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Virilizing and Valorizing Homoeroticism: Eugen Sandow’s Queering of Body Cultures before and after the Wilde Trials.

Abstract
When the art of posing was exploited by Oscar Wilde and bodybuilding performer, Eugen Sandow, both achieved worldwide notoriety. While Wilde fashioned but concealed his body as the effeminate aesthete, Sandow fashioned and revealed his body as a naked Herculean god for both camera and stage. Yet after the Labouchère Amendment when Wilde was persecuted as a poseur and prosecuted, Sandow was not even censored, even though his homosexuality and homosexual following was no public secret. Amidst the homophobic panic unleashed by the Wilde trials, Sandow’s posing was reframed as Sandow’s Physical Culture, repackaged as a patriotic strategy for achieving imperial manliness and National Efficiency, while providing licit new rituals for intense homosocial interaction with bared male bodies lauded by Uranists and Unisexuals. In the battle of virility over effeminacy, this article reveals how the queering of Sandow’s body cultures facilitated their circulation as multifarious signs, simultaneously aspirational and erogenous, edifying and homoerotic, permissive and perverse.
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Before the Wilde trials when Oscar Wilde and Eugen Sandow explored, if not exploited, the art of posing, both achieved worldwide notoriety as poseurs.¹ While Wilde fashioned
but concealed his body as the effeminate aesthete, Sandow fashioned and revealed his body as a Herculean Greek God and Roman Gladiator for the camera, covered in nothing other than a skimp tiger skin or a potently tipped fig-leaf. Yet once effeminacy within Empire, Imperial Confederacy and National Efficiency changed and came increasingly to signify devolution, depopulation, decadence, unmanliness and ‘inversion’, Wilde was persecuted as a poseur and prosecuted, while Sandow was not even censored, despite his homosexuality and homosexual following being no public secret. After the trials and Wilde’s imprisonment for “indecency” when paranoia of insidious inversion peaked, Sandow’s posing was reframed by Sandow himself as ‘Sandow’s Physical Culture’, repackaged as a patriotic strategy for achieving ‘Empire muscle’, imperial manliness and National Efficiency, and promoted by a respectably suited and booted Sandow for the edification of the Empire family. Yet while widely advocated for attainment of muscularized manhood and eradication of masturbation and ‘inversion’, Sandow’s ‘Physical Culture’ was also lauded by Uranists and Unisexuals for depathologizing inversion and virilizing homosexuality.²

To unravel this paradox, this article focuses on the homoeroticism inherent in photographs of Wilde and Sandow taken and published before the Wilde Trials followed by the photographic culture developed after the trials by Sandow for his periodicals, Physical Culture, Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture, Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture and British Sport and Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture, British Sport and Fiction – also published as Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture, Sport and Fiction – in order to explore how, in the battle of virility over effeminacy, Sandow’s body cultures appeared able to function as a multifarious sign. Simultaneously aspirational and erogenous, edifying and homoerotic, permissive and perverse, Sandow’s body cultures seemed able to appease the Marquis of Queensbury, appeal to King Edward
VII, mollify National Efficiency reformers, assuage Eugenicists, galvanize fitness in the Imperial Federation of British colonies while also gratifying a huge homosexual following that included Edward Carpenter and John Addington Symonds.

**Homoerotic Posing before the Wilde Trials: Photographing Sandow and Wilde.**

While Wilde achieved notoriety as a poseur (Fig. 1), John Fair pronounces Sandow ‘without peer as a poseur’. Unlike Wilde, Sandow posed with no body-concealing fashioning save for a modest tin fig-leaf or skin-tight silk briefs that managed to reveal far more than they concealed (Fig. 2). When he performed for Florence Ziegfeld from Autumn 1893, plush red velvet curtains parted, and coloured lights would gradually illuminate Sandow standing still as a statue on his personalized plinth, as captured in Fig. 2. Once an orchestra played, he would ripple four hundred of his chalk-dusted muscles in time to the music before performing dazzling feats of strength that built to his climax: Carrying a piano and elephants on his chest with the entire company on his back. One of the few who remained unimpressed, George Bernard Shaw quipped: ‘I never wanted to stand my piano on my chest ... Nor did I consider it the proper place for three elephants’. Yet ‘wherever he went mobs paid ... to see [him]’, Jim Elledge surmises, ‘and after the mobs had looked their fill there were private séances’, as captured by Fig. 3.

While Wilde invited friends to his private soirées, Sandow implored his male spectators to join him in his dressing-room – as well as those women who could afford US$300 – for the pleasure of scoping his body at close range while feeling his skin and fingerprinting his muscles, as illustrated by Fig. 3. In Sandow’s dressing-room, the two gentlemen attired in dinner suits illustrated seem to have feasted their gaze not just upon the pectoral musculature of Sandow’s bared body but upon his genitalia with one leaning so far forward that his spectacles have slipped down his nose to permit him to scrutinize
Sandow’s credentials more closely. While Sandow’s female spectators do not appear to resist the opportunity of scoping Sandow’s body at such close range, as signified by the lady in the right-hand corner in Fig. 3 lifting her lorgnette to scrutinize Sandow’s back musculature down to his glutinous maximus, the lady closest to Sandow gazes into his eyes while fingering his right bicept. By no means did this activity seem to be restricted to women, according to most reports, with Sandow inviting and indeed encouraging both genders to experience the tactile sensations of his body. ‘He took the hands of some of his audience and ran them over his skin, over the chest walls and other parts of the trunk of his body’, recalled one eager back-stager, ‘with the result that a young fellow described the sensation as being like that of “moving your hand over corrugated iron”’.6 ‘It booted little how much he could lift’, concluded New York World, ‘or whether he could lift anything at all; one attended his exhibitions just to look ... and afterwards to feel’.7 Both Wilde and Sandow were also engaged in the same commercial and promotional activity of posing for the camera and selling a photographically fashioned body, particularly by the famous New York theatrical photographer, Napoleon Sarony, who boasted of having photographed two hundred thousand people, thirty thousand of whom were famous and a thousand of whom were world renowned.8 Yet while Wilde’s body remained concealed for Sarony’s camera, Sandow’s was invariably revealed.

