

TYPICAL MEN

RECENT PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE MALE BODY BY MEN

Michael Worton and Judith Still

artgallery

This catalogue has been published in conjunction with the exhibition organised by the Djanogly Art Gallery

TYPICAL MEN

Exhibition of the 1950s

Djanogly Art Gallery
3 March – 22 April 2001

Firstsite
The Minories Art Gallery, Colchester
7 July – 1 September 2001

Gallery of Modern Art, Glasgow
26 October 2001 – 27 January 2002

Supported by Midland Band Curatorial Development Programme
Exhibition curated by Michael Worton with Judith Still
Exhibition organised by Neil Walker

ISBN 1 900809 90 7

© 2001 Copyright Djanogly Art Gallery
Copyright for essay: Michael Worton
Copyright for images: the artists and their estates

Design by David Bickerstaff
Print by Goaters Ltd, Nottingham

Djanogly Art Gallery
The University of Nottingham Arts Centre
University Park
Nottingham NG7 2RD

artscentre
THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

The Way Men Look: seeing, Representing and Living Masculinity Today

The choice of the title *Typical Men* for this exhibition is deliberately intended to make people think about what exactly is meant when we say someone is behaving like a 'typical man'. After all, what is typical? And, indeed, what is a 'type'? Does the 'typical man' represent all men? Or is he always someone who is precisely *unlike* other men?

The history of the word 'type' is instructive. Coming from the Greek *typos* meaning an image, figure or impression made in printing, via the Latin *typus* meaning a model or symbol, the word still has the meaning of a person of Old Testament history who prefigures some person or thing revealed in the world of the New Testament (in the way that Adam prefigures Jesus Christ). More commonly, of course, by 'type' we mean the general form, structure or character which distinguishes a particular group of beings or objects. While these meanings are radically different, each of them is relevant to the exhibition which, by presenting the work of some of the most interesting and challenging male photographers of the male body in the last twenty years, aims to encourage viewers to reconsider their own ideas of masculinity and to think about what the photographs are saying and doing as well as admiring and enjoying them as formally beautiful art works. In some ways, each of these photographs represents a male body that is decidedly *not* a typical one - whether it be an old body, a sick body, a partial body, a disguised body, a white body, a black body, a crucified body or whatever. On the other hand, I would argue that each of them precisely *is* typical in the sense that every one - sometimes worryingly, sometimes encouragingly - represents the sort of type that prefigures men to come and will attain its full and true meaning only some time in the future when we know better how to see and look - and accept.

In order to encourage viewers to think about and question their own expectations (and perhaps even their prejudices), this exhibition has not been organised chronologically (as if there was a logical, cause and effect relationship between the works) nor by artist, since the intention is precisely to engender a reconsideration of the artists and their work by recontextualising them. The hold that the traditional image of masculinity has over society, even today, is so vice-like that what is needed to shake and destabilise it are encounters with the unexpected, confrontations with the contradictory, visions of visual difference.

Thinking the Body

In his autobiographical study, Roland Barthes argues: 'the body is irreducible difference, and it is also at the same time the principle of all structuration'.¹ Each of our bodies is absolutely unique, yet it is also that which we share with everyone else and also that which structures all social relations, since it is both the site of desire and the outward image of inner changes. Furthermore, and crucially, the body is invisible: it is what we are, yet we cannot ever see it in its totality.

Cat 61. Spinal Tap, New York 1996
Arthur Tress © the artist
Courtesy of the Zelda Cheate Gallery

Our relationship with our body necessarily therefore passes via the gaze of the 'other' who sees 'better' than we can ever see ourselves. The social anthropologist Françoise Héritier has shown how sexual difference structures human thought by its imposition of a largely binary model. Reminding us that the individual cannot be conceived of alone, since it exists only in relation to others, she argues that the world is a construct of individuals united under a set of arbitrarily established rules where social affiliation cannot be reduced to pure biology or to anatomy as destiny. She points out the lack of systematic study in historical, sociological and anthropological research of the fundamental category of 'l'âge d'homme' (manhood/male adulthood), which she regards as being true masculinity. While childhood, adolescence and, to a lesser extent, old age have been much researched, male adulthood, the stage of power and responsibility, has tended to be passed over in silence. Indeed, as she forcefully puts it, male adulthood is both the black hole and the first and last referent.²

This simultaneity of being paradoxically both total absence and the first and final reference-point is specific and unique to masculinity. However, in the modern world, we are increasingly exposing and exploring this extraordinary paradox - and that means that men need to find new ways of understanding and representing this state of being male. Historically, men, unlike women, have not needed to explore their own body image, because their relation with the world is not mediated by the body in the way that women's social place and role have been constructed by their biological functions. (Freud's celebrated assertion that 'anatomy is destiny' applies much more to women than to men - in socio-political terms as much as in psychoanalytic terms.) Indeed, in order for men to preserve the hegemony of male power, it has been essential to keep the body at a safe distance, even if it cannot be rendered completely invisible. In order to retain their power, therefore, men have collectively refused to interrogate their bodies, which have thus become unhealthily protected from public (and often private) scrutiny. The body is always there, but rarely accorded (by men) its place as a fundamental structuring principle. As the psychologist Stephen Frosh ironically puts it: 'In masculinist thought, the body is what holds us back, keeps us in the muddle of nature, the body is what is *par excellence* feminine, to be seen and owned, but not to be intrinsic to us'.³

Speaking the Language of Men

In the contemporary world, it is very difficult to establish a collective sense of masculinity. In other words, men's hold on gender identity is becoming ever less firm and less unitary. We live in a male-dominated society, in a cultural context of what Adrienne Rich has famously called 'compulsory heterosexuality',⁴ of misogyny and of homophobia, and while most of us in this society were socialised in the gender traditions of Western culture and therefore grew up learning to characterise certain aspects of reality as 'masculine' and others as 'feminine', in fact we actually know very little about men as men - and men have difficulty in talking about themselves. This is particularly apparent in the fact that much of the most exciting and challenging feminist work has been done in, on and through language, whereas there has been little similar experimentation by men. This should not surprise us, because our society continues to

Cat 56. Who Am I? 1994
 Duane Michals © the artist.
 Courtesy of Pace/MacGill Gallery, New York

privilege, albeit sometimes ironically, the concept of the strong, silent man, the hero who does not need to speak because he takes action, the 'real' man who does not cry. As Victor Seidler shows, the historic identification of masculinity with reason and the consequent (conscious or unconscious) manipulation of language by men pose problems for modern men because 'men can learn to use language to distance and hold in check their experience [...] we can learn to use language instrumentally to conceal ourselves'.⁵ In the mouths of men, then, language becomes not so much a means of communicating or expressing as a defence against self-exposure, a means of distancing themselves from their emotions and, indeed, from their bodies. While there are deeply embedded institutional and social reasons for the problems that individual men experience in speaking of their inner selves, the cultural heritage of enforced silence or, at least, reticence has come to form part of the psychic make-up of modern Western man. The radical question for us all, in both social and psychoanalytical terms, is 'are we separate individuals?', but men have assumed, have been trained - and allowed - to assume, that they are indeed separate individuals and so have not had to interrogate their individual identities, because a common, corporate identity has been tacitly furnished. The socio-political reality is that Western society is heavily invested in portraying masculinity as heterosexual, white, and dominant. It therefore has created and maintains representations of such a masculinity which come to function as mainstream, collective *ideals*, thereby pressuring people into behaving in ways which are often constraining and against their own individual best interests, but which nonetheless have reassuring adaptive structural effects, facilitating integration into a society that is largely divided along gendered lines.

