



HAL
open science

Photoliterature: trading gazes

Jean-Pierre Montier

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Pierre Montier. Photoliterature: trading gazes. *Image & Narrative*, 2018, Beyond the Text / Image Interaction: the construction and deconstruction of meaning in children's literature, 19 (2), pp.77-90. hal-01896889

HAL Id: hal-01896889

<https://hal.science/hal-01896889>

Submitted on 2 Nov 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Photoliterature: trading gazes

Jean-Pierre Montier, CELLAM, Univ. Rennes

The method of our discourse

We all know that nobody can place themselves outside the frames which enable the formulation of knowledge, as such frames set boundaries to validate what lies within. There is nothing strange in that, except – as in geopolitics – for the problem of managing *contact zones*. In terms of the relationships between texts and images, these contact zones are more ill-defined than ever, it seems to me, for three reasons. The first is technological: never has it been so easy to introduce images into a text, narrative or not; and creation (literary, in this instance) is, as always, in advance of criticism or theoretical reflection. The second is institutional: although academic frames have shifted since the 1990s with the introduction of Visual Studies, we are well aware that the meaning and issues arising from these tectonic shifts are not quite the same in the romance-language and English-speaking areas – to use very large categories. The third is cultural: whilst the dichotomy between the universe of images and the world of the text has always existed, and rules about how they might interact have been posited since Homer himself in the famous *ekphrasis* of Achilles' shield (*The Iliad*, XVIII), the proliferation of images in contemporary literary texts is felt/experienced as an intrusion, deregulation, even unfair competition. Let us clarify that, from our point of view, such a perception is not illegitimate. Images as much as texts speak fundamentally to matters of value and in consequence, power and therefore also, territory. The question which interests us in particular here is this: apart from the dichotomy between images and discourse, is there something we could call a “territory” specific to relations between photographs and literature? Or is the specificity of the photograph not sufficient to justify a different approach (to that of traditional visual arts)? Sometimes as research adapts to the subjects of its study, we create neologisms: is this the case, and can we do without the notion of ‘photoliterature’? If we need such a term, how may we sketch its contours, and by what categories and paradigms could we describe its functioning?

The concept of *Photoliterature* emerged in 1988, as the title of an issue of *Revue des Sciences humaines* directed by Charles Grivel, professor of 19th century French Literature at the University of Mannheim¹. However, the possible complementary relations between literature and photography had for long been underestimated, if not explicitly rejected by literary theory itself – by Käte Hamburger, for example (Albers, 2007 :13) – with arguments which were difficult to dismiss.

¹ Like Charles Grivel, most of the researchers who developed photoliterature as a distinct field came from a background in French (or English) Literature and not from Comparative Literature: such as Jean Arrouye, Daniel Grojnovski and Jean-François Chevrier, who also contributed to this issue, and later, Philippe Ortel, Jérôme Thélot and Paul Edwards, to name but a few.

Why was literary comparatism caught short by the photograph, and not by painting or music? The main reason is easy to state: the photograph pertains as much to technical (chemistry, optics) as artistic matters, so the photographer is as much an ‘engineer’ (somebody passionate about technical progress) as an amateur with no particular skill, or an artist conscious of the means at his or her disposal. In other words, there is a real dilemma between art and photography, which is not only historical or ideological – it is structural. Whilst comparative studies are in *terra cognita* in relation to painting or music as they basically belong to the same artistic field as literature, it must in fact deny part of the specificity of photography in order to allow itself to apprehend it. Or indeed, we must agree to a shift in conceptual lines and fields, plainly facing the question of an art which is also ‘without art’, being mechanical, optical, chemical and industrial. This is the option I have chosen since 1995, when I entitled the book I dedicated to Henri Cartier-Bresson ‘*L’art sans art*’ [*The Artless Art*] (Montier, 1995), as did François Soulages who also decided, in his *Esthétique de la photographie* [*The Aesthetics of Photography*], to make ‘without art’ a fully valid category (Soulages, 1998). So we should admit that photography shares the vast and prestigious domain of the artistic tradition with literature, painting and sculpture (Théophile Gautier, in an article published in *La Lumière*, was noteworthy for creating a ‘photosculpture’). However, we must also admit – as it is also part of the ‘without art’ family – that the quarrels and controversies studding photography’s difficult journey to institutional recognition were not without basis.

