JRC | Religion & Culture

Volume 27 Number 1 & 2

Religion, Ideology & Violence


JRC

The JRC would like to acknowledge the support of sponsors
from within the Concordia University community:

Dean of Students
Concordia Council on Student Life Special Projects Committee (CCSL)
The Department of Religion and Culture
Graduate Student Association

We would also like to offer our special thanks to:
Lynda Clarke, our very supportive department Chair;
Tina Montandon and Munit Merid, administrators extraordinaire;
all of our referees, readers and everyone else who gave their time to
the publication of this journal.

JRC | Religion & Culture

A Peer-Reviewed Graduate Student Journal
2017 Volume 27, no. 1 & 2

Journal Committee

The Journal of Religion and Culture (JRC) is proudly produced
by the Graduate Students of the Department of Religions and Cultures
at Concordia University.

ISSN 1198-6395
Journal of Religion and Culture Volume 27, no. 1 (2017)
Journal of Religion and Culture Volume 27, no. 2 (2018)

For more information:
Journal of Religion and Culture
Department of Religions and Cultures (FA-101)
Concordia University
1455 de Maisonneuve O.,
Montreal, Quebec
H3G 1M8

JRC logo design: Christopher Burkart
Book design: Joseph E. Brito
The type face of this journal is Minion Pro,
designed by Robert Slimbach,
issued as a digital Open Type font
by Adobe Systems, Mountain View California, 2000.

JRC | Religion & Culture

Volume 27, no. 1

Content

Art Interlude

Book Reviews

“Collective fear stimulates herd instinct, and tends to produce ferocity toward those who are not regarded as members of the herd.” — Bertrand Russell

JRC | Religion & Culture
Volume 27, no. 1

The Trouble with Whorephobia

A Contemporary Re-Evaluation of the Myth of Mary Magdalene With Special Reference to Marlene Dumas' Magdalena Series

Rosanna McNamara

> "*A theology that aims to be both critical and life-giving should not content itself with a state of affairs where religion serves to hinder rather than nourish the full humanity of all people.*"[1]

Abstract

Since the Middle Ages, Western Christianity has conceived of Mary Magdalene as the penitent whore who renounced her life as a prostitute to become a chaste and virtuous follower of Christ. There is no mention of Mary Magdalene as prostitute in the four canonical gospels, and in 1969 the Roman Catholic Church firmly rejected the myth of the promiscuous Magdalene, something feminist writers, such as Susan Haskins, have supported. This essay seeks to rethink the Magdalene's role as a prostitute, instead perceiving it as a way to deconstruct the binary thinking of Western Christianity, which has historically reinforced dichotomies such as virgin/whore and established whorephobic attitudes within the church. By looking at visual representations of Mary Magdalene—specifically the Magdalena paintings by Marlene Dumas—and employing Deleuze's concepts of becoming and repetition, the primary aim of this paper is to re-evaluate whorephobic views about the Magdalene myth and to propose ethico-theological frameworks that, through reconstructions of the myth, can support and protect sex workers by accounting for embodied multiplicity and the sexualised body within religion, aesthetics and beyond.

Keywords: whorephobia, Mary Magdalene, Deleuze, Irigaray, becoming, Marlene Dumas, Susan Haskins, sex work, ethics, aesthetics, visual art, Christianity.

In 1969 the Roman Catholic Church renounced Mary Magdalene's historical portrayal as prostitute. In praise of this decision, Susan Haskins has argued that society has everything to gain from "losing" the myth of the sexualised Magdalene.[2] However, this essay contends that the Magdalene's story needs to be reinstated and, more crucially, re-evaluated. As a prostitute, Mary Magdalene can critically deconstruct the moralistic

control over sexuality engrained in patriarchal systems (many of them philosophical and theological in character), which seek to maintain the repressive dichotomies of spirit/body and virgin/whore.[3] Wendy Steiner, in her analysis of Dumas' work in *The Trouble with Beauty*, states that interpreting the women in her work as prostitutes simplifies their "meaning and social standing," reducing all sex work to a low social status having little significance or value.[4] In contrast to Steiner's perceptions, this study attempts to radicalise understandings of sex work and the sexualised body in Dumas' work.

The analysis will employ Luce Irigaray's feminist critique of Nietzsche's phallocentric Apollonian/Dionysian dialectic, looking at how her adoption, and further critique of, Deluezian theory subverts binary thinking and stresses the importance of the body—including sexuality and sexual difference—within ontologies against the objectivist thinking of Western theology and philosophy.[5] Theories of being have historically been dictated by phallocentric Western philosophy, whereby its founding gesture, according to Irigaray, lies in Plato's metaphor of the cave: by liberating themselves from the dark shadows on the cave, representing the womb, the prisoners emerge into the light of Truth, and Irigaray reads this as a metaphor for the renouncement of the maternal and the self-creation of the paternal law.[6] The reflected shadows on the wall of cave became the non-being of the feminine order, only able to serve as a mirror to the 'intelligible masculine soul.' In other words, man is created in the image of God who denies the need for anyone but himself to exist.[7] Irigaray applies this idea to the dichotomous relationship between Apollo and Dionysus in Nietzsche's writing. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche discusses how Socratic reason effectively killed the classical Greek tragedy by introducing the age of the theoretical man and what would lead to Platonic spirit/body dualism. As Eugen Fink states, "in Socrates… only the logical and rational side of the spirit was developed excessively."[8] This is primarily where Nietzsche's discussion of Apollo and Dionysus arose, using their opposing differences to critique the superficiality of Socratic rationality—the two gods, Apollo as the mind and Dionysus as the body, act as "metaphors for the opposite artistic drives," and it is the tension between these two forces that allows for the creation of Greek tragedies.[9] However, even though Nietzsche established a reading and writing of the body, Irigaray criticizes Nietzsche's discussion of Apollo and Dionysus for abandoning the economy of women: both their mothers are dead and Apollo's sister Artemis is annihilated.[10] Kelly Oliver observes that "Apollo's balance and

harmony against Dionysian chaos are bought at Artemis' expense [...] In the Apollonian economy all women are abandoned, denied [...] He denies the body altogether; and, by so doing, he denies the significance of his birth out of the laboring body of a woman."[11] Oliver furthermore states that, in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche's theory of the eternal return presents bodies only as masculine bodies, ones that "appropriate the power of their mothers, sisters, or lovers without acknowledging their debt. They invent ways to give birth to themselves"[12]

Gilles Deleuze, and then later Irigaray, adopted Nietzsche's idea of the eternal return as way of thinking about repetition, difference and becoming. But rather than thinking about it as Nietzsche's "eternal return of the same," Deleuze translated it as the "eternal return of difference." As Cliff Stagoll explains, "if the primacy of identity is what defines a world of re-presentation (presenting the same world once again), then becoming (by which Deleuze means 'becoming different') defines a world of presentation anew."[13] The return is a force of action and re-action, and Irigaray specifically focuses on women's appropriation and repetition of patriarchal language as a way to subvert its sameness and to present new ontologies of sexual difference. Becoming is the "continual production (or return) of difference immanent within the constitution of events," whether these are corporeal or otherwise; it serves as a counteragent to what Deleuze considered to be the "unjustifiable focus upon being and identity" within Western philosophy.[14] A subject, for Deleuze and Irigaray, is not conceived of as "a stable, rational individual," as it is through the lineage of Platonic philosophy, but rather a "constantly changing assemblage of forces" that does not tend towards a particular end-state or goal.[15] Ontology is not thought of as a hierarchical progression towards a transcendent, disembodied objectivity, but exists relationally and between subjects and objects in an eternal production of difference, rupturing the binary thinking of patriarchal theology and philosophy. Employing a Deleuzian philosophy to Dumas' work, and the topic of the Magdalene more generally, will allow for greater understandings of embodied sexuality beyond reductionist binaries such as self/other, spirit/body, and virgin/whore.

