MARIE-LAURE RYAN

PHOTOS, FACTS AND FICTION
Literary Texts and Mechanical Representation

ABSTRACT: As a mechanical mode of representation, both iconic and indexical, photography has a testimonial and documentary power matched only by film and audio recordings. As Roland Barthes put it, "contrary to [language-based] imitations, in Photography, I can never deny that the thing has been there." Yet "the thing" can be faked, the recording can be manipulated, and the testimonial value of photos can be subverted in many ways. In this article, I examine the various roles that photos can play when connected to literary texts or to graphic novels. Several cases will be discussed: photos as factual documents that complement language in nonfictional literary texts such as autobiographies; deceptive use of photos in fictional texts that try to pass as or imitate factual texts (Wolfgang's Hildesheimer's *Marbot*); non-deceptive use of photos to break the frame of a fictionalized storyworld and assert the real-world reference of the text (Art Spiegelman's *Maus*); ambiguous use of photos in texts that hover between the factual and the fictional (W.G. Sebald's *The Emigrants*); and the strange case of Orhan Pamuk's *Museum of Innocence*, where photos as collector's items are exhibited in a real-world museum that both refers to the text and remains independent of it, thereby documenting both the fictional and the real world.

KEYWORDS: Photos in Literary Texts, Fictionality, Reference, Photos as Objects, Mechanical Representation.

When we speak about the photographic camera, we tend to humanize it, by regarding it as capable of subjectivity. The camera has a gaze; this gaze, to quote Susan Sontag, can be "lenient or cruel" (1973, 104). But this is only rhetoric; deep down we know that the camera is only an instrument in the hands of the photographer; it captures what is in front of it and it has no say in what it records or how it records it. If there is a gaze, and if this gaze can be lenient or cruel, it is the gaze of the photographer who frames and who arranges the scene to be recorded. Once the lens has been focused on a scene, the working of the camera is a totally automatic, mechanical process. This objective nature of photography has been duly noted by the theorists of the medium, even by those who insist on its power to construct reality. Here is Sontag: "A photograph passes for incontrovertible proof that a given thing has happened. The photograph may distort; but there is always a presumption that something exists, or did exist, which is like

37

what's in the picture" (1973, 5). And here is Barthes: "In Photography I can never deny that the thing has been there" (1981, 76). The semiotic theory of C.S. Peirce provides a simple explanation for this existence-asserting power. A photograph is not only an icon linked to that which it represents by a relation of similarity, like painting, it is also an index, linked to its object by a causal relation. Just as there is no smoke without fire, there is no photo without something in front of the camera that emits patterns of light.

This causal relation predisposes photography to telling the truth about that which it represents. The vast majority of photographs are indeed used to document the state of the world at a certain time and in a certain place. But if a medium can record reality, it can also be used to fake reality. Photos, like texts, can be either fictional or factual. By the definition I will be using here, a text is fictional when it passes as something other than what it is, but without deceptive intent from its author: the reader must be a willing participant in a game of pretense. Written fiction passes, in make-believe, as a report of true facts, when it is really a report of imaginary facts. In contrast to factual texts, which ask their user to believe their content, fictional texts ask them to imagine a world and to pretend that it is the real world (Walton 1990). The concept of pretense, or make-believe, on which the distinction between factual and fictional texts is based can also be applied to photography. A photo is fictional when the scene represented in the picture has been staged, its human participants, like actors, pretend to be somebody else, and the photographer is the instigator of this pretense. (Staging alone does not make a photo fictional: family portraits are also staged, but they are not fictional because the people stand for themselves.) While it cannot be doubted that real individuals posed for the photo, these individuals impersonate characters who exist in another world. Similarly, the objects shown in fictional photos are real-world objects, but they represent objects that belong to a fictional world.