Rejecting outright the strictrures of Victorian clothing as explained in his treatise, The Philosophy of Dress, published in January 1882, the twenty-seven year old Wilde posed fully fashioned in his Aestheticist lecturing costumes that he wore for his speaking tour of America.9 (Fig. 1) So concerned was he with maintaining the distinctiveness of his fashioning that after his first tour, Wilde sent measurements and instructions to his tour manager, Colonel W. F. Morse, for his costumier to make two Francis I coats in black and grey velvet designed as ‘tight velvet doublet, with large flowered sleeves and
little ruffs of cambric coming up from under collar’, together with ‘two pair of grey silk stockings to suit grey mouse-coloured velvet’.10 Fashioned in bows or furs with gracefully folding cloaks, a midnight grey velvet blazer edged in satin, as can be seen in Fig. 1, with an inner vest of velvet, silk knee breeches and silk stockings, as well as slippers adorned with grosgrain bows – the costume he wore as a member of the Freemason society at Oxford, Apollo Lodge – Wilde was photographed in twenty-seven different poses by Sarony. As signified by the court case that erupted over the copying of one of these photographs, Sarony regarded his photographs as original artworks particularly given his orchestration of the framing of his sitters by his props and his intervention in posing the sitter to fulfill his theory of aesthetic photography, ‘the art of posing is not posing’, even with such an Aestheticist poseur as Wilde.11

The ways in which Sarony framed Wilde with his props, particularly the florid rug on which Wilde rests his feet in Sarony’s photographic studio and the floral patterned settee cover on which he sits from which a sunflower seems to be bursting forth, appears to be complemented by how Wilde was posed. Photographed by Sarony seated as a reflective body in repose gazing contemplatively at Sarony’s camera and leaning towards it, with such potent signifiers of Aestheticism as the book clutched in his right hand – possibly his poems published in May 1881 – the model of masculinity projected by Sarony’s photograph of Wilde represents a very different one to that captured by Sarony’s photographs of Sandow taken some eleven years later.

The same year that he defeated French strongman, Charles Samson, in London to be hailed as the strongest man on earth at only 22 years of age, Sandow began stage-posing for large live audiences at the Alhambra Music Hall.12 Buoyed by stardom, Sandow then commissioned Henry Van der Weyde’s photography studio in Regent Street, London, to photograph him as the new king of strongmen (Fig. 2).13 In the
rejection of any form of fashion to impede the gaze upon Sandow’s bared musculature, as in the choice of virilizing poses and their spotlighting, Van der Weyde’s staging of Sandow for the camera proved the opposite of that of Wilde. While Van der Weyde’s photograph of Sandow on his theatrical pedestal was the first in which he was posed to expose the size and solidity of his muscles, particularly his biceps, it was also the first in a long series of photographs of Sandow posed naked with a fig-leaf. Either appended to Sandow’s genitals or added to the photograph, it was invariably sized and tilted to hint at exactly what it concealed.

Four years later in New York when Sarony posed Sandow in his studio while ‘the king of strongmen’ was being promoted by Ziegfeld, Sarony took more than double the number of photographs he had taken of Wilde, numbering each shot and developing them in black and white with close-ups in sepia for mail-order consumption. Defining his photographic art by this time in relation specifically to bodybuilding, Sarony furnished a very different exposure of the male body to that of Wilde, posing Sandow nude as illustrated by Sarony’s Sandow No. 8 and Sandow No. 33 (Figs. 4 and 5). Void of the theatrical props in which Sarony had enframed Wilde, in Sandow No. 8 (Fig. 4) there is nothing to distract attention being focused exclusively on Sandow’s naked body. Appearing to loom out of a black vacuum, Sandow’s spotlit body with his muscles dramatically defined in chiaroscuro makes them seem to ripple across his back like ‘snakes’ with which they were often compared, ‘coiling and uncoiling ... under his skin’. Although Sandow’s highlighted nude body in Sandow No. 33 (Fig. 5) is not tonally contrasted against the background, nonetheless it also appears to be modelled in light and shade to ensure that every muscle in this fully frontal pose is clearly defined. That both photographs are designed to display different aspects of Sandow’s musculature is conveyed by the bodybuilding poses.
The V-shape of Sandow’s torso is not just accentuated by the uplifted arm pose in Fig. 5, but so are Sandow’s deltoids, biceps and triceps, while his pectoral and abdomen muscles are inflected into a clearly seriated six, if not eight-pack. Simultaneously, the tightness of the side muscles are exposed, specifically those that ensure the healthy functioning of the diaphragm, the *serratus posterior superior*, *serratus posterior inferior* and *serratus anterior*, as designated by the area called *serratus magnus* indicated in Fig. 12. Yet in the posterior pose staged for Sarony’s camera (Fig. 4), not only is the tautness of the biceps and triceps highlighted, but so is the tightness of the postural muscles, particularly those seminal to weightlifting, the *gluteus maximus* and *medius*. As distinct from the softness, looseness, pensiveness and aesthetic indulgence connoted by Sarony’s staging of Wilde’s fully-dressed body eleven years earlier, Sandow’s body seems to have been posed to embody stiffness, tightness, erectness, firmness and self-control. While Sarony seems to have staged Wilde as the effeminate aesthete ‘man of letters’, his staging of Sandow appears to have been as the ‘man of action’. Yet by no means was it void of eroticism, particularly homoeroticism, as signified by the centralization of Sandow’s erogenous zones and the play of light and shadow upon them.

The most spot-lit zone of Sandow’s body in Figs. 3 and 4, which is also the most centralized point in the Fig. 4 and the one that would project furthest in three-dimensional space towards the spectator, are the buttocks. Bulging like two ripe melons, they are clearly defined by the deepest shadow gathering at the glutal crease and descending to a cavernous space where the *glutinus maximus* joins the *vastus lateralis* and meets the anus and scrotum. Despite the reverse of this anatomy in Fig. 5, compositionally it is no different, with the most centralized point in the photograph being the erogenous zone. The unusually large size of the fig-leaf stretching from the *vastus lateralis* in Sandow’s left to his right thigh, together with the play of light and shade on the fig-leaf, tantalizingly
hint at the length, volume and inflexion of the concealed genitals. This interplay of the unyielding ‘man of action’ with the homoerotic poseur set a precedent for future photographers.