This indeed was Charles Baudelaire’s position in his famous text in the 1859 *Salon* « Le public moderne and la photographie » [*The Modern Audience and Photography*]. He mentions, in connection with the vogue for daguerréotypes, a ‘new industry’ provoking the ‘fanaticism’ of ‘idolatrous hordes’, and decries “the vile society which rushed as one, Narcissus-like, to contemplate its trivial image on metal”². For Baudelaire the issue was not to deplore the (real) commercial threat photographers represented for painters, but rather to set out a strong theoretical paradigm, between on one side ‘the photographic industry’ and on the other the idea of a transcendental, ‘philosophical’ art, compatible with all that remains “holy in the French spirit”³ (Baudelaire, 1990 : 317-18). The question is no longer of rivalry between the different arts, but of the mixing, in this well-signposted domain, of a practice which shared their mimetic ambition, whilst deregulating or undermining the very idea of representation – in other words, of a fiction invented by the human spirit and realised by human hand. This is why the idea of an image made *sine manu facta* (Bazin, 1958: 9-17), or a ‘Veronica’ (an image more than merely true, but actually ‘authentic’) as confirmed by the discovery of the Turin shroud (Mondzain, 2003) has long imbued the mythology of photography, and confirms its unique position. As well as this, it is probable that the dual status of the photographic image, both imprint and fiction, had effects or influences on the evolution of the very idea of fiction in literature, for example with Louis Aragon when he puts forward the singular notion of « mentir-vrai » [lying-true] after reflecting on collages, and also with Blaise Cendrars who referred to news reporting

² « la société immonde [qui] se rua, comme un seul Narcisse, pour contempler sa triviale image sur le métal »

³ « de divin dans l’esprit français » (Baudelaire, 1990 : 317-18).

between 1929 and 1931 in *Vu* on the Jean Galmot affair as a « roman vrai » [true novel], in *Rhum [Rum]* (Montier, 1997).

From drawing to painting and from etching to photography, we are not dealing with a single or unified lineage of images belonging to quite the same ontology. When Baudelaire couched the problem in terms of ‘faith’, he was questioning the transcendent capacity of the photograph, in line with the new society he saw emerging at the same time, that of democracy making everything equal and neutralising all verticality. This is why Jérôme Thélot was correct to speak specifically of an ‘age of photography’ which is at one with our Modernity: “‘modern’ means, worked upon by photography and, more precisely, overdetermined by the fundamental traits which constitute photography”⁴ (Thélot, 2009 :17). The invention of photography made us enter into a new era: to reprise the terms of Régis Debray (Debray, 1992), we could say that the *iconosphere*, *logosphere* and *graphosphere* have no longer been evolving along parallel orbits since the photograph effected, an ‘irruption’, as a factor, an accelerator, a symptom and as a result an excellent analyser of our Modernity (Montier, 2008: 11-12).

Ever since the photograph, *terzo incomodo*, erupted into the traditional order of mimetic arts, the parallels, which had worked in pairs (literature/ painting, etc.), were scrambled, because of the very ‘bipolar’ character of the photograph, as art and ‘without art’. Here we are dealing more with zigzags or masked practices, as the effects of the photograph were often underground or buried, which of course does not take from their importance. Today we still need to make a list and carry out a systematic study of the 19th century painters who used photographs (often discreetly) to compose their paintings, from Fromentin to Derain. As for writers, the subtitle of Philippe Ortel’s book, ‘enquête sur une révolution invisible’ [enquiry into an invisible revolution] (Ortel, 2001) reveals how their hesitation was equalled only by their fascination, with the exception of Victor Hugo who immediately integrated the *oxymoronic* character of the photograph into his poetics and metaphysics, which were themselves based on the figure of the oxymoron. The photograph was for Hugo a « soleil noir [...] » (an expression used by Paul Edwards in 2008 as a book title) « [...] d’où rayonne la nuit », [a black sun from which radiates the night]. This very contradiction is at the heart of Hugo’s conception of Creation, rays of light and shadows intermingled.

It is important to posit the oxymoronic character of the photograph: both of art and ‘without art’, coming from Nature and Industry, being made and conceived in contradiction to the norms of classical aesthetics. We must understand that saying this is by no means to claim for example that Henri Cartier-Bresson, mentioned above, was not the immense artist he indubitably was. It is rather a matter of taking seriously what he himself always held: that photography can be learned in a few hours – that he did not consider himself an artist in the same mould as his painter friends (Matisse, Giacometti, etc.), and that if photography as he practised it was to be imagined as an art, that its philosophical and aesthetic model would come not from western schools (he had taken classes with

⁴ “[...] “moderne” veut dire : travaillé par la photographie, et, plus précisément, surdéterminé par les traits fondamentaux dont la photographie est faite” (Thélot, 2009 :17).

the Cubist theorist André Lhôte), but in a Eugen Herrigel essay on zen archery he had got from Georges Braque. Photography is the art of archery, the art of knowing how to breathe and dance before the visible, of knowing how to seize the moment where an event takes form in the uncertain chaos of phenomena, a strategic art, an art of a hunter, as Cardinal de Retz claimed in *Mémoires*, whence Cartier-Bresson took the phrase « instant décisif » [decisive instant]. To speak of ‘without art’ is therefore not to devalue the œuvre of this photographer, or of any other, but instead to respect his thinking and position. It is also to be faithful to sociological and historical reality: the artification movement (Heinich, 2002) of the photograph only became effective (at least in France) during the second half of the 20th century. So when Cartier-Bresson (or we may as well say Brassai or Doisneau) chose photography in the 1930s, it was because it did not fall under any institutional academic rubric, and thus offered a wide range of freedom of creation. As it was not considered of great value, photography lent itself to all the games of value-searching and exchanges with other activities about ‘making visible’ and telling stories, in particular literature. Being ‘without art’ is therefore an initial handicap as much as it is the condition for the possibility of transactions we will deal with later.