Now if both texts and photos can be either factual or fictional, text and photos can be combined in four different ways:

1. Factual text, factual photo
2. Factual text, fictional photo
3. Fictional text, factual photo
4. Fictional text, fictional photo

Category 1 is very common: we find it in journalism, as well as in standard biographies and autobiographies illustrated with photographic documents. Here the photos add to the text their testimonial value, their incontrovertible proof that a given individual existed or that a given event

happened. In the literary domain, this category is represented by Orhan Pamuk's *Istanbul*, which is a meditation on growing up in Istanbul illustrated by vintage photographs of the city, as well as by family photos.

The opposite of category 1 is category 4: fictional text, with fictional photos. It is illustrated by some photographs taken in the 19th century by Julia Margaret Cameron, who asked her acquaintances to pose as fictional characters such as King Lear or Lancelot and Guinevere. It could be said that in this case the photos are just illustrations of a preexisting narrative, a narrative that creates a world through other kind of signs, but an example of narrative fiction that originally develops through a collaboration of fictional text and fictional photos is the photo-novel.

While 1 and 4 are homogenous categories, 2 and 3 mix factuality and fictionality. Category 2 is rather rare, because it would be self-defeating to illustrate a text meant to convey facts with photos that do not. Yet I can think of at least one example. When a film is inspired by a book about the life of a historical character, and the book is reissued because of the interest created by the film, the cover may show the actor who played the historical character, rather than the character himself. For instance, Doris Kearns Goodwin's *A Team of Rivals* featured on its cover a photograph of Daniel Day-Lewis, who played Abraham Lincoln in Steven Spielberg's 2012 movie *Lincoln*.

This leaves us with category 3, a surprisingly rich and varied domain to which the bulk of this article will be devoted. We have seen that photos can be either factual or fictional, but an additional distinction must be made between photos that are born factual and then used factually from photos that are born factual, but that are used fictionally. The difference between a photo born fictional and a photo born factual but used fictionally resides in whether or not the photographer and the sitters are aware of the substitution of identity: with photos born fictional they are deliberately engaging in pretense; with factual photos used fictionally, they are not: the substitution is suggested by the user of the photo, not by its creators.

Wolfgang Hildesheimer's *Marbot*

My first example, Wolfgang's Hildesheimer's novel *Marbot: A Biography*, exploits the indexical value of photos in order to create an illusion of factuality. As I have defined it, fiction consists of making a report of imaginary facts pass in make-believe as a report of true facts. In the majority of cases, the fictional nature of a text is openly signalled by a

paratext, such as the label "novel" or "a biography" below the title, as well as indirectly suggested by its subject matter and mode of narration. Fiction has a way of displaying itself that makes it very rare to mistake fiction for fact or vice-versa. In the last resort, the reader can consult the small print of the Library of Congress catalog data on the inner first page, which will say "fiction," "novel" (which implies fiction), or nothing at all. *Marbot* is classified as a novel by the Library of Congress data, but the title, *A Biography*, and the general presentation of the text say otherwise. The imitation of historical biography is taken so far that the text flirts with deception. The text recounts the short life of an English art critic of the Romantic period named Sir Andrew Marbot, who knew most of the intellectual luminaries of the time—Goethe, Schopenhauer, Lord Byron, Thomas De Quincey, etc.—, who had an incestuous relation with his mother, and who died in 1830, probably by suicide, but his body was never found. Many features suggest that the text is a work of historiography: the title, *Marbot: A Biography*; the acknowledgments that precede the text; the index at the end; the many quoted documents, such as letters and journal entries, and above all the style of the narration, full of expressions of limited knowledge, such as "we don't know," "it remains uncertain," or "we will never know for sure" (Cohn 1999, 82). When the text presents dialogue, it claims to quote it from reliable sources, and in the rare moments when it penetrates into the mind of characters, it does it under the cover of speculation, prefixing the report with "I imagine it thus." In other words, the text renounces the expressive freedom of fiction, and replaces it with the constraints of history.

