Blood Prince: A Character Study That Almost Soared

Perhaps the most interesting **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** review is for *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. Ebert gave it three stars, but his analysis was unusually nuanced. He praised the film for focusing on romance and friendship rather than constant action, calling it "a welcome change of pace." The

performances of Radcliffe, Watson, and particularly Alan Rickman as Snape earned high marks. Ebert described the film as “a melancholic, autumnal film that understands the weight of approaching tragedy.”

Yet he again pointed out structural problems. The subplot involving the Half-Blood Prince’s textbook was confusingly handled, and the film’s ending felt rushed. Ebert lamented that the final confrontation between Dumbledore and Harry was underwhelming compared to the emotional buildup. Still, his review stands as a strong defense of the film’s quieter ambitions.

The Deathly Hallows – Parts 1 and 2: A Bittersweet Finale

When the final chapter arrived, split into two parts, Ebert was generally impressed but not entirely satisfied. He gave *Deathly Hallows – Part 1* three stars, praising its road-movie structure and the trio’s performances. However, he felt the film was too long and that the absence of Hogwarts made it feel

disconnected from the series' heart. The slow pacing, while intentional, tested his patience.

For *Deathly Hallows - Part 2*, he awarded three and a half stars—his second-highest rating for the series. The epic battles, the emotional resolution, and the final confrontation with Voldemort all earned his approval. He singled out the scene in which Harry walks into the Forbidden Forest as “deeply moving.” Yet he could not resist a final critique: the epilogue, he felt, was overly sentimental and wrapped up the story too neatly. Ebert wrote, “After all the darkness, the film ends with a tidy bow. I wanted something more ambiguous, more true to life.”

Ebert's Legacy in Harry Potter Criticism

What can we learn from the **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** reviews? First, that a great critic can appreciate a franchise without worshipping it. Ebert never dismissed the Potter films as mere children's entertainment; he engaged with them seriously, identifying their strengths and weaknesses with clarity and wit. Second, his reviews demonstrate that adaptation is an art form in itself. The films that earned his highest praise—*Prisoner of Azkaban* and *Deathly Hallows Part 2*—were those that

dared to reinterpret the source material rather than simply replicate it.

Finally, Ebert's work reminds us that criticism is a conversation, not a verdict. He did not claim to have the final word on Harry Potter; he offered his perspective, and invited readers to think more deeply about what they had seen. In an age of clickbait and polarized opinions, his measured, thoughtful approach is a model for how to discuss popular culture.

Conclusion

Roger Ebert's journey through the Harry Potter series mirrors the journey of the

films themselves: from cautious optimism, through growing sophistication, to a bittersweet farewell. His reviews remain a valuable resource for fans who want to understand not only what made the Potter movies work, but also what they could have been. By examining the **Roger Ebert Harry Potter** legacy, we see how a master critic can illuminate a blockbuster franchise without losing sight of cinema's higher potential. Whether you disagree with his ratings or cherish them, Ebert's voice enriches our experience of Harry's world—proving that even magic deserves rigorous, loving scrutiny.