photography. For example, computer technology could standardize it, could find some common fields. He was supposed to contribute a chapter, but he didn't. He was not able.

No way yet to do it. Content analysis of the text is available now. But content analysis of photography is suddenly not yet available. That's the difference, but the future may be very similar, because it is a very similar idea to look at the main component of meaning, in this case the main component of meaning of texts and the main component of meaning of a picture.

And once you discover main components you may codify them, you may count, you may find some tendencies.

A visual sociologist's fieldwork

There is various ways. One way is that you just go in the context in which you are interested. One is interested in the street life, another person is interested in the life of the University, another may be interested in the life of the family, another in the life of the hospital. Depending on the your concern with this context, this area of life. You just try to look, to observe and then to record that you find crucial, interesting or important for this area.

You think about commercialization you would go to the supermarket and see how people behave there, and what they are doing, and then try to make photos of it.

Of course, a much more structured approach is when you have already some hypothesis, then you have some questions on your mind. And then you look for the proper context, you look for the proper evidence which you think you should observe.

For example, you have a hypothesis that in the big city of today there is a difference in values between rich people and poor people. And now, how document it? You think where to go, to see how poor people live, you would not go to the center of the city, you would go to some outskirts, to some poor buildings, to the places of this sorts. And on the other hand you want to document how the rich people live, when you go to the most expensive discos, clubs, other places, if you would to take pictures there, because they make kick you out of course. But it is an example that are you doing when you have hypotheses.

A very typical strategy for photography is to look for contrasts. Contrasts themselves are always like exotic things. If you see poor people in a Gucci boutique, that is a contrast. And then you feel something is inaccurate and that is shocking.

So you look for this kind of contrasting situations. The most structured in this situation is to have a clear scenario. Then you have a hypothesis, and the question on your mind is that of taking pictures. You write something like a script, you write something like a movie-maker does, before he goes to take shots. And the you try to find the right people, the right places, and to fill this script.

Pictured Bodies. A methodical photo analysis

Roswitha Breckner

Abstract

This article aims to provide a method to analyze (re)presentations of the gendered body, particularly in photographic pictures. The analysis is based on theoretical considerations and concepts about the relationship of picture and language as well as of the relationship of picture and reality. The key element of this method is an analysis of segments, which are identified by a description of the perceptual process, and formal elements of the construction of a picture. The interpretation focuses on thematic references deriving from specifically pictorial phenomena. The analysis is exemplified by a photograph by Helmut Newton, the well-known fashion photographer. Here, the method gives an insight into sexuality determined relations between bodies and gender. The specifics of the (re)presentation of human bodies in pictures, especially photographs, are summarized in the conclusion.

1. Introduction

Bodies mean something. This is nothing new, not even in the social sciences, which usually focus on textual productions of meaning. But how meaning is constituted in and through the body is still a rather complicated question. Mainly interdisciplinary feminist discourses have put it up for discussion during the last thirty years, and various concepts of the body, which are innovative for sociology and social sciences in general, have been developed (see e.g. Davis 1997). How and to what extent are bodies – just like any human expression – embedded in discourses and therefore structured by textual meaning mainly constituted through language? Or does the body represent layers of meaning that reach beyond a discursive texture?

These questions are similarly raised in another research context, namely the meaning of pictures in the social world. These debates are equally faceted, and also touch crucial questions of the humanities: Do we think or understand mainly in terms of pictures and/or of language? Are pictures, as concerns the constitution of their meaning, structured equally to language? Are they texts in a broader sense of the term, and thus accessible with such tools of textual analysis as, for instance, those developed in semiotics and hermeneutics? Or do pictures constitute another form of expression and meaning that can be grasped only by specific tools based on picture theory?

And if so, how can pictorial meaning be communicated scientifically? And, last but not least, how can this be based on methodical procedures?

Bodies and pictures both form expressions whose meaning is carried by their (re)presentational display, which cannot be easily transposed into language. In contrast, the translation from one medium to another raises the question how and to what extent meaning is bound to the materiality of its medium. Furthermore, bodily and pictorial expressions also have in common that they carry a variety of meanings which are not limited to one certain understanding. Although we are trained to speak with our body and to clearly understand in the course of an interaction what somebody wants to say with her or his gestures, facial expressions, poses and movements (Goffman 1955, Molcho 1985), in contrast to language this normally remains below the level of conscious behavior and is only noticed in cases of attraction or disturbance. We can hear what we say when we are talking, yet we cannot observe ourselves in the same way as our interaction partners do. However, the body is – also in a constitutional sense – an issue of reflection, accessible with our imagination while we are using and at the same time sensing it (Plessner).