Like most biographies, Marbot supports its narration with visual evidence. A centerfold on glossy paper presents photos of the estates of the Marbot family and reproductions of paintings of Marbot and of his parents by well-known artists: Eugène Delacroix for Marbot and Sir Henry Raeburn for his parents. Paintings do not possess the indexical nature of photos, but they can present some evidential value when they are done in a realistic style, and when they are paired with a caption that identifies the sitter, especially when they predate the invention of photography. How could the truth of the narrative be doubted, when its characters have been painted by actual artists? Except, of course, that Marbot never existed, and that the paintings represent other people: Lady Catherine Marbot is really a portrait of a woman named Margaritta McDonald by Raeburn, and Andrew Marbot is Delacroix's drawing of a Baron Schwitter. This is a clear case of actual portraits being fictionalized by pretending that the sitter is somebody else.

If *Marbot* was truly meant to deceive its readers, as were some well-known literary hoaxes such as *Les Lettres Portugaises* in the 17th century or

Ossian in the 18th, the text would be a transgression of the fictional game. But for a discerning reader, there are many signs of fictionality, and it is hard to see how *Marbot* could be seriously taken as historical biography. Among these signs: there is no bibliography whatsoever; there is no textual reference to the many quotes, even though many of them are presented as taken from published materials (for instance, from Goethe's conversations with Eckermann); the index at the end contains only the names of actual people, omitting the characters invented by the author, which means Marbot and his family; the use of expressions of ignorance in the text goes far beyond standard historical usage; one gets the impression that the narrator knows nothing and must imagine everything; and the narrator is far too intrusive to pass as an objective biographer. Last but not least, for the reader of the English version, there is the label "novel" in the Library of Congress data. Jean-Marie Schaeffer (1999, 133-145) has accused Hildesheimer of dishonesty because he extends imitation to the paratextual level with the label "a biography." He implies thereby that since paratexts exist outside the text, they should be reliable. But as Cohn (1999, 93) has cleverly suggested, in this work "a biography" is not a paratextual generic indicator, it is an integral part of the title, and the genuine paratextual marker is omitted (or it is found in the Library of Congress data). Therefore, *Marbot* is not a fake historical biography, it is a novel that fictionally takes the form of a biography. By freely adopting the constraints of historical writing, Hildesheimer's fiction tells factual narrative: I can look like you, but you cannot look like me, for if you did, you would lose your credibility.

W.G. Sebald's *The Emigrants*

Another author who fictionalizes photos is W.G. Sebald, but he does so in a much more ambiguous way than Hildesheimer. In contrast to *Marbot*, Sebald's texts do not reproduce any established genre, but rather, create a fully original mode of narration, one in which autobiography, biography and fiction blend seamlessly. The photos of people in his works are obviously photos of real people, but their relation to the characters in the stories are varied and unclear: some may be photos of relatives or acquaintances whose story is told relatively faithfully; some may be photos of people whose life inspired the stories but who remain distinct from the characters; some may be "stray" or found photos of unknown people to whom Sebald gave imaginary identities, and around whom he weaved made-up stories. There are no captions that identify the subject matter or

41

the person shown in the photos, and their relation to the text is therefore left to the reader to guess.

There are two ways to approach the relations between the text and the photos in the work of Sebald: the external, or genetic mode, and the internal, or imaginative mode. In the external mode, the reader is curious about how the text was put together, which means, about whether the text tells true, semi-true or invented stories about the people shown in the photos. Within the same story, some pictures may be used fictionally and others factually. In the internal mode, by contrast, readers project themselves into the storyworld (i.e. the world created by the text), and they assume that the photos are all accurate representations of its landscapes or inhabitants, but the storyworld may be located at a variable distance from the actual world. If the distance is judged to be nil, the text will be considered factual; if the world is judged to differ in some respect from the actual world, the text will be regarded as fiction. In the external mode, the text is seen as a patchwork of truth and fiction, while in the internal mode, both text and pictures are seen as accurate representations of the storyworld, unless openly presented as fake.