So, while men may have little problem with their gender identity to the extent that they know they are men rather than women or children, they often do not know exactly what being a man means. In other words, gender role identity is much more problematic than gender identity - and yet it is gender as role, gender as performance that constitutes the social reality for men and women in modern society. To be 'masculine' is therefore to adopt a role, to act out (and to act as) a persona that is significantly different from the actor or agent himself, it is to inhabit a difference from oneself. The experience of masculine identity is thus one of being simultaneously inside and outside both a core self and a social self.

As soon as the social structure is shaken, as it has been through the creative challenges of feminism, traditional certainties about masculinity begin to dissolve and the male body becomes the site of an interrogation rather than an affirmation. And this means that while masculinity continues to be a social and political phenomenon, it needs to be increasingly recognised as a personal narrative or representation. This personalising of the body is no privatisation, however, no appropriation or imposition of power through secrecy and willed invisibility. It is a *staging* of difference, a play of and with representation that entails a repositioning of the question(s) of gender outside the traditional binary oppositions of male/female and heterosexual/homosexual.

The Role of Photography

Photography is becoming an ever more important cultural tool for men, since it offers the possibility of representing and expressing their bodies without being constrained within the prison-house of language and its restricting heritage. Furthermore, as theorisings of masculinity increasingly foreground performance, masquerade and the representational dimension of masculinity, photography enables both artists and viewers to see differently and to scrutinise the image as agent rather than simply as reflection.⁴ In 1978 Margaret Walters could assert with little fear of contradiction that the male nude was 'a forgotten subject',⁵ but in the past two decades there has been an explosion of exhibitions and published material on the photographic representation of the male nude. This interest has been largely driven by the 'canonisation' of gay photography as practised by artists such as Arthur Tress, Duane Michals and Robert Mapplethorpe.⁶ However, the requisitioning of the photographed male body as a site of homoeroticism should not be seen only in terms of gay politics, since it precisely permits and encourages a more general assessment of the male body and the part played by its perception (and conception) in the construction of masculinity. Above all, by deconstructing the male body as the site of 'compulsory heterosexuality', it challenges men's self-image and creatively threatens the security of their position of dominance.

The fact that in recent years the male nude body has been made publicly - and often provocatively - visible in photography is therefore indicative of a radical shift in attitudes towards masculinity and is facilitating the establishment of new multiple concepts of male identity. And this radicalism is due to the fact that it is photography rather than painting or sculpture that has now decided to focus on the male nude. In everyday life, photographs are considered to be transparent, to be neutral copies of reality that are not mediated by any codes or conventions of representation, be these aesthetic, philosophical, socio-political or whatever. An integral part of modern life to the extent that they saturate our world, photographs are actually rarely seen in the sense of being looked at or even noticed as artefacts. Their very ubiquity is what, paradoxically, renders them invisible; like the male body, their power lies in the fact that they are not seen to be promoting any politics. The new 'men's' photography can therefore be seen to be a double exercise in self-awareness and consciousness-raising, challenging the shibboleths of both photography and masculinity.

Contemporary theories of photography have enormously advanced our understanding of the powerful but subtle (and often insidious) ways in which photographs function as representations and as signifying systems. It is, however, interesting that much of the most illuminating work continues to insist on the relationship that pertains between the photograph and the real. Susan Sontag, for instance, proposes that 'photographs do not explain; they acknowledge',⁷ and Roland Barthes asserts that 'photography never lies: or rather, it can lie as to the meaning of the thing, being by nature *tendentious*, never as to its existence'; 'photography [...] *authenticates* the existence of a certain being'.⁸

Cat 44. Hans van der Heijden 1986
Hans Van Manen © the artist

Cat 23. Untitled - 2 (from 'Espais II' Series) 1993
Sunil Gupta © the artist

Cat 9. *Reclining Figure, Two Panels No. 1* 1996
 John Coplins © the artist,
 Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art

The very realism of photography is, however, what makes it such a problematic and troubling medium. This is because, as we know from literary theory, realism is about communicating an *effect* of the real rather than presenting or imitating the real itself: in other words, mimesis is a performance rather than a representation. And if 'photography's realism creates a confusion about the real',¹¹ this is particularly true of photographs of the male body which call into question the reality of the body both as discrete object and as *typical*, as representative of men in general, and even the reality of the individual model, who may be aestheticised out of his individuality and transformed into an icon. This ontological confusion is responsible for the ambivalent status of photography, in both aesthetic and socio-political terms, for the photograph seems to issue directly from the physical world, yet it is also (and it is perceived anxiously as) an intervention into - and a manipulation of - the world of empirical experience.

Mary Price offers a complex but beautifully considered definition of a photograph: 'a picture of that which is about to become a memory, a capturing of what, in the present which is about to become the past, is to be remembered'.¹² This is how I conceive of the photographs in this exhibition: as promises of memories. Each of them makes present to the viewer a moment that has been captured, a unique moment that reveals a different man and a different world. However, each of these images is also so strong and so true that we shall retain them in our memories. They will change our perceptions not only of the individuals represented, but also of men generally. In this sense, they are determining types that will fashion the future, even if - indeed, especially if - we do not immediately recognise ourselves or our assumptions in the images.

The Naked Body

The photographic male nude undoubtedly poses major problems for heterosexual men: (how) can the male body be desired?; (how) can one desire the 'other' *within* sameness?; (how) can one admit to desiring the forbidden, the taboo? The history of the nude is one in which the female nude has undoubtedly been 'fetishized, mutilated, fragmented, rendered anonymous'¹³ and in which the male nude was for centuries identified with God, Adam and myths of Creation or was portrayed in essentially anatomical studies in which the emphasis was on how the body worked rather than on how it looked. One of the fundamental exercises of an academic training (and indeed known in the French Salon as an *académie*), the male nude was to be seen and represented as active and dynamic; even when it was portrayed as ailing or decrepit, it was still nonetheless an icon of phallic power. The one thing the male body was not (intended to be) seen as was a site of erotic pleasure. On the other hand, the female nude was - and perhaps still is - viewed differently. That quintessential connoisseur Kenneth Clark states, for example: 'no nude, however abstract, should fail to arouse in the spectator some vestige of erotic feeling, even although it be the faintest shadow - and if it does not do so, it is bad art and false morals'.¹⁴ Leaving aside the thorny (and, in my opinion, inappropriate) question of morality, I would suggest that while it is socially and artistically acceptable to describe a female nude as 'erotic', this is decidedly not the case with a male nude, since if a male viewer is to find pleasure in a male body, he has - traditionally, heterosexually - to find a response that precisely effaces desire.