In ceasing to regard the ontology of images in favour of the practice of those who produce or use them, we must underline the following paradox: the situation of a minor art or the para-artistic status attributed to photography, since its origin until at least the first half of the 20th century, actually liberated photographers as much as writers from the sterile quarrels about precedence, and opened a place of freedom which allowed practitioners to suggest shared ‘bricolages’, extending to the ambition of creating an entirely new type of book. This was the case for example with *Facile [Easy]* (1935), which was made by Man Ray, Paul Éluard, Guy Lévis-Mano and Paul Éluard’s wife, Nush. Here reading and seeing maximise each other’s potential in the pages of a book which became an ‘erotic scene’ of absolute originality (Montier, 2014a). In this unusual quartet, we also see the complexity of the complementarity between the respective ambitions and functions of the artists who collaborated in making one of the most beautiful bibliophilic successes. The book is nothing like a classical work, with an author who gives a manuscript to an editor who then asks an artist to illustrate it. In fact we are not dealing with *illustration*. I would compare it to the way that although we use the same word, a *model*, for a woman who poses for a painter or a photographer, it is not really the same action or work in the two cases. Man Ray does not make images of Nush’s body - she is the one who participates in the transfiguration of her own body into black and white values, from the transfer of the pigmentation of her skin into photographic grain and then into typographical points. This obviously leads to an erotic power bordering on pornography. Lévis-Mano, in turn, does not limit himself to the choice of font and paper, but also plays, for example, with the centrefold of the double page to make it match the folds of Nush’s body, incorporating the image into the very material of the page, as the poems written by Nush’s husband brought *writing by light* to its peak (the literal meaning of the word ‘photograph’) with their calligraphy, in black on white and vice versa, in free verse extolling the absolute liberty of (sexual) pleasure and of seeing - in other words, of loving. « J’ai la beauté facile et c’est heureux » [Beauty comes easily to me and that’s lucky], writes Paul

Éluard: *Facile* is also a *hommage* to the ‘ease’ of the photographic operation, and to the magic of its automatic writing, both abstract and literal. This operation is eminently ‘poetic’, and according to the Eluardian ideal it confers to immanence a transcendent power.

Paradigms - transactional and diagonal

From the previous example, we see that the diverse actors of such an oeuvre do not work in parallel, but rather in coalescence with one another. We must therefore leave the logic of parallels, as we shall see below. Contrary to Baudelaire’s claim, the photographic image is not as unsuitable as all that in terms of transcendence. Earlier we spoke of ‘transfiguration’ to try to write the phenomenon of incorporating Nush’s body into the very fabric of the page with the power of light broken up into its most vigorously abstract prism, black and white. We very nearly wrote: ‘transubstantiation’, but this would not have been correct. In fact a constant in the history of the photograph is its appropriation of religious vocabulary, notably in the French cultural domain, where for example the word ‘revelation’ refers to a laboratory operation where chemistry challenges alchemy. This is a notion of obviously religious origin, suffusing many literary texts from the 19th century to today (Monjour, 2017), especially Georges Rodenbach’s famous novel, *Bruges-la-Morte*, which delineates an amorous and morbid fetishism in the foggy atmosphere of the beguinages (Oberhuber 2017). The notion of ‘revelation’ also takes part in an ambivalent way in the desacralisation of transcendence, by reifying the apparition or revelation to which it refers. ‘Modern’ man (since the era of photography began) is thus torn between the resurgence of archaic or magical thinking which would have him believe in ghosts, and strictly materialist thinking which is equally fascinating when he must accept that an image he appreciates emotionally is nothing but a photonic trace. Such is the train of the magnificent work of reflection, aesthetics and poetry, *L’Instant and son ombre [The Instant and its Shadow]* by Jean-Christophe Bailly, which compares a Talbot photograph, representing the shadow of a ladder resting on a haystack, with what a photograph is and is not: on a wall, the shadow of a man dissolves at the explosion of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima (Bailly, 2008).

All the ambivalence of the photograph resides in its being both a scientific and technical object, secularising and metaphysical, a mediated medium, potentially artistic but in fact accessible to anyone. This ambivalence has been rich since the time of Romanticism, when Victor Hugo spoke of a ‘collaboration with the sun’ (Heilbrun & Molinari, 1998). He wrote on the back of a photograph of closed eyes, « Oyendo a dios » [Listening to God]. Hugo merges sunstreams, magnetism and the Word Who creates. More generally, every photographic portrait of a writer is more than a simple representation, being also the momentary *incarnation* of the *idea* of a writer, and for him/ her a dialogue with posterity – as André Gide knew perfectly well, when he posed with the death mask of Leopardi by his side (Montier, 2017: 22-27). On the other hand, it is clear that this perspective causes horror for a Catholic writer like Villiers de l’Isle-Adam, who published *L’Ève future [The Future Eve]* in 1886, mocking the feminine android produced by the American engineer Thomas Edison in a wholly photographic type of creation. This does not prevent Villiers from contributing to inventing science-fiction in his fascinating novel which prefigures the ‘electricity fairy’ and the ‘robot’: models

which Futurism would later purloin. Villiers even outlined the questions we face today relating to artificial intelligence and sensibility, which have also been asked by the creators of digital and collaborative photoliterature, like the collective 'Remue.net'.