The external and the internal approaches raise different types of questions. If we pursue an internal approach, we will ask of the photographs what they contribute to our mental construction of the storyworld. We will regard photos showing people as representations of the characters, and we will inspect them for the facial expression and the posture of these people, as well as for their clothing and environment, in an attempt to learn something about their personality and social status. Similarly, we will use landscape photos to try to imagine the setting of the stories, and we will regard these photos less as objects within the storyworld—that is, as photographs—than as transparent captures of this world.

If we pursue an external approach, on the other hand, photos become objects, and we will ask questions such as: Where do they come from? Are they part of the family album of the person who served as model for the character or are they found photos? Are the landscape pictures postcards or photos taken by Sebald himself? Are there markings on the documents that suggest their origin? Do all the photos that are supposed to represent the same character at different ages really do so? (Face-recognition software could be helpful in telling us whether the child shown on the cover of Sebald's *Austerlitz* is the same person as the individual identified as the adult Austerlitz in group photos.)

The contrast between the two approaches can be illustrated through a reading of the first story of The Emigrants, titled "Dr. Henry Selwyn." In

this story, the narrator tells about the life of an acquaintance of his, Dr. Henry Selwyn, who recently committed suicide. At the end of the story, he finds a newspaper on a train seat. The newspaper reports that the body of a guide who disappeared seventy-two years earlier has been recovered from a Swiss glacier. The article identifies the guide as one Johannes Naegeli, and the narrator realizes that he is the same person as the close friend of Henry Selwyn, who disappeared many years ago. The reader who pursues the internal approach will regard the discovery as an extraordinary coincidence within the storyworld. On the other hand, the reader who takes an external approach will inspect the image closely, and find on it markings that suggest that the photo represents a document held in an archive, rather than a copy of a newspaper found in a train. Therefore, the story may represent an extraordinary coincidence from the point of view of the narrator, but from the point of view of the author, it is a construction. The creative process may have gone like this (this is pure speculation on my part): Sebald learned somehow about the discovery of the guide's body and was deeply impressed by it; he decided to use this fact in his story by giving the guide's name to the close friend of Henry Selwyn. Then he searched archives for the newspaper article that recounts the discovery, and he reproduced it in the text in order to give an appearance of truth to the story. It is the genius of Sebald to arouse in the reader not only a fascination for the textual world itself, but also an intense curiosity for the question: "how was the text put together."

Art Spiegelman's *Maus*

So far, we have seen examples of photos born factual that become fictional through a substitution of identity. In the case I now want to discuss, images born factual retain a strong factuality, even after being inserted in a text of questionable historical accuracy. My example is *Maus* by Art Spiegelman, a graphic novel in which the author tells about his father Vladek's experience as an Auschwitz survivor, and about his own attempt to get the story from his father. The autobiographical dimension of the text is evident, but I would be hesitant to classify it as factual history, because the conventions of the medium of the graphic narrative impose formal features that are incompatible with a strict report of documented facts: features such as an organization of content into distinct frames, a reliance on freely recreated dialogue, and the fact that drawings are not indexical and cannot therefore make strong claims of truth. In addition, the metaphorical representation of Jews as mice, Germans as cats, and

43

other nationalities as pigs, frogs, and dogs prevents the storyworld from being regarded as a faithful account of historical reality. It is in the context of this ambiguous status between fact and fiction that we should assess the role of the three photos included in the work.

The first is a photo of Art with his mother Anya, also an Auschwitz survivor, who committed suicide in 1968, when he was twenty years old (Spiegelman 1986, 100). The second photo shows a toddler about three years old, and it is used as frontispiece to the second volume of *Maus*. Since the volume is dedicated to a brother of Art Spiegelman named Richieu, who died as a Holocaust victim before Art was born, readers will assume that the photo represents Richieu. The third is a photo of Vladek Spiegelman dressed as a camp prisoner (Spiegelman 1991, 134). The text tells us that after his liberation, but before returning to Poland at the end of the war, Vladek had this photo taken in a photo shop in Germany that had a camp uniform.