Transcribed by Miriam Anvarova
So the body is both, consciously and unconsciously present in social interaction. From a socio-scientific point of view, the question arises as to how the body dimension can be observed as a constitutive element of social interaction and communication, and how it can be made accessible for methodological analysis without losing its 'unspoken' meaning.

We can find a large variety of body (re)presentations in pictures, which represent one means through which the body can be examined in its social contexts. In order to develop a method to analyze how the body dimension is put in pictures, we focus on the question as to what kind of social references can be traced in photographs. In other words: What kind of social realities are created and become accessible by looking at photographs, especially at the ones taken by Helmut Newton, the famous fashion photographer?

To answer this question, we will first need some clarification about how pictures, and especially photographs, can become a means of discovery, and not only one of illustrating verbal information (2). Following this path, I will focus on two aspects, first on the relationship between picture and language (2.1), and secondly on the relationship between picture, respectively photograph, and reality (2.2). Based on that, I will present a method to analyze photographic pictures (3), which will be exemplified by a presentation of an analysis of a photo by Helmut Newton (4). In a final remark, I will draw some conclusions about the body dimension in pictures, what we can detect by analytically looking at it in photographs, and how this could be relevant in social interaction in general.

2. Pictures in the social world

2.1. Picture and language

What is a picture? This has been the leading question in the last thirty years in debates concerning the specific character of visual (re)presentation (see e.g. Mitchell 1989, also Arnhem 1977 / 1989, Berger 1984, Gombrich 1977, et al.). In almost every approach the point of departure was marked by reasoning about 'language', even for those which pointed out differences rather than the similarities between language and picture. The way in which the relationship between language and picture was conceptualized became crucial for almost all concepts of picture, and in consequence also for methodological and methodical considerations about how to analyze them. While one strand of argumentation starts from the assumption that meaning in pictures - just like in all other human expressions and artefacts - is constituted by acts of signification that are grounded in language, others insist on the supposition that pictures have a distinct mode of formation and expression, which is not principally or exclusively based on language. In this view, pictures form a reality that is independent from language and even precedes it or is superimposed by it (Boehm 1994).

In the 'language' or 'textual approaches', the methodological and methodical effort is oriented towards the referential character of pictures, trying to find procedures with which one could decipher their meaning by means of semiological tools. It is assumed that meaning is based on and generated in cultural and textual systems of representation. The analysis of the relationship between pictorial signs and the signified objects, as well as the symbolic references between objects within a far-reaching representational system, form the focal point of these approaches (see e.g. Eco 1994, Barthes 1985). In the visual arts, a tradition of Iconography has developed along this path. However, a 'language of pictures', which could provide us with a basis for interpretation comparable to the one that exists in the field of language has not been found or invented yet. The visual field is, by comparison, not structured by a 'grammar' which systematically and relationally organizes references and meanings within and between texts.

This is one of the main arguments presented by the defenders of a distinct character of pictures. They argue that the methodological approaches do not consider a particular dimension, namely pictoriality. This is a form of expression which is not simply replicable as a sign, based on referential relations to objects outside of a picture (including the world of symbols), or as cultural references within a picture, and its meaning is constituted by pictorial elements, such as the formation of lines, contrasts, colors, areas, surface, and - not least - a materially fixed frame (see e.g. Im Dahl 1995). Concerning the communicability of phenomena created and explored in the pictorial field, however, this approach remains bound to language. But the effort is not focused at a possible 'translation' of pictorial phenomena into meaning constituted by language. It is rather assumed that its potential reaches beyond a rationally organized 'language of pictures'.

W.J.T. Mitchell has developed an approach, which tries to overcome the opposition between the two different viewpoints that is often grounded on theological disputes around idolatry and iconoclasm. He understands pictures as well as language as acts of constructions of concepts, which are neither exclusively of a pictorial nor of a natural nature. Both, texts and pictures, belong to a world of imagination which is - because it is situated 'within the head' (Wittgenstein) - never directly accessible. Imagination is nourished by cognitive as well as affective, rational as well as irrational, logical as well as illogical, culturally formed as well as archaic, and symbolically coded as well as unencoded sources and impulses. They are fed by internal as well as external pictures, as an already structured form of perception, which are based on both material and textual expression and (re)presentation. However, pictures and texts do not translate into one another, even though they are both part of one imaginative world, and they don't represent two distinct areas that could be separated as 'pictorial' or 'textual' ways of thinking (see Arnhem 1977 / 1989, 1984). Depending on whether it is formed or expressed in a picture or in a text, an imagination appears in a different light.