Although photography, from all these angles we have noted, is not a neighbour to literature, it penetrates it deeply– from the graphic dimension to the question of its metaphysical force, including the very notion of fiction. So we should refer to the pairing photograph/literature not as though they were parallel monads; nor should we gloss over the contradictions peculiar to the oxymoronic situation of the photograph by treating it only via cultural studies, no matter how legitimate this approach may be in other contexts. Such is the rôle of the unified and unifying concept of Photoliterature, and such is its necessity.

We also need to determine the chronological, empirical and axiological extension of this concept. In *Transactions photolittéraires* [Photoliterary Transactions] (Montier, 2015: 11-61), I suggested, as a means of modeling this extension, using the notion of 'territory' as well as the type of cartographical projection this implies. In short, a map – but a very special one, inspired by the map of the Land of Tenderness, conceived for a famous novel of the 'précieux' school.

The map of this imaginary country is read as much vertically as horizontally. It represents, of course, the potential itinerary for a couple starting out on a new relationship. At the bottom is the town of New Friendship. In the middle is the River Inclination, spanned by bridges, obviously symbolising meeting points between the spirits or souls of the lovers. On the left, sites and scales represent different situations (backbiting, betrayal...) leading to the Sea of Enmity. On the right, there are other sites (flightiness, forgetting) going towards the Lake of Indifference. Near the central river are qualities relating to getting closer, and reaching a crescendo: care and attention, presence, etc. At the top, across the Dangerous Sea, are the shores of Terra Incognita.

This map actually acts as a *diagram*, and to my mind shows the interest of being able to figure ambivalent fascination and the relation between photograph and literature which is as controversial as it is passionate. In short, this treats them not as two parallel arts without any real points of convergence, and above all reintroduces an aspect of their relation which I find essential, that of values and counter-values, and thus axiology.

The figure of parallels, which revisits the idea of parallels between different arts as imagined from the Renaissance to the Classical Age (Lichtenstein, 1995), is effectively the logic of autarchy, assuming a purely autonomous practice or subordinate relations to a predominant medium. This medium in the end resists any exchange or compromise, any *transaction*, addition, combination, blending, one might even say 'coupling'. We have seen the example of a book like *Facile* tracking the lines of this imaginary. However, if we use the figure of diagonals, or points of overlap, everything changes. Taking the model of the 'Map of Tenderness' as a field of *tensions*, in an attempt to locate the effects of such 'zigzags', it becomes possible to position the entirety of photoliterary production (or of the many works which have recourse to photographic model as a creative frame

without having to be illustrated by photographs) on the polarised and variably tensile space provided by this diagrammatic model.

Setting values and counter-values head-to-head

To speak of photoliterary *transactions* is to immediately focus on questions of economy, not in the common sense of the word – although questions about the remuneration of creative work are never unimportant (Larizza, 2013) – but in the sense that all symbolic production which affects the very basis of a human society and all the types of exchanges which occur within it. “[B]attles over icons are also battles about ideas and idols”⁵, wrote Philippe Hamon, reminding us that these three terms have a shared etymology (Hamon, 2001: 19). We may as well say that in the new regime of images introduced by photography, it is these political, intellectual, social and metaphysical *values* which are replayed. We should also note, as per Hamon (2001: 11)⁶ :

The 19th century certainly did not invent the image, or literature, or the relation of the image to literature [...], nor did it invent the presence of images and figurative objects in literature. However, it did profoundly and radically modify this relation by inventing, or developing, industrialising, circulating, or by generalising in radically new proportions a new *imagerie* [...], made of new objects and new practices.

Philippe Hamon makes his own the term ‘imagerie’, used notably by Champfleury, with a double aim: first, not to leave out other types of images contemporaneous to photography (posters, cinematography, panoramas), and second, to expressly highlight the pejorative associations of the word. Far from debates about genre or historical painting, the photograph is an image in a minor key, a sort of under-painting, or infra-drawing, if you will. It is precisely this minor value which allows it to penetrate, as if trespassing, a literary field constantly ambivalent about it (Edwards, 2008 : 13-19).

As things become complex, our cartographical and transactional model is required to show its efficacy and flexibility and prove its ability to adapt and play on several levels. The relationship between photograph and literature is even more intricate when it is cast into three levels:

1 - Writers who collaborate with photographers, in various configurations (editor’s order, personal friendship, etc.), to produce a single book or a single digital project. Writers who, against Marivaux’s adage « Il faut choisir sa place dans la République des Lettres » [One must choose one’s place in the Republic of Letters], stand, timidly or openly, over a work that is also that of a photographer (Claude Simon, Michel Butor, etc.). We have not yet mentioned the writers who consider writing inseparable from photography and whose work consists in part of exploring and classifying the reasons for this bond, like Denis Roche; or the ‘artists’ who cannot be defined as either photographers who write or writers who take photos, like Sophie Calle. In these ‘extreme’

⁵ « [...] les batailles d’icônes sont aussi des batailles d’idées et d’idoles » (Hamon, 2001: 19).

