

James's audience shift from chapter to chapter. A character's casual reference in "The Siege of London" (1883) to "the decadence of the Roman Empire" was enough, she asserts, for James's Victorian readers to conjure up Couture's famous painting *Romans of the Decadence* (1855) in all its symbolic detail. She assures us that "most contemporary readers of *The Reverberator* (1888) would have seen photographs" of Jean Goujon's bas-reliefs for his 1547-49 *Fountain of the Innocents* (23). But as evidence of James's catholic tastes, her arguments often depend on references to painters who were undervalued at the time, such as Longhi and Vermeer, and whose works would assumedly be inaccessible to many readers. At other points, Tintner limits James's audience, then and now, to tenacious, cultivated detectives, sensitive to those "subtle, ingenious, and subterranean clues" that are "planted in the shadows of the story" (54). Yet today's readers, she claims, "schooled by the movies, television, and the blockbuster exhibitions of the great museums, [are] now fully prepared to understand the intricate relationship between a work of art and James's fictive world," especially with her book "to facilitate that understanding" (xii).

Finally, Tintner's reliance on the organic metaphor of "morphology" is problematic. Although the entire book is based on the premise that "the unifying vision of an individual artist" can be shown to "direct [a] story's course" (xi), successive chapters on *Roderick Hudson*, for instance, treat Pinturicchio and then Daumier as controlling. An intriguing essay on Holbein's presence in *The Ambassadors* would seem to cancel at least partially Tintner's fine extended discussion in *Museum World*, which details the influences of many other painters on that novel. Her argument about the "Gianbellini" in "The Chaperon" cites the roles of two architectural monuments as well. How many "morphologies" can inform a single literary work?

A poststructuralist critic might profitably exploit such multiplicities, but issues of intention, intertextuality, and the instability of a text never bedevil Tintner. They are likely, however, to stimulate readers of this book, and perhaps therein lies its greatest usefulness.

Kristine Ottesen Garrigan
DePaul University

British Photography in the Nineteenth Century: The Fine Art Tradition edited by Michael Weaver. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. Pp. 304. \$59.95. ISBN 0-521-34119-1.

The story of nineteenth-century British photography has been told from various perspectives: technological, biographical, and stylistic. In this volume, readers will find twenty-two short essays on British photography that have been collected to examine photography from a connoisseur's perspective, here called "the fine art tradition." As Mike Weaver explains in his introductory preface, the essays examine works produced in such a way that they "transcended literal fact to arrive at a degree of expressive meaning" (xv). As a result, the essays act as one voice arguing for the legitimacy of photography as a fine art; a battle seemingly as old as photography itself and as out-of-step today as trying to argue against photography's importance.

From this collection we are reassured that the established canon of great British photographers is largely intact: essays explore the aesthetic preoccupations of Talbot, Hill and Adamson, Fenton, Rejlander, Robinson, Cameron, Davison, Emerson, Evans, and Annan. For historical integrity and specialized interest, other essays examine the artistic pretensions of "lesser figures," including Lady Clementina Hawarden, John Dillwyn Llewelyn, Benjamin Brecknell Turner, and Calvert Richard Jones. The biographical model is preserved here, where family manuscripts and other personal materials are used as supportive original research. The collected essays are arranged somewhat chronologically from Talbot to the little-known pictorialist Malcolm Arbuthnot.

In his preface, Weaver notes carefully that by the end of the nineteenth century, photography in Great Britain was known almost entirely through its photographic societies: "Fenton and the Photographic Society, Emerson and the New English Art Club, Davison and the Camera Club, and Evans and the Linked