In this approach, the point of reference are imaginations whose pictorial and textual ways of construction and (re)presentation can not be reduced to each other. So the crucial question is: What kind of light is thrown on an imagination or conception by particular pictures, which would not be possible as a process by a verbal text? A common argument would be that pictures seem to express the sensory, pre-language character of an impression better than language, which is in essence organized rationally. This viewpoint is somewhat weakened by research findings showing that pictures are essential to cognitive thinking operations (Arnhem 1977 / 1989, Coy 2002), and that language can also very well express and evoke emotional and sensual impressions.

Another aspect, which is often pointed out as a specific attribute of pictures, is the simultaneity of appearances found therein. The overlapping and associative character of imaginations, including thinking, could be better expressed in pictures than in language organized in linear sequences. As this argument has proven to stand up to critical inquiry, it could serve as a starting point in the effort to develop a specific methodological approach for picture analysis. However, pictures are not only perceived as a whole, where all elements and parts appear at once equally important and significant. They are rather structured by outstanding and trick placed elements, by perspectival shifts, constellatory relations, and much more. In addition, the reception of a picture explores its structure by letting the eye wander over its surface. Hence the look or the gaze operates as a process of structuring, in which distinct elements are formed to a Gestalt in order to see something (Arnhem 1984). The perception is thus essentially organized along specific pictorial elements, such as lines, contrasts, areas, etc. The eye thus follows iconic paths (Loer 1992), which are laid out in the formal structure of the picture.

By no means is the evident iconic simultaneity natural or already given with the total material presence of the picture. It is much rather a dramaturgal effort, which is based on very specific strategies and can neither be replaced by linguistic narration nor exist in the empirical realm of an event. (Im Dahl 1995: 308).

In contrast to language, which signals a linear sequence of signs, words and phrases, we find no comparable linear sequences in pictures. The arrangement or grouping remains rather

---

* This term was suggested by Thomas Loer in his attempt to bring together the positions of Max Im Dahl and Ulrich Oevermann. Even though the iconic paths are structured, they are also seen as an unstructured whole. Hence, the viewer doesn't really need to synthesize individual and simultaneously given elements into a whole, but is still forming an overall perception. "Reading" a picture consists of a synthesis of different yet simultaneous sequences. (Loer 1992, 259, translation from the German). In the text.

* Translation from the German text: "Kolonnensäule ist der evidente skelettale Simultanität selbstverständlich oder bereits gesagt mit der metaphysischen Totalpräsenz des Bildes, sie ist viel mehr als eine auf sehr besonderen Strategien beruhende dramaturgishe Leistung, die weder durch sprachliche Narration erschaffen, noch auch in der Empirie eines Geschehens ein Vorkommen hat." (Im Dahl 1995: 308).
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contingent. Therefore the eye can 'jump' from one element or iconic path to another and can also develop new ones in the process of looking. Consequently, the methodological challenge is to grasp the coincidence between the simultaneity of viable elements as well as the perceptual process, in which time and sequentility enter as a constitutive element of the formation of a picture. If pictures are constituted, I will focus on another cardinal question concerning a methodological approach, which - from a socio-scientific point of view is even more indispensable.

2.2. Pictures and reality – the reality of pictures

The relationship between pictures and reality can – theoretically as well as practically – be conceptualized in various different ways. Pictures can be seen and used as a means to reflect something from social reality, which is what a social scientist is primarily interested in. In this case, pictures are mainly seen as a source or data among many other data, and they are expected to show something of reality that also exists without those pictures. In contrast, pictures are this kind of reality, even though it is not exclusively formed by pictures. And finally, pictures can be seen as a reality in its own, which is pictorially formed by internal relations and without reference to the outside. A decision as to which approach is more or less relevant for social scientific research is, in my opinion, not very useful. Pictures can become an interesting object of analysis in all the perspectives mentioned. The difficulty in grasping the different characters and function of pictures in relation to reality may be that the referential status of pictures can not be defined beforehand but should in itself rather be made the object of inquiry (see Becker 1986: 276, 279).

An answer to the question as to what kind of reality is shown or created by a particular picture or a particular kind of pictures is only to be found through analysis and cannot be predefined as a general assumption about the status pictures gain in relation to 'reality'.

A systematic overview by Gernot Böhme (1999), however, can give an impression of how differently pictures are used and used, i.e. what different kinds of functions they may have. These also explain in a way the different methodological approaches regarding the use and interpretation of pictures in socio-scientific research.