⁶ Le XIXe siècle n’a certes pas inventé l’image, comme il n’y a pas inventé la littérature, comme il n’a pas inventé la relation de l’image à la littérature [...], comme il n’a pas inventé la présence d’images and d’objets figuratifs en littérature. Mais il a modifié profondément and radicalement cette relation en inventant, ou en mettant au point, ou en industrialisant, ou en faisant circuler, ou en généralisant dans des proportions radicalement nouvelles une nouvelle *imagerie* [...], faites de nouveaux objets and de nouvelles pratiques (Hamon, 2001: 11).

cases, a symbiotic relation emerges which our cartography should be able to map. Even without reaching such a fusion, there is also a literary register where the photograph has great importance: experimental scripts for poetry and novels. This is the case for Raymond Roussel, whose 800-verse poem *La Vue [The View]* (1904) uses a pen with a spyhole through which figures a postcard of a seaside resort to write in parallel the landscape of a seaside resort just opposite. It is also the case for Jean Ricardou, in *L'Observatoire de Cannes [The Cannes Observatory]* (1961), a major œuvre in the history of the *nouveau roman*, where through a photographer character, postcards and a whole succession of optical devices, he explores all the possible variations on points of view in a novel, including the final viewpoint, that of the reader (Montier, 2013: 235-255).

2 - Photographers who publish images by inserting them in a literary narrative model, for example in a report; or who seek out writers to write captions or a preface for a book of photographs; or those who enter the world of writing, becoming critics, poetry experts or diarists/ biographers. These literary works by photographers, some of high quality, are less rare than it might seem at first glance: as well as the Talbots, we should remember Lartigue, Doisneau, Brassai and his *Histoire de Marie [History of Marie]* (Montier, 2014b), and the young photographer Amaury Da Cunha, with *Fond de l'Œil [Base of the Eye]* (2015) and *Histoire souterraine [Underground History]* (2017). In fact, these books written by photographers are becoming a new literary genre, and in the process demanding that we take their creators seriously – not as failed painters or minor writers.

3 – Finally, writers whose works do not overtly feature photographs but in which they are omnipresent, in the construction of the fiction, or even in the *style*, in the Proustian sense of what is imagined as an absolute manner of seeing. Literary criticism is indebted to Brassai for a masterly demonstration of how the œuvre of Marcel Proust should be definitively understood and read « sous l'emprise de la photographe » [under the thumb of the photograph] (Brassai, 1997). Jean-François Chevrier first began this process (Chevrier, 1982), which was then taken up and validated by literary research (Montier, 2003; Thélot 2003). This research merely gave homage to the powerful intuitions of the Hungarian photographer who had learned French by reading Proust. Literary writing has since integrated photo/graphy to its own idea of writing, either for strictly poetic motivations (as for Lorand Gaspar or Gérard Macé for example), or more generally for sociological reasons: the photograph, let us reiterate, upsets the relation between the professional artist and the public, as anybody can take photos with relative success. With all due respect to Baudelaire, it is indeed a 'democratic art'. R.W. Emerson spoke of 'the true Republican style of painting' (Brunet, 2000: 198-209). Clément Chéroux places the history of the photograph itself in the 'vernacular' section (Chéroux, 2013) of a universal factory of images, by men, women and children: Jacques Henri Lartigue was only 10 when he took his first pictures, which sixty years on would be considered as works of art.

Proust collected photographs and laid them out on his table to use as a pack of physiognomical playing cards to give him ideas for characters' features. Not long afterwards, all writers were occasional photographers and had family albums. The *album* is a powerful generic model, for books, memoirs (individual and collective) as well as fiction (Garat, 1994). On the database 'phlit.org',the

entry ‘album’ brings up over a hundred literary works. These figure ‘album’ as a structural capability that actually shapes meaning. Amongst them, we might mention Reinhard Jirgl’s novel, *Le Silence* (Quidam édit., 2016), where the chapters are arranged around a succession of a hundred photographs (not reproduced but scrupulously described) taken from the album of a German family, in such a way that the motif of ‘silence’ in the title reonates with the very absence of all these photographs.

Behind this example lies an entire corpus: we think immediately of Marguerite Duras, Patrick Modiano, Annie Ernaux, etc. Little by little, the photographs from these writers’ workshops (used in their works but not reproduced in their novels) are emerging, thanks to new collections which break with our largely iconophobic tradition. The collection ‘Quarto’ has a volume dedicated to Modiano (2013) with a choice of 62 images, and a volume dedicated to Annie Ernaux (2011) where, unlike *Les Années [The Years]* (2007) which had presented itself as a succession of photos without actually reproducing a single image, the writer revisits her album to transform it into a ‘photo-diary’ (Froloff, 2017).