The first part of this essay will contextualise the Magdalene's historical representation as the erotic penitent from the early church up until the nineteenth century, exploring how tensions between sexuality and spirituality have affected her visual depictions, specifically referring to Lefébvre's *Mary Magdalene in the cave* (1876) which employed the figure

of the Magdalene as an "alibi for the female nude."[16] Secondly, particular works in Dumas' *Magdalena* series that reference art-historical precedents will be examined in conjunction with theories of parody and repetition. These works will be compared with artists, such as Vaginal Davis, Sarah Lucas, and Hannah Wilke, to explore how taking art beyond literal representation can critically deconstruct dominant ideologies of sexuality. The final part will examine curatorial aspects of Dumas' retrospective, concentrating on how the demarcation of "sexually explicit" images within the exhibition manifests a dichotomy of erotic/pornographic. Paintings such as *Fingers* (1999) and *Male Beauty* (2002) will be reread as Magdalenes to question how disrupting the original series of works radicalises art-historical representations, thus acting as a potential mechanism to distort whorephobic stereotypes of the sexualised subject.[17]

Firstly, it is important to recognise that, for a non-sex worker to be discussing these issues, the proposed arguments come from a place of privilege. The term "prostitute" will only be used in reference to a quotation or its historical usage as many people within the sex trade today do not identify with this word and/or find it oppressive.[18] Otherwise, the term "sex work," coined by Carol Leigh in 1978, will be used because of its inclusivity and gender neutrality.[19] Furthermore, the analysis specifically refers to US and European understandings and readings of sex work because, through the West's domination in imperialism and colonialism, a hegemonic discourse on the sex industry has been established which often enforces victimhood upon those in the industry. Put differently, organisations claiming to benefit sex workers can actually deny them agency by inflicting upon them a status of helplessness and vulnerability.[20] The "prostitute" has been constructed as a "marginalised social-sexual identity" in the West, and categorised in relation to the Victorian bourgeoisie ideals of women and sexuality, one of which is the virgin.[21] The demarcation of the prostitute's body as otherness within the identity (sameness)/otherness (difference) hierarchy, and the internal dichotomy of virgin/whore, continues to portray female sex workers as objects of patriarchal control and performing a deviant sexuality (e.g. non-reproductive, non-monogamous).[22]

The Church's decision to renounce Mary Magdalene's involvement in prostitution preserves the "radically dualistic concepts" of sexuality perpetuated since early Christianity and accentuated in the Victorian West.[23] Pope Gregory the Great's misconception of Mary as the unnamed sinner from the Bible in 591, as well as the conflation of at least five

different women into the figure of the Magdalene, created a symbol of the feminine erotic to juxtapose the sanctity of the Virgin Mary. Indeed, within the Litany of Saints, the Magdalene was portrayed as a spiritual virgin, a term that was used to honour those virtuous women who idolised and sought the coveted, but distinctly unattainable, purity of the Madonna.[24] Throughout the later Middle Ages and Renaissance, the symbolic image of the penitent Magdalene prevailed, and her identity as a "reformed prostitute" made aesthetic nudity permissible in the eyes of the church.[25] She became a theological symbol of penitence, emphasised by the contrast between her long hair as representative of female sexuality and her humble gaze directed upwards to God. These depictions became widespread after the Counter-Reformation in portrait paintings such as Titian's *Penitent Magdalene* (Fig. 1, 1565) and Caravaggio's *Magdalene in Ecstasy* (Fig. 2, 1606).[26] As Nancy Qualls-Corbett has claimed, the sexualised figure of the Magdalene paradoxically creates a link between spirit and body, however the divisional hierarchy is reinforced by the demonstration of penitence within these images, creating a stereotyped image of the chastely erotic female.[27]

The nineteenth century revived the historical representation of Mary as virginal prostitute, pushing the boundaries of morality once the nude became "a distinct form of art," something John Ruskin outwardly abhorred as immoral, describing sexually charged paintings as "disgusting."[28] While Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian dichotomy sought to establish a balance within the human condition between mind and body, Irigaray plausibly argues that his "one-ness" of being rejects the feminine as transcendent and creates an eternal return of the (male) same.[29] There needs to be fluctuations to rupture the binary structure in order to dislocate the dichotomies in which other subjectivities are excluded; it is an ethical mode of thinking that allows for otherness within the divine through establishing a language for women to "subvert the primacy of the (singular) male subject position."[30] Art is a medium with the possibility to interpenetrate the spirit and body by enabling a move away from the disembodied transcendent into a territory of immanent becoming that fluctuates between the dualisms established by patriarchal structures.[31] It is important to question moral attitudes towards sexuality, rather than perpetuate them as in Jules Joseph Lefebvre's painting of *Mary Magdalene in the Cave* (Fig. 3, 1876). The Magdalene is completely unclothed and lying within Christ's tomb, supposedly illustrating both the spirituality and physicality of the Magdalene's love for Jesus as a "beautiful example of

womanhood."[32] However, her sexuality is confined within the boundaries of morality as the artist has concealed her genitalia behind a raised leg, in order to avoid an explicit reference to prostitution during such a time of Victorian prudishness.[33] These moral attitudes that impose universalised laws on sexuality still prevail today, and, to disagree with Wendy Steiner, Marlene Dumas does little to radicalise arbitrary conventions of the female nude in her paintings *Venus* and *Manet's Queen*.[34]

The *Magdalenas* (1995) exhibited at Dumas' 2015 retrospective at the Tate Modern, titled *The Image as Burden*, were generated from an amalgamation of art-historical sources, present-day celebrities, and fashion models. The replication of art-historical iconography, whilst containing the potential to disrupt conventions, has become ideological in Dumas' work. Linda Hutcheon argues that parodies have the potential to disrupt patriarchal representations when used self-reflexively. In other words, parodies, as subversive forms of appropriation, can generate a "crisis in the entire notion of the subject"—Dumas' *Venus* (Fig. 4), however, merely copies the pose and attributes of Botticelli's original painting in a way that does not distort the historical Venus Pudica imagery.[35] The painting mirrors the "divine beauty" of the nude Venus, representative of the prelapsarian Eve, echoing the chastely erotic images of the Magdalene that were created to contrast with the unattainable purity of the Virgin.[36] Rather than accepting Wilde's statement that "all art is immoral," art's ethical obligation should be to question universalised morals and binary thinking in order to move beyond normalised representations of sexuality.[37] Ontological discourse needs to disrupt the subjective error of the Apollonian and Dionysian dialectic, which lead to a "refusal of the feminine order" and thus a refusal of sexual difference.[38] Instead, a Deleuzian mode of becoming would enable interpenetrational dialogues between binaries—such as virgin/whore—as something that is about fluid processes and transformations rather than a singularised and static identity.[39] Dumas' *Venus* simply identifies with its historical precedents and imitates its form without causing a significant rupture within the appropriated imagery to open up the Magdalene figure to trajectories of becoming other. She remains an ideal nude in the Romantic aesthetic male gaze.