Historically, as Margaret Walters points out, 'the male nude derives much of its power and meaning from the reverence accorded in patriarchy to the phallus'.¹⁵ This phallus, however, exerted its force through the fact that it was not explicitly sexual or penile, but was incarnated in the male body as a whole. Early photographs of the nude male followed the lead given by painting and desexualised the body through reference to classical iconography or by portraying it as an ideal of healthy athleticism. In many cases, this was a form of camouflaging homoeroticism, thus legitimating the homoerotic, either for the photographer or for the spectator, as the body was represented as an aesthetic object and desire consequently recoded as aesthetic response. However, while such procedures may have permitted the functioning of homoeroticism by veiling the body in Greek gauzes or by framing it in luxuriant meadows crossed by raging torrents and dotted with proudly standing pines, these camouflaging techniques in fact repressed, or at least froze, the mobility that it is absolutely imperative for men to find in masculinity. Contemporary photographers, such as George Dureau, David Newman, Robert Mapplethorpe, Arthur Tress and Joel-Peter Witkin have ironically rehearsed these poses and/or settings to great effect, reminding us of their power whilst at the same time subverting them and challenging us to rethink both past and present. Such re-evaluations of past motifs are often deeply serious; they can also be smilingly affectionate, as is the case with Delmas Howe's 'cheeky' bandanna-ed cowboy in a field of sunflowers. Their humour can also be complex and shot through with nostalgia, as in Jan Saudek's *Early in the Morning*, an ironically wistful homage to the universe of muscled and toned men striding through fields on the road to nowhere except their own phallic certainty: here the naturally coloured naked figure strides off away from us, through the long grass towards... the grey, industrial misery of an industrial town.

In one of the first studies of the photographic nude, Peter Weiermair argues that:

...the history of the presentation of the male nude is also the history of the presentability of its erotic content. [...] The history of the male nude is a history of man's (self) image in 150 years of the photographic medium; it is a history of repression and sublimation, and it is a history of the overcoming of a taboo.¹⁶

The taboo has not, it seems to me, been overcome, but the nude male body has at least been made photographically visible. And this has major implications for the (re)constructions of masculinity, since the visibility of the whole male body permits a reconsideration of the need for its *indivisibility*.

The Active Body

The defining figure of classical Greece is the young male nude. The Ancient Greeks considered that it was through the perfection of their bodies that human beings most resembled the gods; the cult of the body was consequently more than a physical activity: it was also a spiritual - and a civic - activity. Furthermore, many of the statues were associated with the cult of Apollo, who was god not only of manly beauty but also of reason, thereby inaugurating the equation of masculinity with rationality that would recur time and again throughout history, finding its final and triumphant articulation in

Cat 32. *Pinhandle Portfolio* - Mark 1984
Delmas Howe © the artist.

Cat 75. *Early in the Morning* 1984
Jan Saudek © the artist.
Courtesy of Galerie Karol Mennou, Paris

the Enlightenment two millennia later. This equation remains responsible for the difficulties many men today have in expressing and dealing with emotions, but for the Greeks, for whom (male) nudity symbolised beauty and wholeness, masculinity was unequivocally and unproblematically at the heart of religion and philosophy as well as of aesthetics.

The early *kouros* figures depict a man, often a hero or a victorious athlete, or a god, often Apollo, standing stiffly upright, usually with his hands clenched and one foot slightly in front of the other. They emphasise the broad shoulders and the strong buttocks and bulging thighs of the figures. Caricatural as we may find them, we should nonetheless remember that in the 1950s and 1960s, the images of idealised masculinity that filled the body-building or 'beefcake' magazines used exactly the same attitude of glorifying exaggerated body forms in order to assert masculine strength as the definition of maleness.¹⁷ Furthermore, they often presented the male body as 'living sculpture' and, to heighten the association with the ancient world, the models depilated their bodies, thereby fostering the illusion of flesh as marble.¹⁸ By the 5th century BC, sculpture moves into the classical age. The crucial statue is the Kritios boy (480 BC),¹⁹ who marks a radical departure from the past, in that the figure is liberated from the formal, flat plane: his head is slightly turned and his stance more relaxed, with the weight placed on one foot, and his right knee bent. What is remarkable about the Kritios boy is that he gives the feeling of occupying his own space precisely because he is relaxed and natural, rather than monumental. In this, he prefigures the poses that will be adopted centuries later by photographers such as Dureau and Mapplethorpe as they seek new ways of representing and making present the male body.

In his reflections on the undivided nude of Greek art, Adrian Stokes argues that 'the human body so conceived is a promise of sanity'.²⁰ The psychic sanity of which he speaks is a fantasy, but a very necessary and real fantasy. Now, psychoanalysis teaches us that what we lose in reality we recreate in fantasy. In many ways, the male body has been represented in a variety of ideal(ising) forms - as a response to the loss or, rather, the absence of any adequate, lived sense of identity. It is in this context that one can understand and approve the assertion of art historians Andrew Campbell and Nathan Griffith that 'the "male body" does not exist',²¹ and Frosh's declaration that 'masculinity has been marked by closure throughout its history, holding things in place, symbolised by the unitary sexuality of the penis'.²²

If the athlete was glorified in the ancient world, it was not only for his power and prowess, it was also as an aesthetic object. Athletic poses, such as that of the discus-thrower, continue even today to haunt advertising billboards as well as the galleries and portfolios of artists. For *Thomas 1987*, for instance, Mapplethorpe constrains his model, coiled and intent, within a tight circle that evokes Leonardo da Vinci's study of the geometry of man as well as the pose of the *discoboulos*. In another, the model is perched, squatting and with his back to us, on a high pedestal, a young, lithe, and secular St Simeon. The references to the past are undoubtedly powerful, yet the photographed bodies have a presence that transcends historical contextualisation and demands that the viewer gaze - and admire.