- Picture as a copy. In this perspective pictures, especially photographs, are used because it is assumed that they transform physical aspects of the copied objects, including their position towards each other, into a picture. The quality of a picture is defined by its reference to the original objects, which can include situations of action and interaction, or simply scenes or states and conditions.

- Picture as a sign. Pictures here are defined by their coded reference to the signified objects, which in principle can be translated into language. The sign as a signifier is not based on the physical appearance of the signified object, but relates to collectively shared referential systems, which are essentially organized as a language. Religious painting and the textual use of icons in advertisement are examples of the realization of this approach.

- Picture as a picture. The picture is determined by its pictoricity, i.e. by its expressive form which is constituted mainly by internal relations between pictorial elements (lines, light, contrasts, areas, etc.).

- Picture as a means of communication. The picture is determined by its use. A material object becomes a picture only if it is looked at as a picture. Without looking, which always takes place in a specific context (exhibitions, looking at family albums, etc.), a picture would not turn into a view (Berger) and would thus remain a meaningless object.

- The picture as hyper-reality. In this perspective the picture does not show something of a reality that has constituted itself without this picture. Instead, the picture determines what reality is. According to a diagnosis concerning the omnipresence of pictures, our views are more and more formed by pictures. We perceive reality only what we can look at in pictures, especially in photographs (e.g. Böhme 1999: 111-127).

Due to the great variety in the world of pictures we can find examples for each of the relationships between pictures and reality. They do not exclude each other, we can see in the case of photographs. Their usual function is to copy reality, but as many authors have also stated (see e.g. Becker 1986: 231) – we can find aesthetic, communicative and semiotic elements in photographs as well, which can mean the creation of hyper-reality, as Goffman has shown in the case of advertisements (Goffman 1959 / 1979). However, in everyday life as well as in science photographs are still used as a mere copy of reality, assuming a particular relationship to the objects which were there when the light was reflected and/or absorbed by a light-sensitive medium. This assumption works in the case of analogue photographs, even if we know that they could be 'faked', and in general still applies to digital photographs whenever they are used as a 'memory of a situation or event in everyday life. We believe that the photographed objects even if selectively and perspectively captured in the two-dimensionality of the paper or digital photograph, have left indetical traces. They let us grasp the physical existence of the depicted objects in the way they were there (Dubois 1960, Barthés 1986 / 1982). This is why photographs are mainly used for documentary purposes (Becker 1986).

Based on this relationship to reality, photographs are also deemed to have a particular relationship to the past (see Barthes 1986 / 1982). In showing what has been there they assure the existence of objects and persons in the past. At the same time, by capturing a specific moment, photographs imply that the respective scene with the photographed persons and objects will not exist in exactly the same way in the future. Therefore, according to Barthés, death and temporality are an inherent theme in photography. This becomes evident whenever we look at old photographs of persons who are already dead. They show us that one day we will die as well, and our existence, if captured in many photographs, will belong to the past.

However, this particular relationship between photography and past reality does not constitute the whole of the past. But the documentary function of photographs has already been critically and widely discussed and doesn't need to be repeated here (see e.g. Becker 1986: 235ff.). Meanwhile, their use as a means of art which is used and used, and the disillusionment of photography as the best medium to 'copy' realityтворство in this area, photographs have approached and even replaced painting as a way to express specific views on our world.

Different uses and functions of photographs still co-exist. Therefore the question as to what kind of relationship with reality is constituted by a particular photograph, and how the different relationships overlap, co-exist, and support, contradict or exclude each other, remains subject to analysis.

What do we see and interpret when we look at pictures from a methodical point of view? Following what was said before, we can focus on several aspects:
- the producers' imagination (and possibly their prior experience);
- thematic issues, like those manifest in the concrete as well as symbolic order of objects; iconic realities (lmdash!), which are constituted by light, lines, colors, contrasts, perspectives, constellations, etc.;
- moments of interaction, which refer to a reality that goes beyond what is captured in the picture;
- absent realities, which the pictures points at, and without which the picture would not be comprehensible;
- contexts, in which a picture (or a collection of pictures) was made, saved and used; the interaction of all these aspects.