Taken together, the photos represent the nuclear family that the war broke up, that reconstituted itself thanks to the will to live of Vladek and Anya (except that Art took the place of the dead Richieu), and that death finally took apart. The people shown in the photos tell us "I am real and I am alive," even though we know that all of them are dead. Unlike photos used as illustrations in a language-based text, photos inserted in a graphic novel speak to the same sense as the context, namely to the sense of sight. The contrast between photos and drawings is therefore a matter of visual appearance, rather than a matter of semiotic nature. The opposition between the black-and-white drawings and the greyscale photos pits a stylized storyworld inhabited by cats and mice against an objective real world inhabited by humans. This contrast can be interpreted in two ways: on one hand it emphasizes the made up, symbolic nature of the graphic storyworld; on the other hand it asserts the reality of the events on which the storyworld is based. Or to put this differently, it opposes the second-hand, mediated Holocaust experience of Art, who knows about it through the "postmemory" (Marianne Hirsch's [1997] term) of his father's stories and turns it into art, and the first-hand, lived experience of the people represented in the photos. As these people stare into the void in front of them, breaking the frame of the graphic narrative, how could we deny the reality of their experience without denying the Holocaust itself?

Orhan Pamuk's *The Museum of Innocence*

So far in this article, I have focused on photos as representations, which means on what they show rather than on what they are. But photographs are also material objects. As Susan Sontag writes, [In contrast to movies and TV] "with still photograph the image is also an object, lightweight, cheap to produce, easy to carry, accumulate, store" (1973, 13). Digital technology has made it even easier to carry and to share photos, but it also threatens their materiality. Nowadays photos exist as bit patterns in the cloud, not as artifacts that you can touch and that age with time. For Sontag, "...the passing of time adds to the aesthetic value of photographs, and the scars of time make objects more rather than less enticing to photographers" (1973, 174).

The materiality of photos and the effect of time on them are showcased in Orhan Pamuk's novel *The Museum of Innocence*. Or rather, they are showcased in two artistic projects that complement the novel, an actual museum created by Pamuk in Istanbul, and a catalogue titled *The Innocence of Objects* that mediates between the novel and the museum.

 Over more than a decade, Pamuk was a passionate collector of objects that he found in antique and junk stores around Istanbul: not rare antiques, nor Turkish artifacts, but mostly mass-produced objects that document daily life in Istanbul in the mid-twentieth century. What could Pamuk do with his collection? One possibility was to exhibit the objects in a museum, commemorating the vanished lifestyle that they embody, and bringing to the fore their "thingness," their three-dimensional materiality. Another possibility was to turn them into language by incorporating them into the plot of a novel. Pamuk choose to do both: he created a real museum that displays the objects, and he wrote a novel that fictionalizes the creation of the museum. The themes of the novel can be distilled in many ways:

It is about the city of Istanbul, its beauty and its melancholy.

It is about a social elite that rejects the Ottoman past in favor of Western culture.

It is about a tragic love affair between Kemal, a rich member of the elite, and Füsun, a lower middle-class girl of stunning beauty who wants to be a movie star, and who hopes that her suitor will produce a film for her (but he never does). As they are about to get married, she dies in a car crash, which may be either a suicide or an accident.

It is about fetishism, about a hero who collects every object that his beloved has touched.

45

As fetishism turns into obsessive gathering, it is about objects, about their mute presence and their opaque "thingness," about the urge to collect them, and about the strange passion that leads collectors to the creation of private museums.

The novel does not contain any photos. It consists of 83 short chapters, and each of them is represented in the real-world museum by a box that shows some of the objects mentioned in the chapter. The objects were arranged by Pamuk in an artistic way, reminiscent of the boxes of Joseph Cornell, who pioneered this artistic medium.