In 1894 in his Los Angeles photographic studio, George Steckel, like Sarony, did not fail to capture all aspects of Sandow’s naked body, let alone number his shots from 1 to 24 for the ease of customer identification. Unlike Sarony, Steckel introduced Classical Greek and Roman Empire props to stage Sandow as having achieved musculature equivalent to a Herculean Greek god or Roman gladiator. In full-frontal action poses, a naked Sandow was invariably propped against a crumbling Doric column clad in nothing but fetishistic centurion sandals binding his feet and ankles, as elaborately laced as those on the Pompeian statue of Narcissus found in 1862 that inspired so many artists, including Frederick Leighton. Not only was the requisite tin fig-leaf added to draw attention to rather than deflect it way from the genitals but once again it was also conveniently tilted to hint at the dimension and direction of what lay beneath. Later that year in Benjamin J. Falk’s New York studios another array of ‘Antique’ staging was deployed with Sandow posed against fluted Corinthian columns naked save for more prominent strappy sandals to accentuate his nudity.16 Posed as one of the celebrated Hellenistic sculptures appropriated by the Roman Empire, Sandow as The Dying Gaul (Falk No. 36) (Fig. 6), invoked and epitomized the trope of Ancient Greece, Classicism, Western civilization and Darwinian evolution. Nevertheless, the centralization of the fig-leaf on Sandow’s bared supine body together with his open-mouthed languorous expression and languid pose with legs ajar conjures up other connotations closer to the homoerotic Aestheticism and sensual vulnerability to be found in what Edmund Gosse that year had called ‘The New Sculpture’. This is epitomized by Frederic Leighton’s An Athlete Wrestling with a Python (Fig. 7) and Hamo Thornycroft’s Teucer (Fig. 8) – subsequently reproduced by
Sandow in one of his magazines as indicated below – as well as Sir Alfred Gilbert’s *Comedy and Tragedy* ‘Sic Vita’ sculpted four years earlier and well known through its copious reproductions.¹⁷

Lest Sandow be regarded as innocent of these homoerotic significations, it was no public secret that he had sustained a long-lived relationship with his ‘great and inseparable friend’, the Dutch virtuoso pianist and composer, Martinus Sieveking.¹⁸ For some years Sandow had been living with Sieveking before travelling to New York together aboard the *SS Elbe* on 6 June 1893 where David L. Chapman points out ‘they again set up housekeeping on West Thirty-eighth Street’.¹⁹ Wherever he travelled for his Ziegfeld performances from New York, to Boston and Chicago, Sandow insisted that ‘Mr. Sieveking [was] always accompanying me’.²⁰ While Sandow trained Sieveking in bodybuilding, Sieveking composed music for Sandow’s shows and conducted it for the opening scene when Sandow posed as an Ancient Greek statue and made his muscles dance in time to the musical accompaniment.²¹ ‘Sieveking thinks that Sandow is a truly original Hercules’, reported *New York World*, ‘and that no one has ever lived to be compared to him. Sandow thinks that Mr. Sieveking is the greatest pianist in the world and he is going to be greater’.²² Their daily ritual consisted of sharing a piano stool with Sieveking playing bare to the waist, while a naked Sandow worked his muscles. ‘He is fond of the music’, observed *New York World*, ‘and Sieveking likes to see Sandow’s muscles work. Both enjoy themselves and neither loses any time’.²³

The homoerotic connotations of Sandow’s stage performativity and his photography seemed to have been well recognised by homosexual communities. While there was a growing market amongst ‘young ladies’ for the hand-size, card-back cabinet photos supplied by Sarony, Steckel and Falk, a considerable number of their male mail-order subscribers seemed to have been homosexuals, particularly those in London where
there was a growing subcultural network who exchanged photos of male nudes exuding Aestheticist homoeroticism, including Lord Alfred Douglas, Edmund Gosse, André Raffalovich and John Addington Symonds. These photographs included such New Sculpture identified with homoerotic Aestheticism as Leighton’s *Athlete Wrestling with a Python* (Fig. 7), Henry Scott Tuke’s *Perseus* and *Leander*, and Thornycroft’s *Teucer* (Fig. 8), *The Mower*, and *Warrior Bearing a Wounded Youth*, ‘the delight of my eyes & soul’, confessed Symonds. When Gosse first spied Van der Weyde’s photographs of Sandow in a London shop (Fig. 2), in his words ‘in a beautiful set of poses showing the young strongman clad only in a fig-leaf’, he had immediately bought them. So enthralled was Gosse that he attended most of Sandow’s performances at the Alhambra and sneaked the photos into the ‘tedious’ memorial ceremonies for Robert Browning at Westminster Abbey before disseminating them far and wide. When Symonds received them in Switzerland, he gleefully wrote to Gosse that ‘I hardly venture to write what I feel about the beauty of this photograph. It not only awakens the imaginative sense. But beats every work of art. ... No sculpture has the immediate appeal to human sympathy which this superb piece of breathing manhood makes’. Obsessed with possessing ‘copies of all the nude studies which have been taken of this hero’, and displaying them in the public gymnasium he sponsored, Symonds admitted feeling overshadowed by the severity of English law governing pictures that, in his words, ‘could not fail to be seductive’. Nevertheless, when prosecution of obscenity peaked alongside arrests for gross indecency, it was not Sandow or his acolytes who were prosecuted, but Wilde. ‘Indeed it was the extravagantly clothed body of the aesthete, rather than ideal male nudity’, as Michael Hatt surmizes, ‘that raised questions of homosexuality and decadence’. 