3. Methodical procedures

In order to grasp the simultaneous appearance of phenomena, as for example in a photograph, as well as the sequential process of their perception, I would like to propose a procedure which I call segment analysis. As it was already discussed, it is based on the visual perception

8 See, for instance, the highly didactic photographs of Max Ray, which have constituted a new style and thus new ways of seeing and perceiving. Another important field is advertisement, in which the pictorial and aesthetic power of photographs is increasingly used to create specific views (see e.g. Goffman and Ray, 1994). In this field, Helmut Newton has earned his reputation as a fashion photographer who created a new view on women, regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with him.
by looking, trying to track the process in which the eye follows the structural organization of a picture while relations between distinct elements are constructed. In other words, the object of the analysis is the processual construction of a specific form of a picture with its inherent potentials of expression and thematisation. Rudolf Arnheim has formulated the principle of the formation of a picture as a Gestalt process as follows:

'...The process is one of structuring, in which each element receives its character by taking its place in the whole, occurring to some extent below the level of consciousness. What the viewer sees in the picture is already the outcome of that organisational process.' (Arnheim 1964: 176)

Based on the work of Max Immler (1960), we can assume that the Gestalt of a picture is mainly based on its colors, forms, figures and lines, which constitute specific perspectives and compositions in the surface of a picture. However, a Gestalt emerges, or can be changed, only in an active process of looking. The process of looking is determined by the recognition of objects and spatial factors on the one hand, and by iconic elements and their connections within a fixed frame on the other. The development of a Gestalt in the process of looking is — as in all interpretative processes — principally open in its potential to see different things, or to see things differently. At the same time, given the formal structure of the picture, the process of looking is not arbitrary. Upon making this assumption we can base the methodological interpretations. The analysis of pictures, however, is faced with the problem that we can express what we see simultaneously and multi-dimensionally only in a sequential order of words and sentences when we want to share our perceptions, views and interpretations with others.

The interpretation process is organized in such a way that different levels of the constitution of a picture can be looked at separately, yet still being conscious of the fact that all the levels are present at the same time. The main focus lies on the analysis of contents and patterns, as well as to be able to grasp the thematic, symbolic and iconocentric aspects in detail, and their contribution to the formation of a picture with its particular potential of (re)presentation. The method is as visual as direct perception, but it must draw a fence around each of the elements and consider them in succession rather than in an incoherent way: ‘(Arnheim 1964: 177).

Even though a detailed analysis cannot be presented here, I would still like to give a rough description of the different steps involved in it.

1. In a first step, the perception process is reflexively observed and marked by drawing arrows around those segments of the picture that have attracted our attention. Together with a detailed description of the formal elements (light, color, form, line, space, background, relations of adjacencies in space, etc.) the different segments are identified as a basis for the interpretation.

In a second step, the interpretation starts out with one segment that was identified as potentially relevant to the whole structure of the picture. Independently from context knowledge concerning the picture, and based on the procedure of building and testing hypotheses as developed in structural hermeneutics by Ulrich Oevermann, different hypothesis readings are being assembled to the possible thematic, symbolic and iconocentric meaning of the segment are formulated. The following questions can be directed at each segment:

- How and to what extent could the local, temporal, objectual, symbolic, and interactive references of the segment become relevant to the whole picture?
- In what way does the segment create specific temporal and spatial references in its specific perspective?

And if so, how?

Could this segment be part of an iconic path in the perspective plane of the picture? What kind of thematic potential is connected to it?

Which potentiality is realized in the following segments? Does it support, contradict or simply interrupt the potentiality of the former segment?

In a third step, an attempt is made to trace the pragmatic context of the picture, how it was made, kept, used and received. This allows conclusions as to how the potential meaning of the picture was realized by its use or even how it was constituted in these processes.

- Can we detect any hints pertaining to the situation in which the picture/photograph was made? What could have happened before, or later?
- What can we say about the intentions of the producers, in our case the photographer and the photographed? What can we see with regard to their relations? Whose intentions were realized, whose were not?
- How do I, as a viewer, relate to individual segments and to the picture as a whole?

In a fourth step, the results from the previous steps are finally synthesized. The question 'How something is made visible by and within this picture?' is now to be answered also by identifying the pragmatic context. Thus the specific organization of a picture and its use in a specific case ought to shed light on the structuring of meaning. In the end, it is reasonable to be convinced that this phenomena can be seen as a case of:

Depending on the research interests and following the procedure of theoretical sampling developed by Glaser and Strauss (1957) the inquiry could be continued with a comparative analyses of pictures of the same kind (e.g. another fashion photographer, from the same photographer and/or from another one). A comparison of a picture from a different genre (e.g. family photography) could also highlight the specific organization of fashion photographs as part of a particular social practice of constructing and consuming the private sphere, etc. It is also possible to supplement a photo analysis with other data, as for instance a narrative interview if one is interested in biographical research. In the following, I would like to present a short example of an analysis of a photograph by Helmut Newton. The presentation of the analysis is mainly restricted to ideas and hypotheses which could be verified in the course of interpretation, respectively those which could neither be verified nor falsified but show some ambiguity that in the end seems to be constitutive at least for this picture.