Furthermore, it is crucial to recognise that the male gaze and binaries such as virgin/whore, self/other etc., are also racialised in the post-colonial West. During the nineteenth century, black South African women's bodies were exploited through their public displays around Europe; their sexuality

was deemed primitive, and black prostitutes were classed as antithetical to European sexual norms.[40] Wendy Steiner is of the opinion that Dumas, as a white South African woman, is 'well placed' to discuss ideologies of black female beauty.[41] However, Dumas fails to critique the hyper sexualised stereotype of black women in *Manet's Queen* (Fig. 5) by simply exchanging the white horizontal prostitute in the original painting with a vertical black woman. In his writing on Dumas' work, Richard Shiff contends that black and white, as colours, are interchangeable, and that the potential for connecting to fields of difference is made stronger through the rejection of immediately recognising these colours as signified signs, such as races.[42] Yet, it is not a simple case of un-thinking or erasing signs. Why? Because the cultural weighting behind these signs must be recognised if there is going to be any chance of an ethical model of difference. Similarly, with "losing" the myth of the Magdalene as a prostitute, it is not about losing or erasing the cultural meanings of signs, because social erasure is a form of violence, but instead refiguring and decolonising these signs and making space for those who have been silenced within oppressive systems.

Dumas' use of superficial inversions doesn't disrupt these gendered and racialised binaries because the work refers back to the dominant ideology by merely posing as its opposite. This flattening of political structures is also seen in the performance *VB53* (Fig. 6, 2004) by Vanessa Beecroft, whereby a homogenised group of Magdalene-esque women, all of a similar height and weight and sporting the long hair common to traditional depictions of the erotic penitent, stand naked on top of a mound of earth.[43] Although the performative element of the work means that femininity is experienced over a period of time, posing questions about gender as identity, the lack of diversity between the models does not allow for radical interpretations of the Magdalene's sexuality.[44] Vaginal Davis' restaging of Beecroft's work, *VD as VB - Erdgeist, Earth Spirit #27-29 10827* (Fig. 7, 2007), subverts the myth of the beautiful, objectified Magdalene through the use of parody. Davis not only participates in her own work, but allows anyone to take part; her models differ in age, race, appearance, and sexuality as a way to disrupt the normalised representations of conventional beauty found in Dumas and Beecroft's work.[45] Through critically distancing her performative content from that of Beecroft, Davis establishes a trans-contextualisation within the discourse of sexuality.[46] Instead of denying the multifaceted dimensions of cultural experience, and through presenting sexuality as multi-voiced, Davis, as a black, genderqueer artist, utilises difference as a departure for performative content in order to open "being onto becoming." By presenting

at least two subjectivities, Davis' work creates potential trajectories of difference that break apart the "mirror of the same."[47]

Two of the works included in the *Magdalena* series that work more strongly in radicalising the portrayal of a Magdalene figure are *Newman's Zip* (Fig. 8) and *A Painting Needs A Wall To Object To* (Fig. 9). Here, as in Davis' performances, the figures present multiple registers of meaning rather than being representative of sexist art-historical precedents. In *Newman's Zip*, Dumas presents the Magdalene as a figuration of Barnett Newman's abstract zip paintings through paralleling the verticality of the forms with the Magdalene's long hair and elongated body. Even though Dumas is using motifs from traditional Magdalene iconography, here they behave as a retort against the formalism of Abstract Expressionism. Art-historical discourse on Abstract Expressionism often discusses how the movement was a homogenously male domain, one that portrayed masculinity as the "natural expression of maleness itself."[48] Jonathan D. Katz states that in order to exist and exert its power, masculinity cannot admit "to its construction in the social." In Abstract Expressionism, therefore, the social became nature, buttressing a discourse of "naturalised masculinity" whereby the entire movement became steeped in a "transcendent and naturalised authorial presence."[49] The movement was crucially significant to the post-Cold War national identity of the US, portraying the nation as masculine and aggressive in contrast to the weakened, effeminate Europe. Abstract Expressionist art did not represent figurative ideas but instead universalised subjectivity as its principal theme, conceptualising the human mind and experience as predominantly male in the process.[50] Determining what bodily experience is from a singularised perspective means that those who do not identity with this ideology must either conform or be rendered invisible.[51] This has been reflected through the phallogocentrism of Christianity, seen prominently in the Gospel of Thomas whereby Christ informs Peter that Mary Magdalene will enter Heaven when she makes herself male.[52] Totally abstracting Mary Magdalene would be to create an objective image of a symbolic ideal, whereas figurative presentations can disrupt the idealised image of the prostitute by contextualising it. Here Dumas is subverting the power relations between abstract and figurative art and deconstructing the spirit/body dichotomy. The figure, as the "frayed edge zip," refuses to submit to the borders imposed on her body by patriarchal power structures.[53] The Magdalene is no longer moving "within place as place," but deterritorialises the abstracted male subjectivity to open it up to the possibilities of otherness.[54] A myth's power resides in

its malleability, as a creative outlet in order to explore human reality and experience, and it is critical that the Magdalene myth becomes a pliable narrative in order to deconstruct stereotypes of prostitution and the sexualised body.[55]

Sarah Lucas' *Self Portrait with Skull* (Fig. 10, 1997) also destabilises historicised representations of female sexuality through queering the image of the Magdalene. Lucas is sat on the floor, staring out at the viewer, with a skull placed between her feet. Historically, the skull has been used as an attribute of the penitent Magdalene. It symbolised her overcoming the carnal desires that lead to mortality, and became an object of spiritual contemplation about the dangers of sexuality. However, Lucas seems to pose a challenge to the demure nature of such an image through her almost daring gaze. Instead of merely confronting her own sexuality and mortality, she flips it back onto the viewer, situating the skull and her face on the same vertical plane of the image as a way to form a kinship between them. Lucas is becoming-skull whilst the skull is simultaneously becoming-Lucas. Lucas acts as both artist and model, collapsing the distance between subject and object and making the body a site of exchange that continually fluctuates between "self" and "other."[56] Her androgynous appearance—she is dressed in trainers, jeans and a heavy jacket—also disrupts the political power structure of the masculine/feminine binary so often reinforced within Magdalene imagery; Lucas is both the one who looks and the one who is looked at.[57]

A Painting Needs A Wall To Object To also disrupts the formalist reduction of art to the status of an autonomous object.[58] The figure stands with its front facing the wall, its head turned to look at the viewer as if to reject the flatness of the canvas; its dark body merges into the black surroundings, creating a depth that blurs the lines between subject and object and instead becomes a body amongst other bodies. The painting's ambiguity dislocates power relations between viewer and model because the subject has no conclusive identity—its race, gender, and sexuality refuse to become fixed, and instead they are constantly becoming something other. What could be interpreted as a seductive pose has become destabilised through a rejection of the pressure to literally represent an image of the erotic Magdalene, and the power relations between Dumas and the model are shifted because the figure has gained an agency that dislocates the gaze from its historicised position of control. The self-portrait works of Hannah Wilke also subvert the political power of the gaze through presenting a self-reclaimed narcissism

in her nudity.[59] Wilke doesn't rely on the gaze for an impregnation of value and meaning, but instead presents herself as an embodied subject.[60] Like Dumas, she references the historical figure of Venus in her *Intra-Venus* series (Fig. 11, 1992-1993), but here the conventional beauty of the archetype is abjected through Wilke's presentation of her cancerous body. Although her body is in a state of decline, Wilke still makes it the focus of her work, not only as a critique of the art-historical models of beauty, but perhaps of her own presentations of beauty in earlier works.[61] Critical self-parody underlines that beauty ideals are not somehow exclusive to the distant past of art history but can dwell within an artist's own body of work; Wilke's parodies of her own art conveys her subjecthood as a site of continuous becoming other. The controlled, contained nude of the classical Venus is transformed through the presentation of her decaying, naked body as a way to challenge the historic treatment of the nude as a distinct form from the vulgarity of nakedness.[62]