Despite Wilde being endowed with ‘abundant ... manly strength’, according to Mongomery Hyde, without ‘the slightest suggestion of effeminacy’, he became indelibly inscribed in the language of his trials as its embodiment alongside its correlatives of decadence, degeneracy, immorality and ‘sexual corruption’. With ‘manly’ entering press discourse as a keyword to signify heteronormativity, spermatic economy, patriotic duty, heroic salvation, moral constraint, self-control, Empire musculature and imperial manhood, Wilde’s purported ‘unmanlyness’ was invariably decoded as being, according to Herbert Sussman, ‘informed by the homoerotic’. In turn this homoerotic trope of manliness signified ‘insufferable postering’ and ‘filthy practices’ constituting in the words of the prosecution, ‘a dangerous sore which cannot fail in time to corrupt and taint ... all’. The courtroom disclosures, particularly the scandalizing testimonies by rent boys of the prevalence of same-sex practices amongst gentlemen that connected them to the criminal underworld of London, revealed that these so-called ‘filthy practices’ were by no means confined to Wilde. Even though the Cleveland Street Trials of 1889 had already illuminated the network of homosexual sub-cultures across London that involved ‘rent boys’, Members of Parliament and Prince Albert Edward Victor commonly known as ‘Eddy’, these ‘practices’ were deemed to have been most flagrantly pursued, if not flaunted, by Wilde. ‘He was one of the high priests of a school which attacks all the wholesome, manly, simple ideals of English life, and sets up false gods of decadent culture and intellectual debauchery’, declared the Evening News. ‘To him and such as him we owe the spread of moral degeneration amongst young men’. With Wilde’s productions halted, his name removed from theatre hoardings and all hopes for revisions to the Labouchère Amendment crushed, the Wilde trials in April and May 1895 followed
by Wilde’s imprisonment ushered in a spate of suppressions and generated what Jeffrey Weeks aptly calls a ‘state of panic’ over homosexual discursivity. It also generated what Elaine Showalter calls ‘a moral panic that inaugurated a period of censorship affecting both advanced women and homosexuals’. Given Wilde’s reputation as ‘the high priest of Aestheticism’ and of ‘homosexuality’ after the term was coined in 1892, Andrew Stephenson deduces that the Trials ‘further heightened a sense of increasing moral panic around Aestheticism and male sexuality’. As the Aesthete was identified well before the Wilde trials as the physical embodiment of homosexuality, this moral panic entailed the censoring of any publications seemingly associated with Aestheticism.

Under the editorship of Charles Kain-Jackson, from 1889 The Artist had regularly published articles on Wilde, Aubrey Beardsley, Gilbert, Leighton, Thornycroft, and Scott Tuke, with contributions from Alfred Douglas, John Gray, Symonds and Raffalovich. After publication of Kains-Jackson’s ‘The New Chivalry’, The Artist suffered a homoerotic purge from May 1894 when Kains-Jackson was swiftly replaced by the new owner-editor, Viscount Mountmorres. By no means was the rejection of its homoerotic editorial policy for a homophobic one an isolated incident. After a mob incited by the Wilde trials attacked the editorial offices of The Yellow Book where Beardsley, as its editor, had published poetry by Gray, Gosse, Symonds and Yeats alongside illustrations of art by Walter Sickert, Beardsley was instantly dismissed. With a ‘straightened-up’ editorial policy, The Yellow Book allegedly ‘turned grey overnight’. By no means was the editor of The Studio, Joseph Gleeson White, salvaged. After having reproduced Leighton’s male nude maquettes in clay and Athlete Wrestling a Python (Fig. 7), as well as Frederick Rolfe’s and Baron Wilhelm Von Gloeden’s homoerotic photography to illustrate The Nude in Photography, plus an article on the proximity of homosexual trafficking in Piccadilly to the direction of Eros’ arrow in Gilbert’s Shaftesbury
Memorial. Gleeson White was forced to resign. The publishing contracts and publications of the homosexual manuscripts of Carpenter, Symonds and Ellis were similarly affected.

Due to fear of prosecution in 1894, Carpenter’s *Homogenic Love* was removed by his publishers from *Love’s Coming of Age* and was only distributed privately as a pamphlet. Not until 1908 was it published as part of Carpenter’s treatise, *The Intermediate Sex*. Although Symonds had collaborated with Havelock Ellis since 1892 on depathologizing ‘sexual inversion’, on its publication his family panicked, insisting that Symond’s literary executor acquire and destroy the entire issue. Given the very harshness of this homophobic censoring, Christopher Reed considers it ‘no exaggeration to say that Aestheticism’s association with homosexuality destroyed the movement.’ With the self-censoring of ‘queer aestheticism’ by Aestheticists themselves, shop window prints of the nude male body created by Leighton and Watts branded as ‘unfit for public consumption’, and other visual cultures of the male body subject to closer scrutiny and harsher censoring, Sandow, in response, rarely posed for professional photographers, let alone flaunted his bare credentials on or off-stage. Yet just as male literary aesthetes did not respond only in ‘panic, self-ignorance or confusion’, according to Richard Dellamora, but also in ‘resourceful and creative ways’, so did Sandow.

Returning to London in 1896, Sandow worked as a private consultant in physical culture from 32 St. James’s Street while designing physical culture equipment, planning schools for physical culture and writing *Strength and how to obtain it*. Even though he also composed marching music, ‘Marche des Athlètes’, followed by a waltz called ‘Sandownia’, Sandow never publicly performed to them in Britain. Briefly settling in Manchester in 1898, Sandow legitimated his British masculinity and citizenship by marrying and supporting Blanche Brooks, the daughter of his Mancunian photographer,
Warwick Brooks. Straightening-up, professionalizing physical culture and capitalizing on its bodybuilding equipment, Sandow promoted his ‘Exercise Developer for a Whole Family’ clad in a respectable three-piece dark woolen suit complete with gold fob-watch chain (Fig. 9), the antithesis of Wilde’s aesthetic fashioning.

Capitalizing on ‘Khaki fever’ during the Second Boer War (1899-1902), Sandow replaced his trademark leopard-skin briefs with khaki shorts, turning his body into a bridge over which British soldiers were able to escape to the tune of Rule Britannia. Opportunistically endorsing the Imperial Federation designed to bind British colonies more closely to the Empire and achieve British race nationalism, Sandow actively promoted his physical culture in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. Exploiting the mounting paranoia of devolution and degeneration ignited by Francis Galton’s eugenic research, composite portraiture and Anthropometric Laboratory at the South Kensington Museum alongside Max Nordau’s Degeneration, translated into English and published two months before the Wilde trial in 1895, and the discovery on the outbreak of the Second Boer War that 60% of Englishmen were deemed ‘too enfeebled to fight for Queen and country, and to carry the burdens of Empire’, Sandow promoted ‘Sandow’s Physical Culture’ as ‘the Nation’s Salvation’. Shocked by increasing infant mortality, the prevalence of deaf and dumbness, blindness, lunacy, feeble-mindedness and physical deterioration revealed by the 1901 United Kingdom Census, Sandow announced: ‘The fact is that, ever since the last Government census, which demonstrated the decline in physique and stamina so far as the British race is concerned, there has been an uneasy feeling abroad that something must be done’.