Photoliterature, instructions for use

Although the photoliterary territory is vast, thanks to our cartographic projection model, we can test the entirety of the production by splitting it into different areas or particular sites. We prefer to speak of ‘areas’ than ‘themes’ because it seems essential to change methodologies. None of the examples given have the photograph as a literary *theme*, any more than photographers view literature as a theme, even though many of them have sought, and in some cases succeeded, in capturing the essence of literary genius in their photo portraits of writers (Montier, 2017: 22-28).

One of these *areas*, both foundational and constant, is the traveller’s tale or story of exploration, for an obvious reason: photographic apparatus, so heavy and cumbersome up until the end of the 19th century, then took over from sketchbooks, and was soon joined with postcards, which enabled the diversification of epistolary literature accompanied by images. Of course, a production like the exotic illustrated and licentious novels by Pierre Loti (*Les Trois Dames de la Kasbah [The Three Ladies of the Kasbah]*, 1882) and Jean Lorrain (*La Dame turque [The Turkish Lady]*, 1898), published by Nilsson/ PerLamm, stand out from this category of travel narratives, but the voluptuously orientalist setting gives the colorised images of these works an old-fashioned look to modern eyes. This is quite different from other works from the same period where the figure of the writer operates a sort of shashay in the direction of ‘reporter’, as in *Tramp Diary* by Jack London (1894), which the *La Pléiade* publishing has just reissued with original photos. From just these two examples, we may see how the photograph is sometimes drawn into a romanesque imaginary – even though with Loti in particular there is always a certain art of living as an ‘exote’ (to quote Victor Ségalen) – and sometimes used for its capacity to furnish ‘proof’ of the real and trustworthy character of the narratives related by London. This imaginary of ‘evidence’ continued in other genres, such as detective novels, since Jules Verne’s *Les Frères Kip [The Kip Brothers]* (1902, with 12 chromotypographs by Georges Roux), Georges Simenon’s *La Folle d’Itteville [The Madwoman from Itteville]* (1931, photographs by Germaine Krull); and beyond. In recent novels, the discovery of a

photograph serves to spark off an intrigue echoing a quest, be it to find one's identity or some intimate truth, as in *The Photograph* by Penelope Lively (Viking, 2003/ Mercure de France, 2004) ou *Eux sur la photo [The People in the Photo]*, by Hélène Gestern (Arléa, 2011), to name but two.

In all cases, a device has to be established in these œuvres or publications to regulate the place of each method or medium, and the value the reader should assign to each. The photographs are on some occasions touched up or appear as 'crude' documents; sometimes they are taken by photographers of varying renown, or by the writer him or herself. Sometimes they are purposely mediocre in quality, almost illegible, which only serves to make them more valuable in terms of authenticity - W. G. Sebald's novels often have recourse to this type of image. Or perhaps the photographs are simply absent, which renders their aura even greater, if we take the example of the photograph of Roland Barthes's mother in *La Chambre claire [Camera Lucida]*.

We might also think of testing this map or diagram against the domain of 'portraits de pays ou de villes' [portraits of countries or towns] (Martens, 2016; Reverseau, 2017). Sometimes they appear as travel or tourist accounts, but may also tend towards being a Bilundgsroman, as is *Brésil [Brazil]*, by Blaise Cendrars (Monaco, 'Escalaes du Monde' collection, 1953), with photographs by Jean Manzon (Martens, 2018). New York city, in this regard, is a mine of literary 'photobooks', including *New York le jour la nuit [New York Day and Night]* de Paul Morand (Flammarion, 1934, with 9 heliogravures), or books with unexpected authors such as *New York* by Françoise Sagan (Tel, 1956, with 91 photos by a dozen photographers) or *Le New York d'Arrabal [Arrabal's New York]*, published by Balland in 1973 with 58 photographs taken himself. These four cases show a multitude of diverse relations, specific devices, between photographer and writer. Cendrars comments with precision and enthusiasm on the images by Manzon. Morand says nothing about his photographer (who remains anonymous), but this does not preclude him from saying that describing New York is to push the limits of a writer and that only photography can give the city back its power of fascination⁷. Sagan reconstructs her trip in indirect fashion using truly artistic photographs. Arrabal, good libertarian that he is, takes literally the licence that photography gives anybody to become as both photographer and poet.

Another point of contact or 'bridge' between photographers and writers, is the area of prefaces to books by photographers, which are sometimes veritable essays on the photographic poetic, like Yves Bonnefoy's preface to *Henri Cartier-Bresson Photographer*, published by Delpire in 1979, or the preface Jean-Paul Sartre wrote for *D'une Chine à l'autre [From One China to Another]*(1954), where he admitted – probably not without some degree of coquettishness– that its photographer could claim the noble status of intellectual, equal to the writer (Montier, 2010). A systematic study of a corpus of prefaces, as well as book covers and paratexts would likely show a very large spectrum of relations between writers and the photographers they are supposed to critique and comment on, as well as demonstrating the amiable condescendance which turns duty into gratitude as the photographers can inspire and inhabit a literary poetic.