Cat 15. *Barriste and Hogue 1989*
George Dureau © the artist

Cat 83. *Wrestling Match, California 1996*
Arthur Tress © the artist.
Courtesy of the Zelda Cheate Gallery

Other photographers rework classical poses and concepts of activity in different ways. The cult of wrestling is revisited by George Dureau, whose wrestlers are locked in immobility, gazes fixed, their attitude problematised not only by a certain erotic charge but also by the fact that one is white, the other black: are they preparing for real combat or are they in the first stages of a sexual game? In Arthur Tress's version, the sexuality is evident, but so too is the fun - and the fact that there are more than two in this game, thus challenging the conventions of the appropriate number for a sexual encounter/game.

Athleticism is traditionally masculinised, so Roberto Rincón's *Because I Can* is particularly striking, not only because the model (a dancer) is challenging male anatomy by doing the splits, but because he is so poised and still in this strenuous act of agility - and because the viewer's gaze is arrested by the small tattoo that evokes a wholly different culture of balance, that of Yin and Yang.

In her study of modern photography of the male nude, Melody Davis reminds us that 'the ideal for the male body has always been action'.²³ However, if the cult of the active body continues to inform much art practice just as much as it continues to dominate concepts of masculinity, there is an increasing denial of activity as the defining characteristic of the man, especially the desirable man. Delmas Howe's man sitting in a bath and turning to pick up soap reveals the body as simply there, ordinary, yet also the object of a gaze and so potentially desirable. Roberto Rincón's tattooed man standing gazing at the camera has no heroic pose - indeed, he stands almost awkwardly - yet he too has presence, because the photographer has given him presence and even stature. Another tattooed man, Chris Nelson's cigar-smoker, his moustache mimicking (or mimicked by) the cartoon bear on his chest, sits placidly on the lavatory and stares out, aware that he is being viewed and calmly, neutrally holding the viewer's gaze. Above all, his body is now seen, scrutinised even, and because it has been made visible with the purpose of being seen and scrutinised, it becomes a possible model rather than simply being noticed and forgotten in the flux of time. A more defiant rebuttal of traditional attitudes to the active body is offered by Lee Wagstaff, whose self portrait from behind of his multiply-tattooed body planted, legs casually astride, in a bamboo field, suggests that activity need not be thought only in terms of performing action externally but can also be conceived as acting upon oneself - and becoming oneself through will and desire.

The Penis and the Phallus

Whereas the penis has a clear anatomical reality and an essential reproductive function, the phallus is a symbolic object: in the ancient world, it was an image of the penis, symbolising the generative power of nature, being venerated in several religious systems and, for example, being carried in procession in the Dionysiac festivals in Greece. For understandable reasons, patriarchy has tended to blur the differences between the two in order to make men the undisputed holders and wielders of power merely by virtue of having the 'right' anatomical appendage. However, in both the political and the philosophical realms of gender politics, feminists have been particularly alert to the need

Cat 73. *Because I Can* 1996
Roberto Rincón © the artist



Cat 74. *Standing Nude Male* 1999
Roberto Rincón © the artist



Cat 84. *Red Sea* 2000
Lee Wagstaff © the artist
Courtesy of Patrick Brillat



to *ex-pose* and to *say* the illusion that is the male power generated by the penis masquerading as phallus. The phallus, as symbol of power, fertility, and life, has come to represent, for both sexes, the image of narcissistic completion and sexual desire. Indeed, as psychoanalysts have recognised, if a symbolic phallic image were to be entirely missing, psychotic confusion about sexual relationships would ensue. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the phallus has to retain its hegemonic power... For children, the father's penis is traditionally visible and named, whereas the mother's sexual organ is invisible and usually unnamed, even though the penis is rarely seen and/or presented as what it is in reality. Rather, it is habitually perceived and promoted (by men) as the phallus - in order that their power may remain intact. And as Maxine Sheets-Johnstone wittily but powerfully puts it:

within Western cultural practice generally [...] a male's body is not anatomized nor is it ever made an object of study in the same way as female bodies. The net result is that the penis is never made public, never put on the measuring line in the same way that female sexual body parts are put on the measuring line. [...] What is normally no more than a swag of flesh in this way gains unassailable stature and power [...] it is conceived not as the swag of flesh it normally is in all the humdrum acts and routines of everyday life but as a Phallus, an organ of unconditioned power.²⁴

Cat 43. Untitled 1998
Edward Lucie-Smith © the artist

The relationship of the phallus and the penis, or rather the assumption that there is a causal relationship between the penis and the phallus, is what several photographers (and writers) are now challenging. The bringing into visibility and into language of the penis, especially a non-idealised penis, is only one way (although a particularly significant one) of drawing the male body into a representation that will permit exploration of its relationship with identity, in which indivisibility is no longer desired or appropriate.

Not surprisingly, it is in the realm of pornography that one finds the strongest desire to maintain the equation of the penis with the phallus. As Kenneth McKinnon has argued: 'There is a gulf between maleness and masculinity, between the penis and the phallus. One of pornography's most significant functions may be to suggest that the gap is bridged, that one is the other'.²⁵ It is important to note that this is the case not only for heterosexual pornography, but also for gay pornography, since the maintenance of phallic power is a question not merely of sexual difference; it is vital to the preservation and enhancement of a dominant male order within an ideology that needs heterosexuality as a structuring principle - and that, in Western culture, needs the white, heterosexual middle-class male to be invested with unassailable power, regardless of individuality.

I myself have argued that, whether he uses his own name, a pseudonym or a pseudonym of a pseudonym, the signatory of hard- or soft-porn gay texts is neither fully present nor fully absent, being rather a manifestation of what I call the Author-as-collective:

The pseudonymous signatory of gay pornography is merely - and importantly - a cipher; he is not interested in the lure of immortality-through-specificity which tempts writers of 'literature'; he is part of what one might call the Author-as-collective. He does not exist in the sense that he has no identity and no past, and the function of his name is simply to characterize a certain mode of discourse.²⁶

The same is true also of visual pornography: the photographer, often working under a pseudonym (and this not simply to avoid the censor), is not what interests the consumers; what they want is what they know they will get - because they have programmed the photographer to stage the fantasies that they all share. In other words, pornography is fundamentally unoriginal, because it is based on a shared assumption that fantasies are common and share-able; there is no room for imagination and the individual; every body is the phallus.

Some of the artists in this exhibition have been accused of being pornographic. Such accusations are inappropriate, because what marks their work is the originality of the gaze that creates the photograph: the images they create are new images of masculinity and the male body, are types yet to be adopted and - sadly but inevitably - in some cases ultimately to be recuperated by society and recycled and manipulated as stereotypes. It has frequently been assumed that Mapplethorpe's men are phallic bodies, even though he as photographer maintains the power. However, when his work is seen in the context of other photographers, some of whom influenced him and some of whom he influenced, one may see his work differently. Dureau's *Stanley Hurd* presents a white dwarf wrestler in a frozen walking pose on two blocks. His buttocks are strong, like those in the archaic Greek statues; the power in his legs is evident, and the impulse forward captured in the image is undeniably strong; and he gazes out at the viewer through his long hair, sure of his masculinity and athletic prowess. So...a phallic body? In many ways, yes. However, his penis is small, subordinate to the musculature of his upper legs and buttocks. Here the penis becomes a mere 'swag of flesh', and the wrestler's maleness and power is obtained through his (willed) assumption and proclamation of individuality.