Aligning the objectives of his physical culture with the mission of National Efficiency, Sandow pursued a three-way didactic strategy. Incepting his own Institutes of Physical Culture conveniently managed by his father-in-law, Sandow manufactured and
marketed the equipment deployed at them for ‘a Whole Family’, as indicated in Fig. 8, commercially boosted by the patronage of Edward VII. With the help of a team of ghost-writers, he also published his own magazine from 1898, *Physical Culture*, renamed in April 1899 as *Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture*. In 1901, it was retitled with explicit patriotic significations as *Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture and British Sport* and renamed again in 1903 as *Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture, British Sport and Fiction*, not only to signal its relationship to British sports but also to British art. Propelled by these mutually reinforcing strategies and the national impulsion that Sandow called ‘Growing Soldiers without Conscription’, his Institutes became immediately successful. Expanding from his first in 32, St. James’s Street to six other Institutes in London stretching to Crystal Place, and fourteen outside, they attracted such prestigious clients as Edward VII and the writer and physician, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, renowned for his fictional detective, *Sherlock Holmes*. Since these were places for unabashed displays of male nakedness, as well as male-to-male touching, body to body, skin-to-skin, Sandow’s Institutes appeared able to fulfill the National Efficiency imperative of muscularized and virilized manliness while providing licit new rituals for intense homosocial interaction of bared male bodies. Promoting these rituals as patriotic missions in his magazine while significantly calling his bodybuilding posing competition *Empire and Muscle*, Sandow was able to provide a legitimate publishing outlet for the imaging of naked males, albeit muscular manly ones, for the gratification of the queered gaze. Hence paradoxically after the Wilde trials, as Harry Cocks so perceptively surmizes, ‘the namelessness of homoerotic desire could provide perverse opportunities for its expression’. More specifically, Sandow’s virilization of homosociality and homoeroticism valorized its articulation and representation.
At Sandow’s Institutes, Sandow’s male patrons, unlike his female bodybuilders, were brought into contact with one another in the gymnasium, measuring bureau and weight-lifting room for which they needed to be nude. This was also a requisite for Sandow’s male bodybuilding and posing rituals, epitomized by his Empire and Muscle Voting Competition, ‘to encourage’, in his words, ‘the citizens of this country to take an interest in their well-being’. Instructed to ‘take pains’ in having the best photograph taken of their most muscle-revealing pose, British bodybuilders submitted them to Sandow for publication in his magazine. After close perusal of their bodies’ ‘symmetry’, readers were then asked to cast their votes. So popular did this bodybuilding photography competition become that Sandow soon became overwhelmed by entries and commentaries.

Littering the pages of Sandow’s Magazine, these photographs consisted of naked male bodies with minimal genital coverage as illustrated by the five photographs in Fig. 10 and the three photographs in Fig. 11. They were interspersed with kinky cameos of international bodybuilders, just as bare, in the pages of Our Portrait Gallery, and followed by advertisements for Bernarr MacFadden’s The Virile Powers of Superb Manhood. Yet just as the contestants for Empire and Muscle, like those for Notes of the Month, were posed to highlight their bodybuilding muscles, particularly their deltoids, biceps and triceps, as well as their pectoral muscles, their serratus posterior superior, inferior and anterior, the photographs of the gold medallists, Clements, in Fig. 9 and the New Zealand bodybuilder, Hugh McAllum, in Fig. 11, reveal the homoeroticism inherent in their naked postures. This sense of their homoeroticism was further virilized and valorized by their aestheticization by Sandow as works of art.

Lest readers felt bereft of the scopophilic pleasures of Sandow’s body, the cabinet photos of him by Van der Weyde, Falk, Sarony and Steckel were offered as artworks in
ten-numbered poses mostly nude. From 1901 these included engravings of the life-cast made of Sandow’s naked body for the Natural History Museum with, to the horror of Museum Trustee, Lord Walsingham, but the delight of queer and other spectators, his penis and scrotum fully distended. The scopophilic pleasures afforded by the Aestheticist homoerotic sculpture published in The Artist, The Yellow Book and The Studio were also not denied to subscribers of Sandow’s magazines. Despite the commendations showered on Leighton’s and Thornycroft’s New Sculpture by Wilde, Gosse, Symonds and Henry James, and despite their association with the ‘world of the Yellow Book’ and the ‘Green Carnation’ encompassing ‘Eddy’, Aestheticists and the Wilde set, their sculptures were fully exposed in Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture.

Singled out by Gosse for launching the New Sculpture with its ‘vital’ fleshiness and ‘nervous’ corporeality, Leighton’s 1877 life-size version, An Athlete Wrestling with a Python, was photographed for Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture from an angle in which, in the inimitable words of Benedict Read, ‘the writhing python conceals what nature and Leighton would not’: The penis and scrotum of the naked athlete in sensuous contact with the python. (Fig. 7) Juxtaposed with the opening page of Sandow’s introduction to this issue, which was his second article on The Theory of Weightlifting subtitled The Difficulty of Comparison, Sandow evaluated the superiority of ‘the straight press’ over ‘the bent press’ but made no mention of Leighton’s Athlete.64 Even though the athlete’s pressure upon the python exerted with his straightened right arm and tightly flexed hand could have been construed as corroborating Sandow’s argument and even though the athlete’s body could have been highlighted as a superlative model of muscularized masculinity, without any such introjection Sandow’s full-page reproduction of Leighton’s naked athlete was open to queered projections. While the athlete’s smooth, glistening bronze flesh appears to be groped by the scaly, writhing, cold-blooded, phallus,
the python was known to incite circumambulation around Leighton’s actual sculpture and a clear view, from the second coil, of the dangerous proximity of the athlete’s penis and scrotum to the crushing coils wrapped around the athlete’s left leg. Hence despite historiographic readings of the sculpture, within the precincts of the Royal Academy and Chantrey Bequest, as a challenging anatomical conflation of Winckelmann’s *Apollo Belvedere* and the *Laocoon* in dialogue with G. E. Lessing’s essay, *Laocoon: The Limits of Poetry and Painting*, its iconography was by no means bound by this interpretation in *Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture*.