⁷ « C'est de la triangulation, non de la littérature » [It's triangulation – not literature.]

The covers, of course are part of the paratext. For the most part, they are conventional, thematic, periodically renewed by the publishers depending on (real or imagined) changes in public taste, to attract the eye of the passer-by. One of the particularities of photoliterature is that, breaking with the hitherto arbitrary relation between a book's cover and content, it makes the cover *motivated*, a fictional nexus from which a novel or an autobiography then unfolds. The classic example of this is *Three Farmers on Their Way to a Dance* [*Trois Fermiers s'en vont au bal*] ([1985] Harper Perennial, 1994; Le Cherche midi, 2004), by Richard Powers, where August Sander's photograph showing three young German men in their Sunday best serves as both a historical reference to the primitive scene of an obscure trauma, and aesthetic tone. Another example is the autobiography by the sociologist Nathalie Heinich, *Maisons perdues* [*Lost Houses*] (Thierry Marchaisse, 2013), whose cover shows a child of around four, seen from behind, against the light, walking on a pavement. Here the photograph is both referential starting point and an aesthetic view of the autobiographical approach itself: can writing about oneself, and the houses where one used to live, enable one, in the end, to reconstitute the inaccessible locus of self that is childhood? What is a writer, photographed as a small child unable to read or write, but already in possession of what she will become? Is a photo from an album – as we generally claim – a 'memory', or a false memory? If it is a false memory, as is the case here, does this not give it an even greater literary value? It is not insignificant that the photograph was taken by the author's mother and is technically 'bad'. In fact, this imperfection legitimates its selection – we are at the heart of the question of *values* – as the only 'absolute' (as Barthes has it) photograph of this writer (Montier, 2017: 35, 36). The only photo portrait of Nathalie Heinich which counts can only be blurry and overexposed. Furthermore, the game between mother and daughter, is singularly complexified because of another ambivalence relating to the photograph. As linguists have remarked, in the French language, we say “une photographie de quelqu'un” [a photograph of/by someone], where the preposition 'de' can mean both 'of' (the subject) and 'by' (the photographer). This means that the cover of *Maison perdues* is both the photo of/by Nathalie Heinich and by/of her mother. As a result, we are not dealing with the image as a document, but as a proof of love.

Other *areas* may also be envisaged: for example children's literature, which merits more exploration, as it treats of how children apprehend the relation between words and images, and implies analysing the cultural capital of these children (schoolbooks, illustrated ABC books, books of fairytales or fables with drawings as opposed to photos), as well as using new analytical tools from cognitive science. Colette and Prévert wrote books for children with photographs. Ergy Landau and Sarah Moon took photographs for children's books. In this, the phlit.org database provides more than 50 such works. Amongst them is a book by Lise Deharme and Claude Cahun *Le Cœur de Pic* [*The Heart of Spades*] (Corti, 1937), which we mention to introduce the last area we would like to put forward: that of the corpus of partner authors, by which we mean real-life couples, including same sex couples, such as Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore (*Aveux non avendus* [*Disavowed*], Carrefour, 1930). For many reasons, this coupling of authors is almost totally absent from historical or critical literary approaches until now. Incidentally, this corpus reveals the particular role of female

photographers in artistic creation, faced with problems in gaining recognition from largely masculine institutions. An exhibition about them was held in the Musée d'Orsay in 2015-2016. The role of the woman creator is particularly strong in photoliterature – Annie Ernaux and Marc Marie, J.M.G. Le Clézio and Jémia Le Clézio, Michel and Marie-Jo Butor, Alix Cléo Roubaud and Jacques Roubaud, Denis and Françoise Roche, etc. (for the last four couples, see Montier, 2014c) – and we believe that one of the virtues of our ‘love map’ is that it enables us to reveal this corpus and its associated questions. It allows us to consider this field as the socially, historically and artistically complex phenomenon it is. Thus, we may say that although the theoretical legitimacy of photoliterature has achieved recognition, the field will be even better established when it starts pushing the boundaries of literary research by continuing the exploration of these territories.

REFERENCES:

