

regard to tradition or propriety. This disregard makes Cunard a rare and compelling figure through which to trace the complicated lines of modernity. By recognizing Cunard's vexed subject position as a productive area of study, Moynagh has opened up the dialogue and made an important contribution to current scholarship.

*Holly McSpadden*  
*Missouri Southern State University*

John Galvin, ed. *Dickens on Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Pp. 225. \$65.00 hardcover; \$24.00 paper.

*Dickens on Screen* is part of a series produced by Cambridge University Press focusing on cinematic adaptations of the works of various classical authors. *Jane Austen on Screen* and *Eighteenth-Century Fiction on Screen* are already in print; *A History of Shakespeare on Screen* is forthcoming. (It is curious that Austen's first name is included in the title, whereas Dickens and Shakespeare can get by on surname recognition alone.) Each of the volumes in this series consists of a collection of essays by specialists in the fields of both literature and film solicited and arranged by the respective editors.

In *Dickens on Screen*, editor John Galvin divides his collection of short pieces into four parts: a roundtable discussion among film critics, literary critics and psychotherapists, a selection of short essays by literary critics who explore the connections between novels and film, a short third section featuring essays and interviews by and with those who have been actively involved in turning Dickens's novels into films—a screenwriter, a director, an actor, and finally, a concluding selection of essays on film criticism and history that attempt to place Dickensian films within the larger context of twentieth-century cinematography.

Unfortunately, given the quality and expertise of the contributors here, many of whom are well-known names in the field of Dickens studies, the volume as a whole is a disappointment, promising more than it delivers. In fact the title *Dickens on Screen* is something of a misnomer: only six of the seventeen short pieces in this collection deal directly with adaptations of Dickens novels or stories into movies or television. The rest either circle around the topic, or deal with it tangentially. For instance, John Bowen's essay on eroticism in *David Copperfield* provides a stimulating

analysis of the novel, but Bowen's finest observations refer exclusively to Dickens's text. Only the title—"David Copperfield's Home Movies"—and the last two pages of the essay make any reference to Dickens on screen. There are essays, however, that circle the topic of Dickens and film quite entertainingly; for instance, Marguerite Rippey's essay on Orson Welles and why he failed to make a movie out of *The Pickwick Papers*. While this is a lively and informative piece, it tells us a great deal more about Orson Welles than it does about Dickens. Given the fact that Welles's version of *The Pickwick Papers* never got made, it seems somewhat out of place in a collection entitled *Dickens on Screen*.

Of this volume's four sections, I found the roundtable discussion at the beginning to be the most easily expendable. It expects readers to be familiar with David Lean's version of *Oliver Twist*, and, like most discussions, it rambles off in several different directions and lacks a clear focus. This brings me to my other problem with *Dickens on Screen*, namely, lack of focus. It is not at all clear for whom this book was intended. Since so few of the pieces actually deal with Dickens on screen, serious students of film are likely to be disappointed. Only Garrett Stewart's "Dickens, Eisenstein, Film" will offer them much to chew on, and then only if they can decipher the often-convoluted prose. Similarly, serious students of Dickens are just as likely to be disappointed, because, with some exceptions that I will discuss in a moment, few of the short essays in this collection have much to say about dramatizing or adapting Dickens's work for the screen. Even the stronger essays seem to have wandered into the wrong book. A case in point is Robert Polhemus's "Screen Memories in Dickens and Woody Allen." This is a fascinating meditation on what Polhemus calls the Lot Complex, that is, the attraction of an older man to a younger woman as demonstrated by the filmed version of Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Woody Allen's *Stardust Memories*, as well as by Dickens and Allen's personal biographies. While this lively and provocative essay is well worth reading in its own right, its presence in a collection called *Dickens on Screen* is problematic given that Polhemus's focus is not on David Lean's film but on the biographical factors that influenced both Dickens's and Allen's portrayal of women.