4. Exemplary analysis of a photograph by Helmut Newton

Why did I choose a photo by Helmut Newton? In one of my seminars on interpretative picture analysis, some students had brought a recently published book containing a broad selection of Helmut Newton's photographs (Newton 2000). They wanted to examine whether the woman in Newton's photos were portrayed in a sexist or rather in an emancipatory manner. The analysis of two photographs by two female students, which was presented and discussed in this group, led to the conclusion that in one of the analyzed photos, a torso (Newton 2000: 73), the women's body is indeed presented as a sexually available object. It remains unclear, however, whether Helmut Newton's intention, respectively the photograph's effect, was affirmative or critical of this kind of view. In another photo (Newton 2000: 48), the students saw a new image of women, in which the woman claims to take control over sexual interaction. The controversial discussions in the seminar about the female images Helmut Newton had created were embodied in a much broader debate, which had provoked very different impressions and controversial reactions. During the discussions in the seminar it became clear that this debate had affected the students' occupation with gender images and roles, trying to figure out which of them they could identify with and...
which of them they’d better reject. This appeared to be their main motive for analyzing Helmut Newton’s photographs.

In another seminar, which was held in a town located in a region of the former GDR, I tried to explore this experience further and included pictures by Helmut Newton more systematically. However, the discussion developed quite differently in this context. The students (about 35 women and one man) were very hesitant to approach the offered material. It was rather unclear whether they resisted the provocation effected by the photos (some giggles could be heard in the room when the photo-boos were passed around), or whether the photos failed to touch the students’ emotions and interest. Possible explanations for their reactions being so different from how the students responded in Berlin can only be hypothetical, as the reactions were not systematically recorded and analyzed. It is possible that for this generation of East German students, who had experienced the transformation from the GDR to the FRG in their formative years, the thematic issues in Helmut Newton’s pictures, i.e. the relatively sophisticated occupation with a very specific kind of women’s images, were not the ones most relevant to their orientation. But it could also be that these issues did indeed influence their search for roles and orientations, yet was felt as being just too much in addition to all the other challenges inherent in a transformation process. As a third interpretation, it may also be possible that these kinds of images were not part of the students’ experiential ‘household’. This means that their own iconic references may not have matched Helmut Newton’s, which had been developed in the context of a highly aestheticized fashion world. Thus Newton’s style, respectively his iconic elements, possibly did not ‘touch’ them in such a way as to arouse their (emotional) interest. In order to find out why the photographs of Helmut Newton trigger such different reactions, it ought to be examined what kind of (thematic) issues are potentially connected with his pictures. I will focus here on one photograph, following the methodical procedure described above.

Fig. 1: The whole picture

First I noticed my percipient ‘movement’ through the picture. My look was initially drawn to the woman as a whole, but nearly instantly also to the sitting man. It then traveled from his body to his face and from his face to the woman’s face. After that, it moved back to the bed, and finally I noticed the lamp and almost instantly the background with the wallpaper, which had somehow already been present from the beginning.

In the first subjective perception there were two almost simultaneous sequences of looking. The look grasped the woman and man almost instantly, but also wandered first from him to her and then immediately back from her to him. I was driven by the wish to create a picture out of the tension I felt between the two figures. This probably has also determined the sequentiality of my perception. The nakedness of the woman attracted the gaze first, as it forms a sharp contrast with the formally dressed man. But my look did not rest on her, it rather moved onward, searching for the tension between the two figures, probably to find out what kind of relationship existed between them. From this first approach, we can already hypothesize that what happens between the two figures is constitutive of the thematic issue of the picture. Let us now have a look at the formal construction of the photo, so as to see whether my personal perception was ‘led’ by the pictorial structure, with and in addition to my personal viewing preferences.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\) To me, personal viewing preferences are patterns of perceptions that develop during the course of one’s life. They are, of course, embedded in society, yet from a biographical point of view they do mainly revolve around the respective individual. Thus they can be very different from each other. This has, for instance, become apparent in the different reactions of friends and colleagues when they looked at this photograph. The relationship between the two figures was almost exclusively seen as the central action or element, but the individual perception of each figure clearly varied – not least due to gender-related aspects. This issue, however, will not be discussed in this article.