When they appear in the boxes, photographs become objects among other objects. They are displayed as much for what they are—yellowing images surrounded by white borders or encased in wooden frames—as for what they show. They are often too small, or too poorly lighted, or too numerous for the visitor to pay much attention to their content. A good example of this objectification is a display illustrating the love-making of Kemal and Füsun where photos are part of randomly gathered junk that is crammed behind the metal frame of a bed (fig. 1). Though the photos show Istanbul landscapes, they could really be photos of anything.

Fig. 1. Photo as object. In this display, photographs (lower right) are part of the junk gathered under the frame of a bed.

Another form of objectification is the collecting of multiple photos that show the same general subject. Several display boxes are entirely filled by such collections: one contains photos of the Bosphorus with boats, another is filled with newspaper clips of women who got in trouble with the law and whose eyes are hidden by a black bar, so that they will not be

46

recognized. Individual photos become collectible because of what they show, but their value resides in adding one more object to the collection.

A third use of photos in the museum consists of providing a background for the display of three-dimensional objects (fig. 2). In one box, various objects are arranged in front of a photo of the Bosphorus, in a trompe-l'oeil effect that hides the materiality of the image, since we do not see its border, and it is not contained in a frame. But we still know that it is a photo because it is black-and-white, in contrast to the colored things in the foreground. Here, in contrast to other displays, the photo is not an object among others, it is a stage setting.

Fig. 2. Photo as background. Colorful objects are displayed in front of a black-and-white photo of the Bosphorus. Photo by the author from the Museum of Innocence.

From an aesthetic point of view, the photos used in the museum support the observation of Susan Sontag about photographic art in general: "Subjects are chosen because they are boring or banal" (137). This banality is shared with the three-dimensional things in the boxes, which represent the predilection of the Westernized Turkish culture of the seventies for mass-produced objects. In contrast to the things, the photos are all black and white (or rather brown and yellow), not only because they are old pictures found in junk stores, but also because black and white symbolizes for Pamuk the particular kind of melancholy that defines for him the capital of the defunct Ottoman empire. But while none of the individual items displayed in the boxes presents a particular aesthetic interest, the dialogue between these objects creates an accidental beauty that makes the whole into more than the sum of its parts. As Pamuk writes of the display shown in figure 2: "I am particularly fond of this box, which, despite my

47

sketching and designs, has been so receptive to the whim of uncalculated beauty" (2012, 100). This observation reminds us of the Surrealist conception of beauty as the chance encounter of umbrella and sewing machine on an operation table.

The museum can be experienced in two ways: as an autonomous artistic and cultural display, or as a complement of the novel. When the museum is seen as autonomous display, the objects in the boxes are just being themselves; when the museum is linked to the novel, they are like the props used in the theatre: as physical objects they belong to the actual world, but they stand for fictional objects located in the fictional world. For instance, combs, hairpins, and a dress are displayed as things that were worn by Füsun.

In contrast to the objects that serve as props, the photos shown in the boxes do not correlate to objects in the fictional world, because the novel does not refer to them. Most of them represent views of Istanbul. These landscape pictures are used to illustrate the intersection of the real world with the fictional world. They retain a documentary function—the function of bearing witness to the Istanbul landscape and culture of the mid twentieth century, which belongs both to the novel and to reality.

The human figures shown in most of these photos are too small to be given a specific identity: they just stand for anonymous inhabitants of Istanbul. But in two cases, the spectator is cued to associate the people in the pictures with characters of the novel. One of the boxes contains a photo of a young girl in front of the Bosphorus (fig. 3).

Fig. 3. Substitution of identity. A found photo is displayed as representing a fictional character. Photo by the author from the Museum of Innocence.