The distinction made between nude and naked in Western art history has established categories of socially acceptable and unacceptable modes of bodily presentation. The idealised nude was created as an object of elevated aesthetic contemplation for the male viewer, which sought to relieve reminders of imperfection, decay, and the female abject. As Jane M. Ussher notes, the female nude "most clearly transforms the base nature of woman's nakedness into 'art,' all abhorrent reminders of her fecund corporality removed." [63] The nude/naked dichotomy plays into the erotic/pornographic dialectic—a crucial aspect of whorephobic prejudice. Pornography continues to be discussed in moralistic rather than ethic terms with the industry continuously perceived as "all bad" and oppressive for women. Whilst not denying that there are severe issues with the sex industry, such as trafficking and pimping, universalising the sex industry presents those who participate in it, particularly those who are not white men, as immoral outsiders needing to be "saved."[64] Wendy Steiner describes pornography as a repellent extreme of beauty, stating that Dumas' artworks must be "saved" from pornographic readings because this renders the subject matter as "dead."[65] Jerold Levinson, echoing Steiner's views, also states that pornography cannot be considered as art because it cannot be appreciated for its own sake.[66] For him, erotic art has a capacity for disinterested contemplation, in contrast to the functionality of pornography, reinforcing the Kantian philosophy of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche that endorses art as being a form of transcendent, objective truth and knowledge, segregated from individuality and desire.[67] Unfortunately, rather than using the

subject matter of Dumas' work to critique this dialectic, the retrospective reinforced the distinction by segregating so-called "explicit" artworks from other images of the naked *Magdalenas*. Maintaining these distinctions means that those who choose to participate in the sex industry remain ostracised from other parts of society, and the segregation and labelling of certain imagery within the exhibition poses as a microcosm for such social exclusion.

Freda Dröes has argued that within Dumas' *Magdalena* series there is a shifting of identity that disrupts the repetitive iconography of the Magdelene throughout the Western canon, and Dumas herself claims that her *Magdalena* series portrays a "bastard race" refusing to be fixed to any singular meaning.[68] However, these women are bastardised only as far as Nietzsche's Apollonian and Dionysian dialectic bastardised the hierarchic rationalism of Socratic philosophy. Nietzsche's dialectic reduces any concept of otherness as a mirroring of the male same, and Dumas, by uncritically imitating patriarchal representations of the Magdalene from art history, genders the Magdalene as prostitute as exclusively female.[69] Melissa Gira Grant stresses the importance of reframing discussions of sex work to include the identities and experiences of men and gender non-conformists who are rendered invisible when sex workers are stereotyped as women.[70] As previously stated, the Magdalene myth needs to be re-evaluated as a malleable narrative that can be assimilated into a multiplicity of voices, and one way of disrupting the homogenous presentation of sexuality in Dumas' exhibition would be to reinterpret the segregated, "explicit" works as Magdalenes by displaying them amongst the series of *Magdalenas*. Reading a work like *Male Beauty* (Fig. 12, 2002) as a Magdalene figure distorts the historical representations of the female penitent by presenting her as a black man. This may sound somewhat hypocritical after being sceptical of Dumas' use of a black model in *Manet's Queen*, and it is not to say that *Male Beauty* is devoid of similar issues. However, rereading the homoerotic male figure as Mary Magdalene has the potential to disrupt not only normalised representations of sex workers as cis-gendered women, but also to deconstruct the power relations of the heterosexual male gaze that historically dominated representations of the Magdalene. The painting was inspired by homoerotic pornography and has been described as dehumanising in its exposure of the naked body, but universalising pornography as oppressive reduces the differing experiences of those in the industry as one of pure victimisation, ultimately silencing the multiplicity of voices in sex work.[71] Dumas' Magdalenes are uniformly contained in

their verticality, their genitalia either blended into the surrounding flesh or, in the case of *Venus* and *Out of Eggs, Out of Business*, totally covered by their hair. In contrast, *Male Beauty* and *Fingers* (Fig. 13, 1999)—the latter also exhibited in the segregated room—prize open their bodies with their hands, openly exposing their genitalia, blurring the lines between subject and object. The horizontal pose of the figure in *Fingers* could potentially disrupt Dumas' use of verticality in the *Magdalena* series by challenging the claim that horizontality is a form of objectification. Steiner automatically considers a horizontal figure as passive and aligns it with prostitution, without considering that the figures, such as *Fingers* as well as Manet's *Olympia*, could be actively sexual.[72] Through the curatorial organisation of the exhibition, Dumas' show implies that an active display of the genitals is differentiated from other forms of art, suggesting, as Jerold Levinson does, that images cannot be "both art and pornography."[73] Establishing a dualism whereby certain bodies convey inspiring, aesthetic nudity and others morally and artistically redundant nakedness, serves to maintain the spirit/body dichotomy that is perpetuated in Western theology and philosophy. Instead of being hierarchically situated above the body, the spirit should be considered as the "*other side* of the body" whereby both are simultaneously interconnected by a chiasm or an interval that opens up the possibilities of interchange and transformation.[74] Exhibiting both the brazenly naked figures and the chastely nude Venuses as *Magdalenas* would present sexuality as multi-voiced, rupturing the divide between spirit and body and portraying the sexualised, embodied subject as a site of continuous becoming.

In conclusion, this essay has illustrated that society has nothing to gain from losing the Magdalene myth, because, as a prostitute, she has the potential to radicalise the repressive dichotomies that seek to police bodies and sexuality. As Sandra Rushing aptly states, to discard the erotic Magdalene is to cast off the "visceral, grounded aspects of being in the body and in the soul."[75] Her penitence reflected a type of transition from carnal immorality to spiritual transcendence, and therefore the renunciation of her association with prostitution may sincerely diminish the space for sex workers and their experiences in the Western Church. However, it is crucial to underline that reinstating her historical characterisation is not good enough; the crucial part of her story lies in her rejection of sexual desire and the myth needs to be re-evaluated in a way that forms an ideology whereby the spirit and body are not diametrically opposed. This paper has argued that contemporary art is a medium that has the potential to disrupt normalised

representations of the Magdalene, but that Marlene Dumas' retrospective at the Tate Modern falls short of challenging the conventional imagery portrayed through the Western art canon. Works like *Venus* and *Manet's Queen* do not parody their art-historical precedents in a way that critically distances them from idealised nudes like that of Lefébvre. Iconographic copies or inversions reiterate the dominant ideology by merely conforming to its "other;" works like *Newman's Zip* and *A Painting Needs A Wall To Object To* are stronger in parodying historical images of the Magdalene through the use of reappropriation and non-literal representation. These paintings disrupt patriarchal dualisms by blurring the line between subject and object, presenting sexuality as multi-voiced. Artists like Vaginal Davis, Sarah Lucas, and Hannah Wilke, who participate in "the performative posing of the self," deconstruct the power relations between subject/artist and object/model by presenting themselves as both "self" and "other," adopting the gaze and projecting it back onto the viewer.[76] Although, this is not to say that self-portraiture is the only way to subvert patriarchal structures; curating Dumas' exhibition to integrate the more graphic works with the *Magdalenas* could potentially disrupt the moralised boundaries of erotic and pornographic imagery. Presenting Mary Magdalene as both demure and overtly sexual, as well as diverse in race and gender, conveys her subjecthood as multiple, opening up her myth to a trajectory of becoming that refuses to be assimilated into a singular, idealised meaning. It is not time to lose the myth of the Magdalene but to reclaim the importance of her life as a prostitute and to reappropriate patriarchal representations of her in order to rupture the binary thinking of Western theology and philosophy. Creating radical art is just one way this reclamation can manifest, and deconstructing phallocentric theology is another. Sex workers' voices need to be heard and listened to in order for the experiences and safety of those in the industry to be acknowledged, understood, and, more crucially, protected within those discourses that have historically silenced and erased them. Religion and sexuality should not be an either/or decision, and thinking about existence as unfolding through trajectories of becoming, fluctuating between self/other, male/female, spirit/body, has the potential to manifest important ethical discussions of sexuality and sex work within the church and beyond.