Since the python seems to have slithered up the athlete’s leg and past his penis and scrotum to come to a head at the point at which the athlete throttles it, when the python emits an open-mouthed orgasmic gasp, its iconography was vulnerable to queering as a struggle with oneiric and homoerotic desires for the phallus. Within the Victorian spermatic economy, this could be read as a struggle with spermatorrhoea ‘to banish the beast within’, particularly given the purportedly enfeebling repercussions of masturbation espoused by physicians and debated during the Obscenity Trial of Annie Besant and Charles Bradlaugh in the very year that Leighton embarked upon this sculpture.65 While it led to the manufacture from 1880 of anti-masturbation metallic armour to safeguard the human penis and scrotum from ‘animal instincts’, this struggle was meant to be overcome by athletics and Sandow’s physical culture.66 That Leighton’s sculpture may also be decoded autobiographically as his own struggle with autoeroticism and masturbatory impulses is suggested by Keren Hammerschlag. ‘Read as a manifestation of his own threatening phallus’, she concludes, ‘the python represents not just the daemon without, but also the daemon within’.67 Yet after the Wilde trials its iconography may well have been queered for seeming to capture the struggle not only with autoeroticism but also with homoeroticism as demonstrated by Gosse’s homosexual
passion that he likened to a ‘wild beast’ he grappled to control, which he called ‘The Taming of the Chimaera’. Obsessed with Thornycroft to the point that Lytton Strachey called him ‘Hamosexual’, the 41 year old Gosse endeavoured to explain the arduous process of ‘taming’ his libidinous Chimaera for the sculptor who he called his ‘Jaguar’.

I have reached a quieter time – some beginnings of that Sophoclean period when the wild beast dies. He is not dead, but tamer; I understand him & the trick of his claws. And the curious things is that it is precisely this volcanic force, ever on the verge of destructive ebullition, that one owes the most beautiful episodes of existence, exquisite in all respects.

Although Sandow reproduced Thornycroft’s sculpture for his next issue and article on *The Theory of Weightlifting* subtitled *The Straight Press*, he did not choose to reproduce such testaments to imperial masculinity as Thornycroft’s *Monument to General Gordon*, but selected Thornycroft’s *Teucer* (Fig. 8). Even though the photograph of *Teucer* seemed to complement Sandow’s discourse upon the severe strain imposed on a few muscles by ‘the one-armed straight press’, as with his photograph of Leighton’s *Athlete* Sandow made no reference to the sculpture, leaving it open to his reader’s projections. Although the moment in Homer’s *Iliad* chosen by Thornycroft was the climatic one when the Trojan Bowman released his final arrow to kill Hector, the sculptor depicted Teucer neither crouching behind a shield in this bloody battle nor clad in a protective tunic but upright and naked. Despite the implausibility of firing an arrow with his feet so closely together, it meant that his body could appear like a column to convey its stillness and tautness, as well as its rippling musculature, without any distortion. Glistening in bronze, it appears comparable to the photograph of Sandow’s
upright body taken by van der Weyde (Fig. 1). Although utterly naked, save for a modest fig-leaf – the uncovered version remaining in Thornycroft’s private collection – Sandow’s readers and beholders may well have been aware of what lay off camera: The buttocks of Teucer flexed as much as those of Sandow as signified by Figs. 4 and 5. This may be why Thornycroft’s sculpture was deemed far too scandalous for publication in the American, Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine, alongside Gosse’s article, ‘Living English Sculptors’. This may also be why Gosse urged Thornycroft to rephotograph it with a thick, opaque loincloth wrapped around its most erotogenic parts, the pelvis, penis, scrotum, anus and buttocks. Although Gosse exclaimed on receipt of the photograph that ‘it does not look very nice, does it?’, it was only this censored image of the Teucer that this New York based magazine agreed to engrave for publication, unlike Sandow’s Magazine.

At the same time, the contextualization of these photographs within Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture could shift the readings of these sculptures in other ways. Although both Leighton’s and Thornycroft’s sculptures achieved renown for launching the ‘New Sculpture’ and were identified with Aestheticism and Aestheticist homoeroticism, when relocated and reframed in Sandow’s Magazine of Physical Culture by articles on ‘The Theory of Weightlifting’, their sculpture appeared to be revalorized in relation to a virilizing homoeroticism. These strategic conjunctions, in turn, could valorize Sandow’s physical culture as a virilizing homoeroticism. This virilizing homoeroticism appeared to be reinforced by the photographs of the near, if not fully naked bodies of modern sportsmen and bodybuilders Sandow and others had trained, published in every issue of his magazine, and their strategic juxtaposition with other sculpture that was acclaimed as ‘virile’. This included the sculpture by Scottish, John Tweed, who had trained and collaborated with Thornycroft, to whom Sandow’s Magazine
of Physical Culture devoted a series of articles in the third year of the Second Boer War. Not only was his sculpture singled out for its ‘imperial spirit’ but also for its ‘splendid physiques’, and most of all, for its ‘virility’. ‘Given the sentimentality in art, it is gratifying to find an exponent of sculpture who makes his mark so high and his work so virile’, the magazine exclaimed. Interspersing Sandow’s photographs of bodybuilders trained by him with virilizing Classical Greek and Roman sculpture of Hercules and pugilists, as well as such contemporary French sculptures as Félix Charpentier’s 1893 plaster entitled The Wrestlers – although never clearly identified like Leighton’s and Thornycroft’s sculptures – Sandow dubbed them in his magazine ‘living statues’. This reproductions of historical sculptures extended to Donatello’s homoerotic David with which the Teucer had been compared and Giovanni da Bologna’s Mercury, often cited as a model for Gilbert’s sculpture of Eros for the Shaftesbury Memorial. Not hesitating to cite himself as a prime exemplar, Sandow’s own nude body was also reproduced eight times in a flayed format as ‘artistic anatomy’ (Fig. 12).