In his study of the male nude in photography, Emmanuel Cooper questions whether in recent photographic exposures of male nakedness, 'the male nude has shed any of the power invested in the body ideological by revealing the body physical, or whether it has, in the process, taken on new strengths'.²⁷ It is undeniable that the male body, once divested of its assumed identity with the phallus, becomes a very different object of regard.

Mapplethorpe may indeed have colluded in investing the black male with the symbolic responsibility and sexual duty of being the phallus rather than simply having a penis (or even a phallus). This certainly is how his own gaze operated within his world of desire and fantasy, and his images are so powerfully, if problematically, charged with eroticism that the equation still remains for some, even though the psychosexual and cultural map of the world and its behaviour has since changed. As a black gay man, Rotimi Fani-

Cat 10. Stanley Hurd 1983
George Dureau © the artist

Kayode was necessarily influenced to a certain extent by Mapplethorpe as he strove to create images which fused desire, ritual and the black body - and which were made to be gazed upon and savoured. Fani-Kayode's family were forced to leave Nigeria in 1966 as political refugees, so his experience of life was always as an outsider, neither wholly Nigerian nor wholly English. Furthermore, his family had the title of Akire or 'Keepers of the Shrine of Ifa', an oracle. This heritage suggested to him the practice of seeking to emulate the 'technique of ecstasy' through which the Yoruba priests became possessed and communicated with the gods: his aim was to communicate with the unconscious mind. We should not over-emphasise the extent of Fani-Kayode's familiarity with the Yoruba religion; what he did was to see the Western world to which he had come through the prism of folk memories.

A key figure for Fani-Kayode, as for Lyle Ashton Harris who represents him with the dual, androgynous goddess Oshun in *Untitled (Orisha Studies)*, was Eshu-Elegba, the Yoruba god of indeterminacy, who promises rebirth, just as Fani-Kayode's work seeks both to represent the promise of renaissance and to generate in the viewer a belief in its possibility, both individually and collectively:

Esu presides here, because we should not forget him. He is the Trickster, the Lord of the Crossroads, sometimes changing the sign-posts to lead us astray. At every masquerade (which is now sometimes called Carnevale - a farewell to flesh for the period of fasting) he is present, showing off his phallus one minute and crouching as though to give birth the next. He mocks us as we mock ourselves in masquerade.²⁸

In Fani-Kayode's *Untitled 1987-88*, a ritual dancer stands immobile, yet also in motion, for the tasseled fronds of his belt are blurred, so rapidly have they been moving. The figure is naked, except for the ritual paint centring on his golden penis, a rampant tongue in the face painted on his stomach. The penis cannot be any more central here, especially given that the model's head is invisible, cropped out of the photograph. Yet the penis is not pure phallus, even ritualised like this: hanging over unpainted testicles, it has the reality of flesh, showing the waning of desire in the moment of representing desire and power. It is the body which is beautiful, not the penis - and especially the unpainted body, the simple gleaming flesh that catches the light and encourages our gaze upwards to the absent head. Fani-Kayode was a hybrid being who celebrated hybridity, a Yoruba trickster who played in the same way as Jung's Trickster (itself a variation of the classical gods of mischief and creation) plays and obliges us to rethink our categories and structures. We look at Fani-Kayode's works and marvel at their sensuality and seduction; we also realise that we do not fully understand them. This, however, is the point: they are not to be decoded and then forgotten; they are to remain in our minds and memories as images that we know to be meaningful because they speak of something deep, of something beyond individual cultures, of something that is calling to us.

Cat 28. *Untitled (Orisha Studies)* 1994
Lyle Ashton Harris © the artist.
Courtesy of Galerie Analix Forever, Geneva

Cat 18. *Untitled 1987-88* (printed 1995)
Rotimi Fani-Kayode © the artist's estate.
Courtesy of Autograph AEP Ltd

If the fantasy of the undivided body and the pursuit of the body beautiful are still powerful drivers of art and of desire, increasing numbers of artists are substituting for the phallic body (centred on the penis) a scattered, exploded body. The quest is no longer to find or impose a unified, phallic body and thereby establish a sense of identity, even, if necessary, oppositionally. Rather, the emphasis is on acts of presence, on making visible, on 'giving to see', as the Surrealists said. For we do not see much in our everyday lives. Even with our partners, do we really see them as they are, *all* of them? Indeed, do we see ourselves totally or simply the reflection that we expect to see in the mirror?

Arno Minkkinen is an astonishingly self-effacing self portraitist: he represents himself repeatedly but his face is invariably absent. In *Nelson's Point*, his arm becomes part of the landscape, almost indistinguishable from the bare branches of the tree; his *Self Portrait, Mountain Lakes* is simply three of his fingers, massively yet delicately posed on the table; his *Self Portrait, Fosters Pond* is an exercise of acrobacy in the snow that creates a wonderful geometrical pattern that hardly seems to involve a human body at all; most movingly, in *Self Portrait with Daniel, Andover, 31.12.86*, his body is almost invisible: his son sits on the bed looking straight at the camera, while Minkkinen protects him by spreading his arms over the curved bed-head, a guardian presence, unseen yet always there.

One of the most delightfully playful of contemporary photographers (as well as one of the darkest and most thought-provoking, as can be seen in his *Black Circus Master* series), Ajamu creates exquisitely intense photographs, as with his *Ear 1993*, in which the silver star ear-ring and curling ear-clip flank the darkly luminous pool of the earhole, highlighting every pore of the shaven head. It is an image of exquisite beauty, sufficient unto itself. Yet that star does not remain just a star: the viewer speculates on it - Star of David, Jewishness, blackness, ... what is the connection?; Star of Bethlehem, Christianity, blackness... what is the connection? Is that a Celtic pattern on the ear-clip or an African one? The questions go on and on, yet the image remains, reminding us of the presence and autonomy of beauty at the same time as it generates speculation on meaning.

In *Colin from Albuquerque*, Edward Lucie-Smith uses an ear studded with an ear-ring to evoke an object of desire, heightening the sense of eroticism by focusing only on one small body-part, which the viewer assumes to be a much-desired zone. And in *Untitled (David Collins in Robe)*, the man's beard is almost indistinguishable from the rough hessian blanket surrounding him: this is just an image, yet as the eye recognises what is beard and what blanket, memories and associations begin and the viewing experience becomes one in which the senses of smell and touch also come into play.