Endnotes

1. Damien Casey, *Flesh Made Word: Theology After Irigaray* (Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010), 191: http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/staffhome/dacasey/buchblock.pdf
2. Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1993), 400.
3. Platonic philosophy emphasised that the spirit is hierarchically situated above the body, aligning the spirit with transcendence and Truth and the body with immanence, matter and decay. Within this ideology women and the maternal were associated with the body and its unruly passions, which needed to be controlled by the rational, masculine mind. This dualism is reflected in the virgin/whore dichotomy; the former is aligned with asexuality which will lead to a higher state of being with God. The renouncement of the Magdalene as a prostitute reinforces the virgin/whore binary because it refuses any opportunity to be both, or indeed neither. In order to be "saved" and protected by God she must follow in the footsteps of the Virgin Mary who is perceived as the epitome of woman—obedient, chaste, and asexual. See: Alison Jasper, "Recollecting Religion in the Realm of the Body (or Body©)," in: Pamela Sue Anderson and Beverly Clack, eds., *Feminist Philosophy of Religion: Critical Readings*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 172; Katrina Forrester, "Blame it on the Management," review of *Playing the Whore: The Work of Sex Work,* by Melissa Gira Grant. *London Review of Books* 36 no.13, (2014): 24-26, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v36/n13/katrina-forrester/blame-it-on-the-management; Melissa Gira Grant, *Playing the Whore: The Work of Sex Work*, (New York and London: Verso Books, 2014), 17.
4. Wendy Steiner, *The Trouble with Beauty* (London: William Heinemann, 2001), 224.
5. Within phallocentrism, it is only the man's ontology that signifies meaning, hinging on the metaphor of the phallus as signifier. Man is the meaning of "I," as the thing which has a penis, whereby its opposite becomes "not-man" (read by Irigaray as "woman"), as something that does not have a penis. The other is constructed in a negative relation to this possession and thus no syntax and no space is available for the other to exist. The other must reflect the man, the phallus, in order to have an ontology, and this is why Irigaray talks about breaking apart the "mirror of the male-same" in order to account for sexual difference. Hilary Robinson, *Reading Art, Reading Irigaray: The Politics of Art by Women*, (New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2006), 55.
6. Andrew Cutrofello, *Continental Philosophy: A Contemporary Introduction*, (New York: Routledge, 2005), 334.
7. Ibid, 2005, 334.
8. Eugen Fink, *Nietzsche's Philosophy*, trans. Goetz Richter (London and New York: Continuum, 2003), 21.
9. Ibid, 2003, 15.
10. Kelly Oliver, *Womanizing Nietzsche: Philosophy's Relation to the "Feminine"* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), accessed October 20, 2016, http://bit.ly/2eZvLJu, unpaginated. Also see Luce Irigaray, *Marine Lover of Friedrich Nietzsche*, trans. Gillian C. Gill (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).
11. Ibid, 2016, unpaginated.
12. Ibid, 2016, unpaginated.

13. Cliff Stagoll, "Becoming," in *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition,* ed. Adrian Parr (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 26; Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (New York and London: Continuum, 2006), 43. Also see: Sjoerd van Tuinen and Niamh McDonnell, eds., *Deleuze and The Fold: A Critical Reader* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
14. Stagoll, 2010, 25-26.
15. Stagoll, 2010, 27.
16. Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, "Revisiting 'The Scarlet Lily': Mary Magdalene in Western Art and Culture," in *Secrets of Mary Magdalene: The Untold Story of History's Most Misunderstood Woman*, eds. Dan Burstein and Arne J. De Keijzer (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2009*)*, 208; Forrester, "Blame it on the Management," unpaginated.
17. Whorephobia is defined in this essay as the discrimination against and violence towards sex workers, which extends to their forced victimization.
18. Gira Grant, 2014, 20.
19. Forrester, "Blame it on the Management," unpaginated.
20. Rosalee Sylvia Dorfman, "A Foucauldian Analysis of Power and Prostitution: Comparing Sex Tourism and Sex Work Migration," *Polis Journal* 5 (2011): 12, http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/assets/files/students/student-journal/ug-summer-11/rosalee-dorfman.pdf.
21. Shannon Bell, *Reading, Writing, and Rewriting the Prostitute Body* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 40.
22. Ibid, 1994, 41; Gira Grant, 2014, 15.
23. Marjorie M. Malvern, *Venus in Sackcloth: The Magdalen's Origins and Metamorphoses* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975), 170.
24. Nancy Calvert-Koyzis, "Ready to Sacrifice All: The Repentant Magdalene in the work of Harriet Beecher Stowe." In *Breaking Boundaries: Female Biblical Interpreters who Challenged the Status Quo,* eds. Nancy Calvert Koyzis and Heather Weir (New York and London: T & T Clark International, 2010), 194. Also see Helene E. Roberts, ed. *Encyclopedia of Comparative Iconography: Themes Depicted in Works of Art*, vol. I, (London: Routledge, 2013), 904; Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, op.cit, 201; Helene E. Roberts, op.cit, 901; Nancy Qualls-Corbett, *The Sacred Prostitute: Eternal Aspect of the Feminine*, (Toronto: Inner City Books, 1988), 146.
25. Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, "Revisiting 'The Scarlet Lily,'" 207.
26. Jessica A. Boon, "A Full-Figured Paradox: Mary Magdalene as Prostitute, Apostle, Virgin, Ascetic, and Contemplative." In *Jusepe de Ribera's Mary Magdalene in a New Context,* vol. II, ed. Gabriele Finaldi (Dallas: Meadows Museum, Southern Methodist University, 2011).
27. Qualls-Corbett, 1988, 147.
28. Eric Jan Sluijter, *Rembrandt and the Female Nude*, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 17; Kumiko Muka, *Hawthorne's Visual Artists and the Pursuit of a Transatlantic Aesthetics*, (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 187; George P. Landow, *Aesthetic and Critical Theory of John Ruskin*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), 169.
29. Friedrich W. Nietzsche, "The Birth of Tragedy," in *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings,* eds. Raymond Guess and Ronald Speirs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 21; Irigaray, *Marine Lover*, 164; Stagoll, 2010, 26.
30. In this paper, "ethics" are separated from "morals," defined here as objective and universal, and refer to what Anna L. Peterson describes as "Feminist ethics" that "reject objectivist and universalist epistemology of traditional Western moral theory" by instead stressing the importance of relationships and context in order to

"accommodate the particular needs and interests involved... in people's actual lives." Also see: Anna L Peterson, *Being Human: Ethics, Environment, and Our Place in the World*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 139; Jean Marie Byrne, "Breath of Awakening: Nonduality, Breathing, and Sexual Difference" in *Breathing with Luce Irigaray,* eds. Lenart Skof and Emily A. Holmes (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 70.