An extended formal picture analysis of the one developed by persons without detailed picture description as proposed by Parowsky, is not possible at this point. Here the focus is only on the findings and results that were used in the subsequent analysis.

Fig. 2: Segment 1 – man

First of all, his posture stands out. The relaxed shoulders contrast with the closed knees, which signal discipline retention all the way down to his over-meticulously positioned feet. His hands are folded, resting in his lap, almost as if he would be in a position of prayer.

One could very well sit on a church bench in such a way, with one’s eyes focused on a priest or a saint’s image. In any case, the body keeps still, it does not appear to be moving or about to start moving. Otherwise his hands would have to open up. In his closed position, the body does not appear to be stiff. The man’s pose rather expresses expectation with a controlled undertone, seemingly without preparing himself to be part of an incident or action. His look is concentrated on something above eye-level, but the neck is not exposed. So the man remains protected and reserved here as well (see Molcho 1985).

The suit possibly indicates a celebration of a special occasion or festivity. The association going to or being in a church, and thus the reference to a public context, still suggests itself. Alternatively, we can also imagine a dinner situation in a bourgeoisie household, in which all participants are immodestly dressed and attend the serving of the meal by the servants with reserved and controlled expectation. The brilliantly shining shoes, which are enhanced by the cone of light, indicate that they are not being used to walk on dusty streets, or that they have been thoroughly polished.

Following the structure of the perspective plane, the man forms the iconic focal point, which is mainly determined by the direction of the light and by the dark-light contrast. The shadow shows that the light is coming from the right side. Sunlight enters through a big window that is not visible in this crop. \(^{14}\) The traces of light on the wall and on the floor form a cone which is focused on the man. The light falling frontally on the man and his dark suit present the strongest dark-light contrast within the picture. The woman’s body is laterally illuminated and stands out against the darker background. But here the contrasts are not as sharp as with the man. She does, however, form the largest light area in the picture. In the spatial perspective she is placed in the vanishing point, thus adding an additional focus of the man in the perspective plane. As regards the photo as a whole, the camera is not centrally positioned but rather placed directly in front of the woman, which causes the direction of the view to concentrate on her figure first. Thus a formal tension is created between two iconic dimensions, the perspective plane and the spatial perspective. Each figure is central in one of these dimensions.

In order to reconstruct in more detail what kind of tension is built up in the picture, the photograph is divided into segments, which can be examined as to their own iconic perception as well as the formal structure of the picture. All identified segments are analyzed sequentially and subsequently, first by themselves and then in view of their relation to each other. But which segment should be examined first?\(^{15}\) As the spatial perspective in this picture does not dominate the perspective plane, I will mainly construct the discussion of the picture in its flat dimension. Consequently, I will start with the man as the first segment.

\(^{14}\) I found this photograph online and in three different printed publications of Helmut Newton’s work. These sources showed some minor differences in how the picture was extracted from the original negative. My interpretation is based on the photograph published in Newton 2005b, 75.

\(^{15}\) The question concerning the significance of the specific sequence of the segments in this analysis could not yet be answered satisfactorily. Some experiments carried out in seminars showed that similar segments are usually identified according to the structure of the picture, but that the sequence (and the degree of detail) in which they are perceived can vary extensively.
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for this occasion. This implies that the man is consciously staging himself. Altogether, the man - when he is seen just as a single segment - may lead us to expect a quiet, reserved and settled manner, with a strong performative touch and him being the center or focal point.

The frame of the picture reminds us that what we see here is an enclosed, flat area. In terms of proportion, the center of the man's body is placed close to the left margin, even though his legs and feet reach beyond the middle line of the picture. The sitting position makes him appear small, yet in the horizontal line he covers more than half of the space in the photograph. Let us now look at the second segment.12

Fig. 3: segment 2 - woman

We see an almost naked woman. Almost because she is still wearing shoes. But let's discuss this aspect later on. First, it is rather striking that she crosses her hands behind her head while standing upright, thus attracting attention to her well-formed breasts. One of them 'points' to the left, below the horizontal picture line. The other one faces towards the front, i.e. towards the viewer of the picture. The body seems to point in two directions: its left side to the front and its right side to the left, as if it were to say: one part is for the viewers outside the picture, who are spatially positioned, the other one for the viewer within the picture, who is laterally positioned. The right leg is slightly drawn forward and, together with the breast and the top of the shoe, creates a slight barrier towards the left side of the picture.