- Albers, I., (2007) *Claude Simon, moments photographiques*, Lille, PU du Septentrion.
- Bailly, J-C., (2008) *L'Instant et son ombre*, Paris, Le Seuil, Coll. Fiction et Cie.
- Baudelaire, C., (1990 [1859]) « Le public moderne et la photographie », *Salon de 1859*, in *Curiosités esthétiques*, Paris, Bordas, Coll. Classiques Garnier.
- Bazin, A., (1990) « Ontologie de la photographie », in *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma ?* [1958], Paris, Le Cerf.
- Brassaï, (1997), *Proust sous l'emprise de la photographie*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Brunet, F., (2000) *La Naissance de l'idée de photographie*, Paris, PUF.
- Chéroux, C., (2013) *Vernaculaires*, Paris, Le Point du jour.
- Chevrier, J-F., (2009) *Proust et la photographie, la résurrection de Venise*, Paris, L'arachnéen, [1982, Les Cahiers du Cinéma].
- Debray, R., (1992) *Vie et mort de l'image, une histoire du regard en Occident*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Edwards, P., (2008) *Soleil noir, Photographie et littérature*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Froloff, N. (2017) « Redonner un sens plus pur aux mots et aux choses : « l'écriture photographique du réel d'Annie Ernaux », *Revue internationale de Photolittérature* n°1 [En ligne], consulté le 9 novembre 2017. URL : <http://phlit.org/press/?articlerevue=redonner-un-sens-plus-pur-aux-mots-et-aux-choses-lecriture-photographique-du-reel-dannie-ernaux>
- Garat, A-M, (1994) *Photos de famille*, Paris, Le Seuil, Coll. Fiction et Cie.
- Hamon, P., (2001) *Imageries*, Paris, José Corti.
- Heilbrun F. & Molinari, D., (1998) *En collaboration avec le soleil. Victor Hugo, photographies de l'exil*, Paris, Editions des Musées nationaux.
- Heinich, N., (2002) *L'Art en conflits*, Paris, La Découverte, Coll. L'Armillaire.
- Larizza, O., (2013) *Les Écrivains et l'argent*, (dir.) Paris, Orizons, Coll. Universités.
- Lichtenstein, J., (1995) *La Peinture*, Paris, Larousse, Coll. Textes essentiels.
- Martens, D., (2016) *Qu'est-ce que le portrait de pays ?*, conférence donnée à l'Université de Lausanne, URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tsign1u4Vds>
- Martens, D., (2018), « Conversion du regard et conjonction générique. Du portrait du Brésil au tombeau photolittéraire, par Blaise Cendrars et Jean Manzon », *Word & Image : a Journal of Verbal / Visual Enquiry*, Taylor & Francis.
- Mondzain, M-J., (2003) *Le Commerce des regards*, Paris, Le Seuil, Coll. L'ordre philosophique.

- Monjour, S., (2017) « La révélation : archéologie d'une métaphore photolittéraire », *Revue internationale de Photolittérature* n°1 [En ligne], consulté le 9 novembre 2017. URL : <http://phlit.org/press/?articlerevue=la-revelation-archeologie-dune-metaphore-photolitteraire>
- Montier, J-P., (1995) *L'art sans art d'Henri Cartier-Bresson*, Paris, Flammarion, Coll. Idées et recherches, Prix Nadar.
- Montier, J-P., (1997) « Blaise Cendrars : images et texte dans *L'Affaire Galmot* », *Cendrars au pays de Jean Galmot*, Michèle Touret (dir.), Presses Universitaires de Rennes, Coll. Interférences », p. 39-56.
- Montier, J-P., (2003) « La photographie "dans le temps" », in *Proust et les images*, J-P. Montier et J. Cléder (dir.), Presses universitaires de Rennes, Coll. Æsthetica, pp. 69-114.
- Montier, J-P., (2008) *Littérature et photographie*, (dir.) Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, Coll. Interférences.
- Montier, J-P., (2010) « Henri Cartier-Bresson, figure de l'intellectuel ? », in *Études photographiques*, n° 25, mai, pp. 146-179.
- Montier, J-P., (2013) « De *La Vue* de Roussel à *L'Observatoire de Cannes* de Ricardou : avatars du référent photographique », in *Roussel : hier, aujourd'hui*, P. Bazantay, C. Reggiani, H. Salceda (dir.), Colloque de Cerisy, Rennes, PUR, pp. 235-255.
- Montier, J-P., (2014a) « Le livre surréaliste comme scène érotique », in *La scène érotique*, F. Nicol et L. Perrigault (dir.), Rennes, PUR, pp. 55-70.
- Montier, J-P., (2014b) « Le pognon dans *Histoire de Marie de Brassai* », in *Transactions photolittéraires*, J-P. Montier (dir.), Rennes, PUR, pp. 165-188.
- Montier, J-P., (2014c) *Transactions photolittéraires*, Rennes, PUR, 2014.
- Montier, J-P., (et alii) (2017) Préface de *L'écrivain vu par la photographie*, D. Martens, J-P. Montier & A. Reverseau (dir.), Rennes, PUR, Coll. Art et Société.
- Oberhuber, A., (2017) « Deuil et mélancolie, métaphores photolittéraires dans *Bruges-la-Morte* », *Revue internationale de Photolittérature* n°1 [En ligne], consulté le 9 novembre 2017. URL : <http://phlit.org/press/?articlerevue=deuil-et-melancolie-metaphores-photolitteraires-dans-bruges-la-morte>
- Ortel, P., (2001) *Littérature et photographie. Enquête sur une révolution invisible*, Nîmes, Jacqueline Chambon.
- Reverseau, A., (2017) *Portraits de pays illustrés*, dir., Paris, Minard, Coll. Lettres modernes.
- Soulages, F., (1998), *Esthétique de la photographie*, Paris, Nathan.
- Thélot, J., (2003) *Les inventions littéraires de la photographie*, Paris, PUF, Coll. Perspectives littéraires.
- Thélot, J., (2009) *Critique de la raison photographique*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, Coll. Encre marine.