31. Simon O'Sullivan, "The Aesthetics of Affect: Thinking Art Beyond Representation," *Angelaki*: *Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 6, no. 3, (2001): 129.
32. Buthaina I. Zanayed, "The Visual Representation of Mary Magdalene in Art: From Penitent Saint to Propagator of the Faith" (Master's thesis, The University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2009), 56.
33. Susan Haskins*, Mary Magdalene: Myth and Metaphor* (Old Saybrook: Konecky & Konecky, 1993), 399-400.
34. Steiner, *The Trouble with Beauty*, 224.
35. The Venus Pudica, or the "modest Venus", traditionally covers her breasts with one hand and her *pudendum* with the other, a double gesture that both conceals and emphasises her nudity. Aligning the Magdalene with Venus portrays her as both carnal and divine; her nudity is thus permissible in the eyes of the church because the pudica gesture reinforces her penitence and renouncement of the flesh. See: Claudia Lazzaro, "The Visual Language of Gender in Sixteenth-Century Garden Sculpture," in *Refiguring Woman: Perspectives on Gender and the Italian Renaissance,* eds. Marilyn Migiel and Juliana Schiesari (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 82; Rachel Geshwind, "The Printed Penitent: Magdalene Imagery and Prostitution Reform in Early Modern Italian Chapbooks and Broadsheets," in *Mary Magdalene, Iconographic Studies from the Middle Ages to the Baroque,* eds. Michelle Erhardt; Amy Morris (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 120; Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* (New York and London: Methuen, 1985), 2-4.
36. Silvia Malaguzzi, *Botticelli. Ediz. Inglese*, (Florence: Giunti Editore, 2004), 72; Isabella Alston, *Botticelli*, (Charlotte: TAJ Books International LLC, 2014), 12-13.
37. Oscar Wilde, *Intentions*, 8th edition, (London: Methuen & Co, 1913), 169.
38. Irigaray, *Marine Lover*, 72; Tamsin E. Lorraine, *Irigaray and Deleuze: Experiments in Visceral Philosophy*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 55.
39. Keith Robinson, "Towards a Political Ontology of the Fold: Deleuze, Heidegger, Whitehead and the 'Fourfold' Event," in *Deleuze and The Fold: A Critical Reader*, eds. Sjoerd van Tuinen and Niamh McDonnell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 199.
40. Dorfman, "A Foucauldian Analysis of Power and Prostitution," 7.
41. Steiner, *The Trouble with Beauty*, 222.
42. Richard Shiff, "Less Dead," in *Marlene Dumas: Measuring Your Own Grave,* ed. Cornelia H. Butler (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary art, 2008), 158 and 161.
43. Domenico Quaranta, Antonio Caronia, Janez Janša, *RE:akt! Reconstruction, Re-enactment, Re-reporting* (Brescia: Link Editions, 2014), 88.
44. Clare Johnson, *Femininity, Time and Feminist Art* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 53.
45. Quaranta, Caronia and Janša, *RE:akt! Reconstruction, Re-enactment, Re-reporting,* 80.
46. Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody*, 101.
47. Casey, *Flesh Made Word*, 183; Irigaray, *Marine Lover*, 72.
48. Francis Frascina, *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate* (London: Routledge, 2000), 350; Moira Roth and Jonathan D. Katz, *Difference/Indifference: Musings on Postmodernism, Marcel Duchamp and John Cage*, revised edition, (New York:

Routledge, 2013), 60.

49. Roth and Katz, 2013, 60-61.
50. Michael Leja, *Reframing Abstract Expressionism: Subjectivity and Painting in the 1940s*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 256-258.
51. Carolyn M. Tilghman, "The Flesh Made Word: Luce Irigaray's Rendering of the Sensible Transcendental," *Janus Head* 11, no.1, (2009), 42: http://www.janushead.org/11-1/tilghman.pdf; Lynda Nead, *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 2002), 45.
52. G. Thom. 114: "For every female who makes herself male will enter the kingdom of heaven."
53. Marlene Dumas, Emma Bedford, eds., *Marlene Dumas: Intimate Relations* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2007), 82.
54. Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*, trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 35.
55. Benjamin Bennett, "Nietzsche's Idea of Myth: The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics," *Modern Language Association* 94, no. 3 (1979), 423.
56. Amelia Jones, "The 'Eternal Return': Self-Portrait Photography as a Technology of Embodiment," *Signs* 27, no.4, (2002), 965.
57. Margaret E. Boyle, *Unruly Women: Performance, Penitence, and Punishment in Early Modern Spain*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 40; Roxana Marcoci, "From Face to Mask: Collage, Montage, and Assemblage in Contemporary Portraiture," in *Modern Women: Women Artists at The Museum of Modern Art*, eds. Cornelia Butler and Alexandra Schwartz (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2010) 474.
58. Wendy Steiner, *Venus in Exile: The Rejection of Beauty in Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Free Press, 2001), XXII.
59. Jones, "The "Eternal Return"', 965; Claudia Mesch, *Art and Politics: A Small History of Art for Social Change Since 1955*, (London: I.B.Tauris, 2014), 109.
60. Amelia Jones, *Body Art/Performing the Subject* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 157.
61. Crispin Sartwell, "Venus/Intra-Venus, Art against and as the Body," in *Reclaiming the Spiritual in Art: Contemporary Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, eds. Dawn Perlmutter and Debra Koppman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 30.
62. Gannit Ankori, "The Jewish Venus," in *Complex Identities: Jewish Consciousness and Modern Art,* eds. Matthew Baigell and Milly Heyd (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 250 and 258 n.33; John Berger, Chapter 3 of 'Ways of Seeing', 1972, in: Hilary Robinson, ed., *Feminism Art Theory: An Anthology 1968-2014*, second edition, (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2015), 296: "A naked body has to be seen as an object in order to become a nude [...] In the average European oil painting of the nude the principal protagonist is never painted. He is the spectator in front of the picture and he is presumed to be a man. Everything is addressed to him [...] [The nude] is made to appeal to *his* sexuality. It has nothing to do with her sexuality [...] Women are there to feed an appetite, not to have any of their own."
63. Helene E. Roberts, *Encyclopedia of Comparative Iconography,* 641; Griselda Pollock, "Nude Bodies: Displacing the boundaries between Art and Pornography," in *The Body*, eds. Sean Sweeney and Ian Hodder (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 101; Jane M. Ussher, *Managing the Monstrous Feminine: Regulating the Reproductive Body*, (London: Routledge, 2006), 2.
64. Kath Albury, "Reading Porn Reparatively," *Sexualities* 12, no. 5 (2009): 647-648; Dorfman, "A Foucauldian Analysis of Power and Prostitution," 12.