We all know which part of the male body most appeals to us, this knowledge usually being reserved only for ourselves and perhaps for our partner. Duane Michals shows us and tells us, gently but confidently, where he thinks 'the most beautiful part of a man's body' is: 'where the torso sits on and into the hips, those twin delineating curves, feminine in grace, girdling the trunk, guiding the eye downwards to their intersection,

Cat 60. *Self Portrait, Nelson's Point, Clark Island, Maine 1996*
Arno Rafael Minkkinen © the artist

Cat 59. *Self Portrait with Daniel, Andover, 31.12.86*
Arno Rafael Minkkinen © the artist

Cat 2. *Ear 1993*
Ajamu © the artist

the point of pleasure'. The image itself has preceded the text, yet also succeeds it, as the viewer's eye travels from image to text and back again, stopping to savour the dimpled hollow at the hips and the curling wisps of abdominal hair that no words can describe and yet that need the words in order for the viewer to take seriously this part of the body that is so rarely seen or looked at on its own.

More disturbing images of fragmented male bodies are offered by Ajamu, Dureau and Witkin. Ajamu's *Auto Portrait as Armless and Legless* is clearly a manipulation, albeit a most distressing one. Witkin, on the other hand, sometimes takes as his models individuals who are already physically disadvantaged or 'freakish', as he puts it, and then renders them even more outlandish. In *Man without Legs*, the masked man's penis hangs just over the wheel of the skate-board, perilously close to castration, but that is not what strikes and haunts us about the photograph: rather, it is the way in which the man is framed by drapes and in front of a bright triangle, made into a freak, a monster to be displayed (from the Latin *monstrare*, to show). And yet... from behind his crude hand-made mask, the anonymous man gazes out at us and holds our returning gaze, obliging us to notice his strong arms (for propelling him through the streets) and his slightly pendulous breasts. He thus makes himself present and visible in a way that he never would be on a street in New York or London.

Much of Dureau's work is also devoted to photographing physically atypical men, especially dwarfs and amputees. What is significant about these images is that the models neither seek our pity nor are represented as in any way to be pitied. They look out at the viewer confidently, ordinarily, whether propping themselves up with one or two crutches, holding a lyre like a black Orpheus, or, in the case of Roosevelt Singleton, proclaiming his own kingliness. Dureau's men relate to us and we to them in ways that are not easy or comfortable, but they do speak to us across a gulf of difference that reminds us actively of what (physical and emotional) loss means and how it can be transcended.

The Body Religious

Much has been made of the importance of the tradition deriving from ancient Greece of the active, indivisible male body. The other great tradition of the portrayed naked male is, of course, that of the Christian tradition of the exceptional suffering and passive body, notably Christ on the Cross, the dead Christ in his mother's arms (the *Pietà*), and the martyred St Sebastian pierced by his archers' arrows. The latter became, of course, the inspiration for many homoerotic paintings and photographs, and the force of this image of the willingly suffering body can still be found in such different work as Evergon's giant Polaroids and Newman's staged, self-aggressive self portraits. Newman's Sebastian-esque *Unnamed Action (Self Portrait)* is one of the most powerful and complex portrayals of the Christian suffering body (although Newman himself has no Christian belief, but rather is sensitive to the weight of violence and sado-masochism that Christian iconography has left to us). The body is girded with a loose loin-cloth, masking the genitals modestly, yet open enough for the bottom of the belly to be noticed. The figure's arms strain to hold a rope, emblematic of the archers' weapons,

Cat 54. *The Most Beautiful Part of a Man's Body* 1986
Dureau Michals © the artist
Courtesy of Pace/MacGill Gallery, New York

Cat 88. *Man without Legs*, New York City 1984
Joel-Peter Witkin © the artist
Courtesy of Fraenkel Gallery, San Francisco

Cat 14. *Jeffrey Cook* 1984
George Dureau © the artist

and he gazes upwards proudly, defiantly. This image, though complex, is eminently readable in the context of Christian iconography. However, its iconic stature is challenged and problematised by the fact that the left arm is truly naked, whereas the rest of the body has been 'antiquated' by photographing part of the first print of the photograph through a glass plate. Newman regularly manipulates all of his images, so that none is ever repeatable, but in this case, the effect is to make the viewer speculate hard on the body as it is represented: part history, part legend, part reality.

The crucifixion is, for Christians, the most sacred of all representations, since it shows the death of God, albeit in preparation for His resurrection. As such, it is usually represented with respect and dignity. Witkin's extraordinary *Penitente, New Mexico*, however, challenges the viewer to imagine pain. His Christ-figure is tied, howling, to a cross, flanked by two screaming, crucified monkeys. The image appals, even when one learns that the model was standing on a footrest and that the monkeys were dead prior to crucifixion.⁴⁹ Yet the image also compels the viewer to go on looking at it. Whether this process of spectating is therapeutic or not is perhaps ultimately not the main point; what matters is that the viewer looks and looks and looks and finally sees the body, feminised and in pain - and in an aesthetically pleasing pose. In fact, it is the crucifixion of the monkeys which most shocks, not for reasons of heresy but because their suffering has no art historical precedent to sanitise it; they therefore make the viewer connect personally with the physical suffering of crucifixion and finally, paradoxically, see the crucified figure as a real man rather than an icon.

In European culture, another dominant image of the suffering male is that of the dead Christ cradled in his mother's arms. The most familiar representation of this is Michelangelo's great *St Peter's Pietà*, which van Manen imitates and subverts in his self portrait, where he, an ageing, anxious and awkwardly seated man, replaces the serene Madonna, staring out questioningly at the viewer and holding an erotically-abandoned naked male body.

Fani-Kayode's *Every Moment Counts*, presents a black man with dreadlocks (emblems of both desire and fear), who is wearing a halo of pearls and gazing into the distance. A younger man, of uncertain ethnicity, clings to him. In this photograph, powerful archetypal images from African and European, Yoruba and Christian cultures come together. Alex Hirst, the artist's lover and collaborator, has suggested the following reading of the image: 'The hero points the way forward for the lost boys of the world - the young street-dreads, the nightclub-chickens, the junkies and the doomed: every moment of imaginative transformation counts towards a future synthesis: an initiation or the birth of a magical "changeling"'.⁵⁰ Perhaps - indeed, undoubtedly, since Hirst describes this as 'our last joint work'. However, the picture says and does more: it reminds both African and European that there is something not quite right about the iconic status of the image and so directs attention onto the two figures, seeing them as they are and not simply as what they are standing for. So art, by referring back on itself and to its origins, can also make us actively enter the present and seek new ways forward.