As mentioned above, I make an exception of six of the essays in this collection, which are not only on topic, but are well worth reading as well. My personal favourite is John O. Jordan's "*Great Expectations* on Australian Television." Jordan's essay tells of a 1987 Australian television production of *Great Expectations*, written and directed by Tim Burstall, that was "at once an adaptation of Dickens's novel and an imaginative expansion of

it.” The program was called *Great Expectations: The Untold Story*, and the “untold” part of the title tells the story of Magwitch’s years in New South Wales. In fact, of the program’s six hours running time, only one hour, according to Jordan, derives directly from Dickens. Jordan begins by noting that “the shadow of Dickens falls heavily across Australian literary and cultural production of the past two centuries” (46). He then proceeds to analyze the portrayal of Magwitch, the central character in the Australian production, as a version of the “ideal national type,” the rugged frontiersman who is mythologized in numerous Australian narratives. Jordan’s essay is compelling for the way it taps into postcolonial theory as a means of discussing the literary and cinematic implications of this Australian take on Dickens. I wish only that Jordan had been allowed more space to elaborate on his absorbing analysis of the Australian national character as filtered through this production of Dickens’s novel.

Another fine essay is Regina Barreca’s lively “David Lean’s *Great Expectations*.” Lean’s version of *Great Expectations* is, incidentally, alluded to in several of the essays. However, Barreca’s analysis is the only one that does justice to both Lean’s film and Dickens’s original. Barreca is a superb reader of films, if I may put it that way, and her analysis of Lean’s *Great Expectations* is almost literally a “reading” in that she analyzes the meaning of how and why shots are framed as they are and how Lean’s filming of certain scenes differs from Dickens’s original. This too is an essay that should have been longer.

Pamela Katz’s “Directing Dickens: Alfonso Cuarón’s 1998 *Great Expectations*” discusses the making of the 1998 film, starring Gwyneth Paltrow, that resets the Dickens’s novel in twentieth-century Florida and Manhattan. Katz and Cuarón have some interesting things to say about Hollywood’s constraints upon directors. Interesting as well—but too short—is John Glavin’s interview with the English actor, Miriam Margolyes, who has made a career of depicting Dickens’s women on stage and screen. Margolyes claims to be frustrated in her attempts to play Mrs. Gamp and her explanation of how she lost out on that role and how she came to be performing so much Dickens on stage makes for lively reading.

Steve J. Wurtzler’s “*David Copperfield* (1935) and the U.S. Curriculum” and Jeffrey Sconce’s “Dickens, Selznick and Southpark” mine similar territory but in different ways. Wurtzler is concerned with the way George Cukor’s film was marketed as a “prestige production” to high school students, thus legitimizing film as a purveyor of high culture. Jeffrey Sconce’s essay uses this same observation as the basis for comparing the reverential way classical texts, such as Dickens’s novels, were treated by

Even the  
stronger  
essays seem  
to have wan-  
dered into the  
wrong book.

the popular entertainment industry of the 1930s and the way they are treated today in such productions as Southpark's animated 22-minute retelling of *Great Expectations*. Sconce notes ruefully that Southpark's version of *Great Expectations* was the least popular of all its episodes and has never been rerun.

*Dickens on Screen* ends with a listing of television and film adaptations made from Dickens's novels. This filmography is far from complete—omitting, for instance, the 1922 version of *Oliver Twist*, starring Jackie Coogan as Oliver. It is an odd omission considering that a still from this movie is featured on the cover of *Dickens on Screen*.

*Goldie Morgentaler*  
*University of Lethbridge*

Anne Lancashire. *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. 355. Appendices, index. U.S. \$70.00 cloth.

Given her fearsome scholarship and vast erudition, Anne Lancashire suffers with surprising grace the stupidities and unproven assumptions that have marred the study of the early English theatre to date. At one point in her latest book she optimistically hazards the view that such prejudices “may finally now be extinct” (25). Alas, they are not: your run-of-mill teacher of theatre history no less than your average textbook introduction to drama still maddeningly repeats the idea that classical theatre traditions completely disappeared from Britain in the Dark Ages, and that theatre was “reborn,” as if from scratch, in the tenth or eleventh century, from “within” the Church.

The idea is false and in *London Civic Theatre* Lancashire proves it so. This book should be required reading for all scholars and teachers of drama and theatre, not only because it establishes many of the facts (and corrects many of the fictions) about theatre in London before 1558, but also because it demonstrates the extent to which Medieval theatre in general was a civic activity, undertaken by secular city authorities and groups for the entertainment of citizens, celebrities, and tourists, while serving (or undermining) a variety of social, political, religious, and military agendas. As Lancashire shows, in the hundreds or thousands of plays, pageants, parades, mummings, variety acts and naumachia exhibited to Londoners