48

The number of the box connects it to a chapter in the novel in which Kemal's father tells his son about the secret mistress he kept for many years; the museum visitor who has read the novel will consequently imagine that the photo represents the mistress. There are also a few photos in the museum that represent street scenes with a small figure highlighted in color; since they correlate to chapters where Kemal is looking for Füsun in the crowds of Istanbul, one must assume that they are fictionalized as photos of Füsun. But whatever connection the museum visitor can imagine between photos in the boxes and characters in the novel, the illusion is broken in the catalog, when Pamuk, speaking as author and not as narrator, tells the reader that the photos are found objects: "As for the youthful photograph of the mistress Kemal's father talks about in the novel, I found it after the story was written. While quickly leafing through reams of photographs conserved through the years and then collected by junk dealers because 'there is a ship in the background,' the girl's downcast expression caught my eye more than the ship did" (2012, 119).

But in general, the museum is remarkable for its avoidance of photos representing the faces of characters. It would have been easy to include close-ups of Füsun and Kemal, but this would have turned the display into a direct illustration of the novel, rather than a general evocation of its cultural and geographic context. Moreover, since Füsun stands for beauty in general, she cannot be given a face, for fear of compromising her allegorical dimension. It is up to the reader to imagine what she looks like.

Conclusion

Depending on their mode of reference, photos born factual can be used in fictional texts in three ways:

Actual reference. Photos inserted in a fictional text are presented as referring to what they actually show. When they represent individual members of the actual world, these photos break the fictional frame, as is the case in *Maus*; when they represent landscapes, as is the case with the photos of Istanbul shown in the Museum of Innocence, they illustrate a cultural and geographical background that is common to the fictional and the real world.

Substitution of reference: a photo or a portrait of a real entity is presented in the text, through an explicit caption or some kind of allusion, as representing a fictional entity. This use is illustrated by the portraits of Marbot and by the found photo presented as the mistress of Kemal's father in the Museum of Innocence.

Ambiguous reference: Photos are shown without captions, and it is for the reader to decide whether their sitters are really the characters in the story, or whether the use of the photo involves substitution of reference. My example was Sebald' *The Emigrants*. This ambiguity can only be maintained in a text of uncertain status with respect to the fact/fiction dichotomy.

In addition to these three modes of reference, a text can implement a meta-mode of *broken reference*. When a photo connected to a fictional text is interpreted as referring to an imaginary character, a non-fictional paratext can break the illusion by revealing the substitution of reference. This happens in the catalog of Pamuk's museum, when he admits that the photo of the mistress of Kemal's father is actually a found photo.

Is this catalog exhaustive, or are there other ways to relate photos born factual to fictional texts? I will keep this question open, leaving it to creative authors to actualize possibilities that we cannot yet imagine.

REFERENCES

BARTHES, R. 1981 [1980]. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Trans. by R. Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
COHN, D. 1999. *The Distinction of Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
GOODWIN, D.K. 2005. *A Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
HILDESHEIMER, W. 1983. *Marbot: A Biography*. Trans. by P. Crampton. New York: G. Braziller.
HIRSCH, M. 1997. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and Postmemory*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
PAMUK, O. 2006. *Istanbul: Memories of a City*. Trans. by M. Freely. New York: Vintage Books.
—. 2009. *The Museum of Innocence*. Trans. by M. Freely. New York: Vintage Books.
—. 2012. *The Innocence of Objects*. Trans. by E. Oklap. New York: Abrams.
SCHAEFFER, J.-M. 1999. *Pourquoi la fiction?* Paris: Seuil.
SEBALD, W.G. 1996. *The Emigrants*. Trans. by M. Hulse. New York: New Directions.
—. 2002. *Austerlitz*. Trans. by A. Bell. London: Penguin.
SONTAG, S. 1973. *On Photography*. New York: Picador.
SPIEGELMAN, A. 1986-1991. *Maus: A Survivor's Tale.* I: *My Father Bleeds History.* II: *And Here My Troubles Began*. New York: Pantheon.
WALTON, K.L. 1990. *Mimesis as Make-Believe: On the Foundations of the Representational Arts*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.