Cat 72. *Unnamed Action (Self Portrait)* 1985
David Newman © the artist

Cat 87. *Penitente, New Mexico* 1982
Joel-Peter Witkin © the artist.
Courtesy of Fraenkel Gallery, San Francisco

Cat 19. *Every Moment Counts* 1989 (printed 1995)
Rosini Fani-Kayode © the artist's estate.
Courtesy of Autograph ABP Ltd

One of the most worryingly paradoxical features of photography is that it fractures the relationship between the image and its subject (the 'model') at the same time as it naturalises it. This tension becomes even more acute in the case of self portraiture. Who is real? What is the viewer to make of what s/he sees? Why has the photographer chosen to show himself in this way?

We traditionally accept that 'the nude' is an artistic category, and so we can look at naked bodies without fear of being socially compromised because it is 'art'. However, recent photography of the male body has made it clear that what is on view is the *naked* male body and not the 'safe' nude. The question of how to negotiate the inevitable consequent eroticism, both for men and for women, is not simple - nor is it intended to be. With naked self portraiture, the problem becomes even more complex, as the viewer has to contend with a body which has been seen (and posed) by a photographer who is also the very body he has seen and posed. The photographed man is both the subject and object of a gaze and an interpretation, even before he is seen and interpreted by the viewer - who may feel somewhat superfluous and even irrelevant to the work in the sense of arriving too late to add to its meaning. However, when we gaze longer on such self portraits, what we see is the emergence of a more profound sense of the body, of what it is and where it is. John Coplans omits his face from all his self portraits and also omits to title them; in these vast, monumental prints we discover a body that is always naked and arrestingly new to the eye, and sometimes both naked and nude, as when he adopts a pose familiar from art history. This ageing body has a marvellous presence: it is very much always Coplans's own body, with its tree-like lower legs and elephant toes, its gnarled hands and its granite-textured back, yet it is also very much ours as we age and grow hairier, stouter and more wrinkled.

Cat 7. Self Portrait (Back with Arms Above) 1984
John Coplans © the artist
Tate, London 2001

As the body gets sick, we tend to hide it, yet photographers like Sunil Gupta have made their illness a driving force in their creativity. Committed to 'making awkward connections' in his work, Gupta explores the notion of the New Europe in the context of migrant cultures and, more recently, has been exploring ways of re-inscribing his Indian heritage into the reality of his life in London as an HIV+ gay man. In his digital montages, he juxtaposes self portraits with old family photographs, publicity stills for Indian films, cartoons, historical Indian art, and advertising for gay male soft porn or beefcake escort services. In one image from the *Trespass II* series, a photograph of Gupta, nude and facing the camera, is superimposed on an old army photograph showing a troop that contains Gupta's father (who is no. 26). In the *From Here to Eternity* series of diptychs, he pairs a self portrait (often undergoing treatment for HIV) with the facade of one or other south London gay club, deserted in the daytime, thereby obliging the viewer to make connections on what both 'here' and 'eternity' are - for Gupta and for the viewer him/herself. Significantly, these connections will be different from the artist's himself, since few of his viewers will know what, say, 'The Pleasuredome' really is or what happens there at night (it is a gay sauna). So viewing his works is to speculate around unknowns and to have for the focal centre of that speculation the changing body of Gupta himself, a body that is both ailing and ageing.

Cat 25. Untitled - 6 (from 'Trespass II' Series) 1993
Sunil Gupta © the artist

If Gupta's self-analysing work is highly conceptual, it is also visually compelling, the 'autobiographical' Polaroid work of Lyle Ashton Harris (in collaboration with his brother Thomas Allen Harris) is vividly referential in its challenging of gender stereotypes. The *Brotherhood* images, which evoke variously the *Pietà* or the Greek heroes Achilles and Patroclus, Cain and Abel (locked in a kiss of death), and *David's Oath of the Horatii* and the myth of the Spartans, are also highly erotic, dangerously so, presenting as they do images of gun-violence in the context of incestuous SM gay sexuality. Furthermore, while a phallic gun is present and pointed, both men are feminised through pose, lipstick and ear-rings and the poses are often languorous, so the viewer is confused as to how to respond. Images such as these show how far male photography of the male body has come in the past two decades, for they are not so much breaking taboos (that has already been done) as making the taboo part of the mainstream. Furthermore, and more radically, the brothers do not merely act out their fantasy for the camera; they turn to gaze into the lens, making the viewer realise that s/he is complicit in both the living-out of the taboo fantasy and the establishment of further taboo areas. In his inspired and simultaneously self-proclaiming and self-mocking self-portraits, Harris not only reclaims subjecthood for the sexualised (and sexy) black male, gay or straight, he shows that beauty is decidedly not in the eye of the beholder, but may be created, manufactured and manipulated by the artist in a dialogue of complicity with his viewer.

The Delightful Body

Alastair Foster asserts that 'there is not a great deal of humour to be found in popular representations of the male nude'; this is, he suggests, largely because 'patriarchy is too fearful of cracks appearing in the monumental edifice of heterosexual masculinity to allow even the most gentle ripples of laughter to lap at the walls'.³¹ Happily, this is not strictly true. While patriarchy will undoubtedly continue to attempt to maintain a monolithic vision of masculinity, new representations and practices throw up an ever-changing kaleidoscopic screen of multiple masculinities.

Duane Michals is perhaps one of the most gently thoughtful of contemporary photographers. Preoccupied by the ways in which photography can both represent the world and comment on and thereby modify it, he annotates his images with handwritten messages or titles in order better to communicate his ideas on filiation, the sharing of love and the need to be recognised and affirmed both by the self and by others. In his witty *Self Portrait with Feminine Beard*, his luminous and kindly eyes look out at the viewer, who smiles in response, yet whose serenity is splintered by the title. Why a *feminine* beard? Because the hair is wispy? Or because the hair is pubic or feigning to be? These questions rage and ultimately must remain unanswered; the artist smiles on and in a state of semi-serenity, the viewer reflects on what exactly *is* feminine about that beard...

Humour often serves to hook the viewer into looking more closely and thinking more carefully. For instance, Ajamu's body builder in a bra challenges stereotypes of masculinity and of gayness and cross-dressing, but above all, it makes the viewer *look*, noticing the stray threads and the way in which the bra doesn't quite fit - or hasn't been

Cat. 30. *Brotherhood, Crossroads and Ecce Homo #2* 1994 Lyle Ashton Harris © the artist.
Courtesy of Galerie Aralia Folevic, Geneva

Cat. 52. *Self Portrait with Feminine Beard* 1982 Duane Michals © the artist.
Courtesy of Pace/MacGill Gallery, New York

put on properly. In another image that makes the viewer initially smile, he shows male varicose-veined legs crammed into a pair of silver high-heeled shoes: here again, traditional male masculinity is interrogated, but questions are raised too about femininity and the tyranny of fashion. Van Manen also plays with the blurring of masculinity and femininity in both pose and dress: his *Hans van der Heijden* is wearing even higher heels than Ajamu's model, as he stretches elegantly, almost sculpturally, and his *Vinoodh Matadin* stares straight out at the viewer, a Spice Girl before the group had even been invented. Arthur Tress, noted more for his often Surrealist depictions of gay male sexuality and almost freakish individuals, presents a sexy piece of beefcake perched on a bathtub with his ample but firm buttocks hanging just over the tiled rim. The back is worthy of a Mapplethorpe model and the arms bent behind his back show a musculature worthy of an ancient Greek discus-thrower. Yet they are bent to squeeze washing-up liquid into his hands; the image is entitled *For Your Toughest Pots and Pans, California!* To this domesticity then is beefcake reduced; playing on the visual association of the froth with ejaculated sperm, the picture is undoubtedly erotic, but it is also marvellously, tenderly, side-splittingly funny.