Conterminously, Sandow launched twenty County Bodybuilding Competitions culminating in Britain’s first nationwide bodybuilding competition in 1901 judged by Conan Doyle and the sculptor and athlete, Sir Charles Lawes, with Sandow as referee. With county winners needing to pose for The Great Competition in nothing but ‘black tights, black jockey belt and a leopard skin’, this meant that for the first time in its Victorian history, the Royal Albert Hall displayed eighty males stripped to their erogenous credentials. ‘There were eighty competitors, each of whom had to stand on a pedestal, arrayed only in a leopard skin’, recalled Conan Doyle. Consonant with Sandow’s alignment of physical culture with classical Greek sculpture, the crucial criterion was ‘symmetry’, although a disgruntled Galton complained to Karl Pearson that none of the competitors ‘bore comparison with Greek statues of Hercules and other
athletes, being somewhat ill-proportioned and too heavily built’. First prize ‘for the man ... adjudged ... the most perfectly developed in Great Britain’ was a solid gold statuette sculpted by William Pomeroy in 1891 of a naked Sandow lifting a dumbbell with silver and bronze variants for the runners-up. For those not so fortunate, Sandow promised to mail an engraving of the Natural History Museum life-cast of his body, fully-nude. With every seat filled in the 15,000 capacity Albert Hall and thousands having to be turned away, so successful was *The Great Competition* deemed to be that Sandow promised to hold one every year. Through these new homosocial rituals and forums purportedly redressing the British crisis in physiology and ‘race degeneracy’, Sandow valorized the baring of muscularized male bodies while spawning models of virilized homosexuality championed by Carpenter, Symonds and Marc-André Raffalovich.

Given the homosocial and homoerotic subtext underlying Sandow’s official promotion of physical culture as a heteronormative imperative for achieving imperial manliness and National Efficiency, by no means did Uranists or Unisexuals shy away from subscribing to his magazines let alone of promoting modern sport and physical culture. Such enthusiastic exponents of Sandow’s physical culture as Carpenter, as well as Symonds and Raffalovich, considered that it could be instrumental to de-pathologizing inversion after the Wilde trials, thereby combating effeminacy and virilizing homosexuality. An ardent supporter of Sandow, Carpenter had openly advocated the practice of Sandow’s physical culture. A subscriber to *Sandow’s Magazine* from the time it was launched, early in 1900 Carpenter took to its pages to extol the virtues of open-air gymnasia in response to Sandow’s article touching on this subject published in November the previous year. Concerned about the ‘stuffy rooms’ and the absence of ‘light and air on the body’ in gymnasiu
order to be able to run, leap, wrestle and swim while using dumb-bells and bars.88 ‘In the
centre of this ground’, Carpenter explained, ‘there should be a large open swimming bath,
and round the ground a running track; while horizontal bars and other apparatus could be
placed in convenient situations. Along one side I would have a broad covered portico for
shelter and with access to dressing-rooms, small bath-rooms, &C.’89 Given the ‘capital
outlay’ to build these gymnasia, Carpenter concluded by highlighting the importance of
this project for a public benefactor.

Not hesitant to pick up the cudgel, in the very next issue Sandow highly
commended Carpenter’s idea in an article surrounding a photograph of Carpenter while
immodestly reminding readers that it had been prompted by Sandow’s remarks in an
earlier issue of the magazine. ‘His proposal to build a gymnasium and place of recreation
which shall be literally open, is a capital one,’ wrote Sandow, ‘and the scheme which he
has laid down is certainly practicable. Which of our leading clubs is entertaining enough
to make the experiment?’90 Like Sandow, Carpenter also extolled the virtues of nudity.
In order to maximize the exposure of the body to sun and air, Carpenter insisted that
clothing was unnecessary. ‘I believe that what we call “catching cold” is greatly due to
our everlastingly covering the skin and checking the action of the sweat glands’ he wrote.
‘At any rate occasional exposure for an hour together would immensely strengthen this
most important organ and with it the general health’.91 Long concerned with virilizing
homosexuality, Carpenter considered modern sport and body culture were instrumental
to those he called ‘normal’ Uranians, ‘possessing thoroughly masculine powers of mind
and body ... becoming more muscular and well built... healthy specimens of their sex ...
of powerful brain, high standard of conduct, ... with nothing abnormal or morbid.’92 It
was a conviction with which Raffalovich wholeheartedly concurred.
From his position as a self-proclaimed ‘unisexual’, Raffalovich had intervened in the extensive French medical debate on inversion, written *L’Affaire Oscar Wilde* and helped to galvanize the petition of this name to be sent by French writers to the Queen.93 The life-partner of John Gray – Wilde’s lover before Lord Alfred Douglas and his model for the main protagonist in Wilde’s novel, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890) – Raffalovich lauded the Ancient Greek gymnasium as Sandow’s model and expounded how the ‘Unisexual’ was masculine, manly and superior in every way to the effeminate ‘invert’ due to virilization of their bodies.94 Atune to the scopophilic significations of the queered gaze, Raffalovich also expounded how Unisexuals were virilized by art and culture in which healthy heroic manliness was glorified. ‘He loves pictures, statues, images representing attractive figures. He has heroic dreams. He is a hero loving other heroes’.95 In contesting the binarization of effeminacy and virility, Raffalovitch’s theory reinforced the words of Symonds, namely that ‘the belief that all subjects of inverted instinct carry their lusts written in their faces; that they are pale, languid, scented, effeminate, painted, timid, oblique in expression [is] ludicrous. The majority ... are athletic, masculine in habits, frank in manner’.96 Yet Raffalovitch also furnished a theory signalling why Unisexuals were attracted not only to virilizing their bodies in homosocial institutes, but also to virilizing their gaze with the ‘heroic’ pictures in *Sandow’s Magazine*.