65. Steiner, *The Trouble with Beauty*, 218 and 225.
66. Jerrold Levinson, "Erotic Art and Pornographic Pictures," *Philosophy and Literature* 29, no. 1, (2005), 263.
67. Ibid, 239; Arthur Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, vol. I, trans. and ed. E.F.J. Payne (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1969), 184-185; Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, 29.
68. Freda Dröes, "Art at the Edge: The Painter Marlene Dumas," *Feminist Theology* 14, no. 3, (2006): 389-390.
69. Irigaray, *Marine Lover*, 72.
70. Gira Grant, *Playing the Whore*, 19.
71. Moira de Swardt, "Marlene Dumas – Intimate Relations," *Artslink,* last modified February 13, 2008, http://www.artlink.co.za/news_article.htm?contentID=5046; Nadia Tscherny, "Elizabeth Peyton," *Art in America*, last modified February 1, 2009, http://www.artinamericamagazine.com/news-features/magazine/elizabeth-peyton/; Dorfman, "A Foucauldian Analysis of Power and Prostitution,"12 and 15.
72. Steiner, *The Trouble with Beauty*, 224.
73. Levinson, "Erotic Art and Pornographic Pictures," 234.
74. Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible: Followed by Working Notes*, ed. Claude Lefort, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), 259 and 266; Shannon Winnubst, *Queering Freedom* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 94.
75. Sandra M. Rushing, *The Magdalene Legacy: Exploring the Wounded Icon of Sexuality* (Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1994), 172.
76. Jones, "The 'Eternal Return,'" 965.

Works Cited

Albury, Kath. "Reading Porn Reparatively," *Sexualities* 12, no. 5 (2009): 647-653.

Alston, Isabella. *Botticelli.* Charlotte: TAJ Books International LLC, 2014.

Ankori, Gannit. "The Jewish Venus," in *Complex Identities: Jewish Consciousness and Modern Art*, edited by Matthew Baigell and Milly Heyd, 238-258. New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 2001.

Apostolos-Cappadona, Diane. "Revisiting 'The Scarlet Lily': Mary Magdalene in Western Art and Culture." In *Secrets of Mary Magdalene: The Untold Story of History's Most Misunderstood Woman* in Burstein, edited by Dan Burstein and Arne J. De Keijzer, 200-211. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2006.

Bell, Shannon. *Reading, Writing, and Rewriting the Prostitute Body.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Bennett, Benjamin. "Nietzsche's Idea of Myth: The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics." *Modern Language Association* 94, no. 3 (1979): 420-433.

Boon, Jessica A. "A Full-Figured Paradox: Mary Magdalene as Prostitute, Apostle, Virgin, Ascetic, and Contemplative." In *Jusepe de Ribera's Mary Magdalene in a New Context,* edited by Gabriella Finaldi, 91-102. Dallas: Meadows Museum, Southern

Methodist University, 2011.

Boyle, Margaret E. *Unruly Women: Performance, Penitence, and Punishment in Early Modern Spain.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Byrne, Jean Marie. "Breath of Awakening: Nonduality, Breathing and Sexual Difference," in *Breathing with Luce Irigaray,* edited by Emily A. Holmes and Lenart Skof, 67-82. London: Bloombury, 2013.

Calvert-Koyzis, Nancy. "Ready to Sacrifice All: The Repentant Magdalene in the Work of Harriet Beecher Stowe," in *Breaking Boundaries: Female Biblical Interpreters Who Challenged the Status Quo*, edited by Nancy Calvert-Koyzis and Heather Weir, 190-207. New York: T & T Clark International, 2010.

Caronia, Antonio, Quaranta, Domenico and Janez Jansa. *RE:akt! Reconstruction, Re-enactment, Re-reporting*. Brescia: LINK Editions, 2013.

Casey, Damien. *Flesh Made Word: Theology After Irigaray*. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2015. Accessed March 28 2015, http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/staffhome/dacasey/buchblock.pdf

Cutrofello, Andrew. *Continental Philosophy: A Contemporary Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Dorfman, Rosalee Sylvia. "A Foucauldian Analysis of Power and Prostitution: Comparing Sex Tourism and Sex Work Migration," *Polis Journal* 5 (2011): 1-23.

Dröes, Freda. "Art at the Edge: The Painter Marlene Dumas," *Feminist Theology* 14, no. 3 (2006): 389-397.

Dumas, Marlene. *Marlene Dumas: Intimate Relations,* Edited by Emma Bedford and Marlene Dumas. Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2007.

Fink, Eugen. *Nietzsche's Philosophy.* Translated by Goetz Richter. London: Continuum, 2003.

Forrester, Katrina. "Blame it on the Management." Review of *Playing the Whore: The Work of Sex Work,* by Melissa Gira Grant. *London Review of Books,* July 3, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v36/n13/katrina-forrester/blame-it-on-the-, 2014.

Frascina, Francis. *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate*, *Second Edition.* New York: Routledge, 2000.

Geshwind, Rachel. "The Printed Penitent: Magdalene Imagery and Prostitution Reform in Early Modern Italian Chapbooks and Broadsheets." In *Mary Magdalene, Iconographic Studies from the Middle Ages to the Baroque,* edited by Michelle A. Erhardt and Amy M. Morris, 107-134. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Gira Grant, Melissa. *Playing the Whore: The Work of Sex Work*. London: Verso Books, 2014.

Haskins, Susan. *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1993.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms.* New York: Methuen, 1985.

Irigaray, Luce. *Marine Lover of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Translated by Gillian C. Gill. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.

——. *An Ethics of Sexual Difference.* Translated by Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Jasper, Alison. "Recollecting Religion in the Realm of the Body (or Body©)." In *Feminist Philosophy of Religion: Critical Readings,* edited by Pamela Sue Anderson and Beverly Clack, 170-182. New York: Routledge, 2002

Johnson, Clare**.** *Femininity, Time and Feminist Art*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Jones, Amelia. *Body Art/Performing the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

——. "The 'Eternal Return'" Self-Portrait Photography as a Technology of Embodiment," *Signs* 27, no. 4 (2002): 947-978.

Landow, George P. *Aesthetic and Critical Theories of John Ruskin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Lazzaro, Claudia. "The Visual Language of Gender in Sixteenth-Century Garden Sculpture," in *Refiguring Woman: Perspectives on Gender and the Italian*

Renaissance, edited by Marilyn Migiel and Juliana Schiesari, 71-113. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Leja, Michael. *Reframing Abstract Expressionism: Subjectivity and Painting in the 1940s*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Levinson, Jerrold. "Erotic Art and Pornographic Pictures" *Philosophy and Literature* 29, no. 1 (2005): 228-240.

Lorraine, Tamsin. *Irigaray and Deleuze: Experiments in Visceral Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Malaguzzi, Silvia. *Botticelli. Ediz. Inglese*, Florence: Giunti Editore, 2004.

Malvern, Majorie M. *Venus in Sackcloth: The Magdalen's Origins and Metamorphoses.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Marcoci, Roxana**.** "From Face to Mask: Collage, Montage, and Assemblage in Contemporary Portraiture." In *Modern Women: Women Artists at The Museum of Modern Art*, edited by Cornelia Butler and Alexandra Schwartz, 462-479. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2010.

McDonnell, Niamh and van Tuinen, Sjoerd, eds. *Deleuze and The Fold: A Critical Reader*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Visible and the Invisible: Followed by Working Notes*. Edited by Claude Lefort. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968.

Mesch, Claudia. *Art and Politics: A Small History of Art for Social Change Since 1945*, London: I.B.Tauris, 2013.

Mukai, Kumiko**.** *Hawthorne's Visual Artists and the Pursuit of a Transatlantic Aesthetics*. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

Nead, Lynda. *The Female Nude: Art, Obscenity and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Birth of Tragedy." In *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, edited by Raymond Geuss, R. and Ronald Speirs, 14-51. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1999.

Oliver, Kelly. *Womanizing Nietzsche: Philosophy's Relation to the "Feminine."* London: Routledge, 2016.