Cat 5. *Silver Heels* 1993
Ajamu © the artist

We all care deeply about the way we look, in the sense that we want to present ourselves as we feel we really are and also to seem attractive to others. Men have, of course, been trained not to worry about the way they look, since in the past simply being a man was enough to guarantee them place and power in social hierarchies. As our notions of gender have changed and as monolithic masculinity is being gradually replaced by a multiplicity of mobile masculinities, the way men look does matter - and in more senses than one. First, they must learn that they exist in part through the eyes of others and that the way they dress and express themselves is about choices, enabling them to establish chosen and lived personal identities. Second, they must learn to look at what is outside them, learn to see the world. Above all, they - and we all - must learn the fundamental importance of difference and that we can only understand those who are different from us if we see in them things that are the same as us and, conversely, that we can only recognise how others are the same as us if we recognise and affirm our own inner difference. These photographs take us into this everlasting play of difference and similarity. They open our eyes to vistas of happiness, difference and desire and to scenes we might rather not have seen. They help us to think. They aid us to see.

Cat 82. *For Your Toughest Pots and Pans, California*
1997
Arthur Tress © the artist.
Courtesy of the Zelda Cheate Gallery

Michael Worton, 2001

- 1 Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes, trans. Richard Howard (London: Macmillan, 1977), p. 175.
- 2 See Françoise Héritier, *Masculin/Féminin: la pensée de la différence* (Paris: Éditions Odile Jacob, 1996), pp. 288 and 303.
- 3 Stephen Frosh, *Sexual Difference: Masculinity and Psychoanalysis* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 103.
- 4 See Adrienne Rich, 'Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5:4 (1980), pp. 631-60.
- 5 Victor Seidler, *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 1989), p. 123. For analogous considerations of the implications for masculinity of modern conceptions of rationality, see Ross Poole, 'Modernity, rationality and "the masculine"', in Terry Threadgold and Anne Cranney-Francis, *Feminine/masculine and representation* (Sydney, London, Boston, Wellington: Allen & Unwin, 1990), pp. 48-61.
- 6 See, for example, the essays and dossiers collected in Andrew Perchuck and Helaine Posner (eds), *The Masculine Masquerade: Masculinity and Representation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: MIT Press, 1995).
- 7 Margaret Walters, *The Male Nude: A New Perspective* (New York and London: Paddington Press, 1978), p. 7.
- 8 I use the term 'canonisation' doubly and ironically in order (a) to signify the incorporation into the canon or mainstream of art of such previously marginalised photography, and (b) to suggest that this often takes the form of a hagiography. Mapplethorpe in particular has been 'canonised' since his death, with his fascination with both the Roman Catholic Church and Satanism being repeatedly evoked as an explanation not only of his life-style but also of his art; see, for instance, Patricia Morrisroe's biography of Mapplethorpe (London: Macmillan, 1995).
- 9 Susan Sontag, *On Photography*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979), p. 111.
- 10 Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, translated by Richard Howard (London: Cape, 1982), pp. 87 and 107.
- 11 Susan Sontag, *On Photography*, p. 110.
- 12 Mary Price, *The Photograph. A Strange Confined Space* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 163.
- 13 Gill Saunders, *The Nude: A New Perspective* (Cambridge, Philadelphia, San Francisco and London: Herbert Press, 1989), p. 71.
- 14 Kenneth Clark, *The Nude: A Study of Ideal Art* (London: J. Murray, 1956), p. 6.
- 15 Margaret Walters, *The Male Nude*, p. 8.
- 16 Peter Weiermair, *The Hidden Image: Photographs of the Male Nude in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, translated by Claus Nielander (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1988), pp. 9-10, 27.
- 17 For a well illustrated overview of these magazines, see F. Valentine Hoover, *Beefcake: The Muscle Magazines of America 1950-1970* (Cologne: Benedikt Taschen, 1995).
- 18 The flesh/marble association has been strikingly explored by Edward Lucie-Smith in his recent book, *Flesh and Stone* (New York: Ipso Facto, 2000), where he juxtaposes photographs of naked male bodies with images of statues.
- 19 The statue is in the Parthenon Museum, Athens. It is almost certainly wrongly attributed to Kritios, since he was a worker in bronze, rather than in marble.
- 20 Adrian Stokes, *Reflections on the Nude* (New York and London: Tavistock Publications, 1967), p. 4.
- 21 Andrew Campbell and Nathan Griffith, 'The Male Body and Contemporary Art', in Laurence Goldstein (ed), *The Male Body: Features, Exploits, Conclusions* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), p. 153.
- 22 Stephen Frosh, *Sexual Difference*, p. 144.
- 23 Melody Davis, *The Male Nude in Contemporary Photography* (Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1991), p. 10.
- 24 Maxine Sheets-Johnstone, 'Corporeal Archetypes and Power', *Hypatia*, 7: 3 (1992), p. 69.
- 25 Kenneth McKinnon, *Uneasy Pleasures. The male as erotic object* (London: Cygnus Arts, 1997), p. 131.
- 26 Michael Worton, 'You know what I mean? The operability of codes in gay men's fiction', *Paragraph* 17: 2 ('Gender and Sexuality'), edited by Cath Sharrock, 1994.
- 27 Emmanuel Cooper, *Fully Exposed. The Male Nude in Photography* (London: Routledge, London, 1990, 1995), p. 186.
- 28 From Rotimi Fani-Kayode, *Abiku - Born to Die*, quoted in Kobena Mercer, 'Eros and diaspora', in Rotimi Fani-Kayode and Alex Hirst, *Photographs*, edited by Mark Sealy and Jean-Loup Pivin (Paris and London: Éditions Revue Noire and Autograph, 1996), p. 119.
- 29 See Melody Davis, *The Male Nude in Contemporary Photography*, p. 124.
- 30 Alex Hirst, 'Acts of God', in Rotimi Fani-Kayode and Alex Hirst, *Photographs*, p. 35.
- 31 Alastair Foster, *Behold the Man. The Male Nude in Photography* (Stills Gallery, Edinburgh, 1988), p. 45.