Hence, while promoted as places for the eradication of effeminacy after the Wilde trials and the attainment of heroic, heteronormative imperial manliness, Sandow’s Institutes were also esteemed as locations for homosocial rituals that virilized inversion and valourized homoeroticism. Following Raffalovitch’s theory of the ‘virilizing gaze’, they were prized as phantasmatic spaces for what Leo Bersani calls ‘desiring skin’: A homosexuality without sexuality where desire could circulate freely through intimate
proximity, touch and the gaze. As Sandow promoted the baring of male bodies and their homosocial touching in his magazines as much as in his Institutes and events as a patriotic strategy to win the Boer War, achieve the British Imperial Federation and accomplish National Efficiency, with even the revenue from *The Great Competition* being donated by Sandow to the Mansion House War Relief Fund, this dual strategy appeared designed to nullify the homophobic panic reverberating after the Wilde Trials. Marketed as elevating models able to reverse corporeal deterioration and attain ‘empire muscle’ across Britain, Sandow’s body culture was then able to circulate as a multifarious sign to straddle the nexus between the aspirational and erogenous, edifying and homoerotic, permissive and the perverse and, more specifically, homophilic exhibitionism and homoerotic voyeurism. By no means was Sandow alone in his ‘resourceful and creative’ deployment of this multi-directional strategy able to confound the homophobic panic, as illustrated by the vigorously muscular nude youths cavorting at Newport Beach depicted by Tuke in his 1902 painting, *Ruby, Gold and Malachite*. In connecting, in the illuminating words of Hatt, ‘the map’s pink surface and the bather’s sun-kissed skin; cool waves on bare flesh and colonial seas heaving with traffic; the world of duty and the world of pleasure’, an image of imperial manliness after Britain’s eventual defeat of the Boers appears to cohabit with a virilizing homoeroticism consistent with Uranianism and the sonnet to youth that Tuke had published anonymously in *The Artist*. As Stephenson has so astutely observed in relation to post-Wildean cruising and the ‘lingering look’ able to ‘recast the male body as a living work of art’, so much depended upon those in the know being able to decode ‘highly ambiguous body signifiers’, which were ‘relatively invisible to others’. Within this lexicon of multifarious signs, Sandow’s physically cultivated male bodies, like those of Tuke, appeared controlled but sensuous, patriotically dutiful but exhibitionist, imperialized but phallicized – a model of masculinity to emulate and desire as epitomized
by Sandow himself. Falling within the liminal zone between health-phobic scrutiny and homophilic scopophilia, the manliness required by the British Imperial Federation and National Efficiency seemed to be attained while the virile eroticism desired by homosexuals after the Wilde trials appeared to be flaunted. That Sandow’s body culture was then able to function as simultaneously heteronormative and queered, without fear of persecution or prosecution, demonstrates paradoxically how the very policing of homoeroticism after the Wilde trials led to the opposite of the required effect. In giving licence to the baring of physically cultivated male bodies as much in pictures and sculptures as in the flesh, Sandow’s body culture virilized homosociality while valorizing the articulation and representation of homoeroticism for the gratification – not the denial – of the queered gaze.
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7 Ibid., 127.


9 Wilde, ‘The Philosophy of Dress’: This lecture expands on his public lecture given in England and Ireland from 1883 entitled *Dress*; also refer to Wilde, *Oscar Wilde on Dress*, ed. John Cooper.

10 Ibid., *Oscar Wilde on Dress*, 24.

11 Novak, 18. When Sarony’s photograph, *Sandow No. 18*, was copied by the Burrow-Giles Lithographic Company without authorization, Sarony sued as the ‘author’ of this ‘original artwork’ and of Wilde’s ‘pose’. Sarony’s attorney maintained that the portrait of Wilde was ‘a useful, new, harmonious characteristic, and graceful picture ... made ... entirely from [Sarony’s] own original mental conception, to which he gave visible form by posing the said Oscar Wilde in front of the camera, selecting and arranging his costume, draperies and other various accessories in said photograph, arranging and disposing the light and shade, suggesting and evoking the desired expression’. The Supreme Court accepted this argument.

12 In ‘Samson’s Challenge’ as it became known, the Marquis of Queensbury was one of the presiding judges who decided in Sandow’s favour.


15 Chapman, 46.

16 Refer Falk Sandow Nos. 32, 34 and 36.


18 Chapman, 51. ‘The truth is that Sandow was definitely a womanizer. The truth is also that his tastes ran in other directions too. Crossing the Atlantic with him was Martinus Sieveking, described as Sandow’s “great and inseparable friend”. Sieveking was a Dutch pianist and composer who had known Sandow from his years in Holland.’

19 Ibid., 51-52. To corroborate his argument, Chapman mentions Sandow’s rejection of *La Belle Otéro* in London in 1891 and her comment: ‘He must have had a bad hour or two with me before I sent him back to the man he was living with’. He also cites Sandow’s rejections of other women famous for their beauty. His homosexuality does not seem to have changed until Sandow’s return to Britain after Wilde’s imprisonment. Sandow’s marriage and the birth of two daughters did not seem to have long impeded his homosexual libido, particularly given the notoriety he achieved for actively pursuing relationships with men, as well as women. When he died in 1925 of an Aortic Aneurism, some of his closest friends suspected that it had been brought on by his syphilis. So ashamed were his wife and his daughters of what they discovered in Sandow’s private papers after his death that they destroyed them all. As Chapman and other Sandow scholars have conjectured, so much of Sandow’s correspondence that went up in this bonfire would have consisted of personal letters and cards from homosexual lovers. To disown any relationship to him, his wife and daughters buried Sandow in an unmarked grave at Putney Vale Cemetery.

20 Sandow, *Strength and How to Obtain It*, 120.

21 Chapman, *Sandow the Magnificent*, 60.

22 *New York World* (June 20, 1893).
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24 Rictor Norton, *Myth of the Modern Homosexual*, 233; Getsy, *Body Doubles: Sculpture in Britain, 1875-1905*, 8-9, has revealed that Wilde and Henry James were also interested in these artists and their sculpture. Getsy was the first, amongst a number of scholars in this field, to reveal Gosse’s ‘homosexual’ relationship with Thornycroft.
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