O'Sullivan, Simon. "The Aesthetics of Affect: Thinking Art Beyond Representation" *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 6, no. 3 (2001): 125-135.

Peterson, Anna L. *Being Human: Ethics, Environment, and Our Place in the World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Pollock, Griselda. "Nude Bodies: Displacing the boundaries between Art and Pornography." In *The Body,* edited by Sean T. Sweeney and Ian Hodder, 94- 126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Qualls-Corbett, Nancy. *The Sacred Prostitute: Eternal Aspect of the Feminine*. Toronto: Inner City Books, 1988.

Roberts, Helene E., ed. *Encyclopedia of Comparative Iconography: Themes Depicted in Works of Art, Volume I.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Robinson, Hilary. *Reading Art, Reading Irigaray: The Politics of Art by Women.* London: I.B. Tauris & Co Limited, 2006.

——. Ed. *Feminism Art Theory: An Anthology 1968-2014, Second Edition.* Malden: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

Roth, Moira, and Jonathan D. Katz. *Difference/Indifference: Musings on Postmodernism, Marcel Duchamp and John Cage*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Rushing, Sandra M. *The Magdalene Legacy: Exploring the Wounded Icon of Sexuality*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1994.

Sartwell, Crispin. "Venus/Intra-Venus: Art Against and as the Body." In *Reclaiming the Spiritual in Art: Contemporary Cross-Cultural Perspectives,* edited by Dawn Perlmutter and Debra Koppman, 19-31. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *The World as Will and Representation: Volume I*. Translated by E.F.J Payne. New York: Dover Publications, 1966.

Shiff, Richard. "Less Dead." In *Marlene Dumas: Measuring Your Own Grave*, edited by Cornelia Butler, 145-175. Los Angeles: Distributed Art Publishers Incorporated, 2008.

Sluijter, Eric Jan. *Rembrandt and the Female Nude*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Stagoll, Cliff. "Becoming." In *The Deleuze Dictionary: Revised Edition*, edited by Adrian Parr, 25-37. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 25-27, 2010.

Steiner, Wendy. *The Trouble with Beauty*. London: William Heinemann, 2001.

——. *Venus in Exile: The Rejection of Beauty in Twentieth-Century Art.* New York: The Free Press, 2001.

Swardt, Moira de. "Marlene Dumas – Intimate Relations." *Artslink*, February 13, 2008, http://www.artlink.co.za/news_article.htm?contentID=5046

Tilghman, Carolyn, M. "The Flesh Made Word: Luce Irigaray's Rendering of the Sensible Transcendental." *Janus Head* 11, no.1 (2009): 39-54.

Tscherny, Nadia. "Elizabeth Peyton." *Art in America*, February 2009, http://www.

artinamericamagazine.com/news-features/magazine/elizabeth-peyton/

Ussher, Jane M. *Managing the Monstrous Feminine: Regulating the Reproductive Body*. London: Routledge, 2006

Wilde, Oscar. *Intentions, 8th Edition.* London: Methuen, 1913.

Winnubst, Shannon**.** *Queering Freedom*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Zanayed, Buthaina I. "The Visual Representation of Mary Magdalene in Art: From Penitent Saint to Propagator of the Faith." MA Thesis, The University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2009.

Works Consulted

Alphen, E. van, 2005, *Art in Mind: How Contemporary Images Shape Thought*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Bloom, B., Boogerd, D. van den, Casadio, M., 1999, *Marlene Dumas*, London: Phaidon Press Limited.

Foucault, M., 1997, *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*, Rabinow, P., ed., Hurley, R. et.al, trans., New York: The New Press.

Irigaray, L., and Whitford, M., 1991, *Luce Irigaray: Philosophy in the Feminine*, London and New York: Routledge.

Jansen, K. L., 2000, 'Like a Virgin: The Meaning of the Magdalen for Female Penitents of Later Medieval Italy', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, vol. 45, 131-152: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4238768 (Accessed 2 April 2015).

Johnson, E. A., 2003, *Truly Our Sister: A Theology of Mary in the Communion of Saints*, New York and London: Continuum.

Kieran, M., 2001, 'Pornographic Art', *Philosophy and Literature*, vol. 25, no. 1, 31-45.

Miles, M. R., 2008, *A Complex Delight: The Secularization of the Breast 1350-1750*, Berkeley et. al. Oakland: University of California Press.

Rivera, B., 2003, 'Female Contradictions', *Breaking Waves*, vol. 1, 25-35: http://womenstudies.fiu.edu/students/making-waves-journal/mw_vol1.pdf (Accessed 2 April 2015).

Roberts, M., 1998, *Food, Sex & God: On Inspiration and Writing*, London: Virago Press.

Saiving, V., 1992, 'The Human Situation: A Feminine View', in: Christ, C. P., and Plaskow, J., eds., *WomanSpirit Rising – A Feminist Reader in Religion*, London: HarperCollins, 25-42, (originally published 1960).

Slaughter, M., 2004, 'The Arc and The Zip: Deleuze and Lyotard on Art', *Law and Critque*, vol. 15, 231-257.

Tatman, L., 2007, *Numinous Subjects: Engendering the Sacred in Western Culture, an Essay*, Canberra: ANU E Press: http://epress.anu.edu.au (Accessed 28 March 2015).

List of Figures

Figure 1: Titian, Penitent Magdalene, 1565. Oil on canvas, 46.9 × 38.6 in. Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure1

Figure 2: Caravaggio, Mary Magdalene in Ecstasy, 1606. Oil on canvas, 41.9 × 35.8 in. Private collection in Rome. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure2

Figure 3: Jules Joseph Lefebvre, Mary Magdalene in the Cave, 1876. Oil on canvas, 28 x 44.5 in. Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure3

Figure 4: Marlene Dumas, Magdalena (Venus), 1995. Oil on canvas, 78 x 39 in. Private collection in Belgium. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure4

Figure 5: Marlene Dumas, Magdalena (Manet's Queen), 1995. Oil on canvas, 118 1/8 x 39 3/8 in. Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure5

Figure 6: Vanessa Beecroft, VB53, 2004. Performance still. Tepidarium of The Giardino Dell'orticultura, Florence. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure6

Figure 7: Vaginal Davis, VD as VB - Erdgeist, Earth Spirit #27-29 10827, 2007. Performance stills. Kapelica gallery, Ljubljana. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure7

Figure 8: Marlene Dumas, Magdalena (Newman's Zip), 1995. Oil on canvas, 118 x 40 in. Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure8

Figure 9: Marlene Dumas, Magdalena (A Painting Needs A Wall To Object To), 1995. Oil on canvas, 78.5 x 39 in. Private collection, location unknown. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure9

Figure 10: Sarah Lucas, Self Portrait with Skull, 1997. Digital print on paper, 29 x 30 in. Tate collection, London. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure10

Figure 11: Hannah Wilke, Intra-Venus Series #3, August 17 and August 9, 1992. Performalist self-portrait with Donald Goddard, 2 of 3 panels from the chromagenic supergloss with laminate triptych, edition of 3, 71 1/2 x 47 1/2. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure11

Figure 12: Marlene Dumas, Male Beauty, 2002. Acrylic on paper, 49 x 27 in. Albertina, Vienna, on permanent loan from the Österreichische Ludwigstiftung für Kunst und Wissenschaft, available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure12

Figure 13: Marlene Dumas, Fingers, 1999. Oil on canvas, 15 x 19 in. Collection Jan Andriesse. Available at http://tinyurl.com/jrcfigure13b