Her pose is - similar to that of the man - exceedingly staged, since it would hardly be manageable as a spontaneous posture. Furthermore, the body also presents itself as immobile, in spite of the inner rotation. It shows no signs of actual or imminent movement, but rather appears as if it was kept still in this particular pose. Maybe this is the sole purpose of the picture - this pose and nothing else. This assumption is also underlined by how the woman is positioned in relation to the light, which highlights her left breast and left leg in a way that presents her body in a most advantageous way. The shoes add to this impression, since in an actual erotic situation - even if captured in a photographic picture - they would hardly have remained on her feet in this way after undressing. Thus the shoes are an important element of the performance. If we cover them up, the female body appears much more approachable. The high heels signify female elegance, a sharpness (as an erotic, but also 'bitchy' sense). But they could also be seen as a weapon, as a means to lengthen the legs and to obtain a specific posture (which would not be possible without them), as a typical accessory from another era (e.g. the twenties or thirties), as a particular fashion item, and - last but not least - they could be associated with prostitution.

They signal the desire to shape and perform, which is further highlighted by the contrast to the nakedness of the body. It is still unclear what exactly is connected with the shoes in this particular picture, but it is obvious that in contrast with and in connection to the woman's nakedness they create distance and tension.

In the face, the impression of a staged performance is somewhat relativized. The open mouth, the inclined head and her glance open and focused empathy. The loose, almost disheveled hair, which is kept in motion, also contrast the still and fixed posture of the body. Maybe the hair in her armpit, which had not been removed, can in its lack of cleanliness been seen as a kind of contrast, a naturalness which could, however, easily have been staged as well. Altogether, the woman bears an expression of self-consciousness in dealing with her own attractiveness, even with a certain amount of retention and distance, which can be interpreted either as shyness or as professional distance. The oscillating undecidability between these possible interpretations may well be part of the making of the scene.

In what kind of scenes can we imagine such a posture or figure? It could be a self-presentation for a (new) lover, even though the great effort to put on an act may be difficult to explain in this context, but it could also be the love play of a couple that wants or needs such strongly staged elements to get aroused.

Of course, such a pose may be equally meaningful within the context of prostitution. In this case, the specific way of staging the scene would have to be interpreted as a separate component. It would, however, be taken for granted in a casting situation for a film, photo competition and suchlike.

In the perspective plane, the female figure is placed on the right side, having no specific relation to or tension with the frame. She remains within the picture, without referring to or creating an outside. This in turn underlines the somewhat static construction of the picture, which cannot be embedded in narrative indications of 'where from' and 'where to'. Furthermore, it becomes clear that the tension in the picture is not so much formed by compositional elements that relate to the whole picture area, but rather by the scenic elements carried by the two figures.

Fig. 4: segment 3 - the relation between the two figures

If we look at the two figures without the scenic arrangement, it becomes obvious that their relation is not formed by mere placement within the picture. It rather gains expression simply by the fact that they look at each other and - presumably - by certain scenic elements.

What kind of hints about the thematic formation of the picture, i.e. what this picture is all about, can we get from the scenic elements?

Fig. 5: segment 4 - the scenic context of the man

He is sitting on a bed, which initially gives weight to the assumption that this could be a love scene. Yet the picture only shows a single bed, which makes it rather unlikely that the picture portrays a couple. The idea of a casting situation can be excluded as well. Thus remains the interpretation of suggesting a scene with a (new) lover, or prostitution if we focus on the female figure. A single bed, however, would be unlikely in a real situation involving prostitution. Still, this does not mean that it couldn't have been staged as a symbolic situation, intended to inspire the viewer's imagination, as opposed to being a representation of a real situation.

Within the context of this bed, the man - with his rather distinguished appearance, his well-fitted suit and polished shoes - seems to create a peculiar contrast. It seems that he doesn't belong on this bed, even though he is framed by it. The bed also looks clean, smoothed down, polished and unused, just like the man in his suit. He does not take up much space as he is sitting square and appears as someone who out of respect tries to disturb the intimacy of a foreign bed. Together with the headboard and the pillows, this part of the scene appears quite austere, the arrangement does not evoke much emotion. On closer inspection, it

---

12 This segment could be divided up even further. The head, the hands, the feet and shoes, for instance, could be viewed as individual segments. If it is deemed useful in the analytical process, a more detailed differentiation is certainly possible. For lack of space, however, we refrain from describing the entire analysis with all its differentiations and alternative interpretations and rather focus on the results that turned out to be most plausible during the course of the analysis.

13 You may try it yourself and see how much body control is needed for this posture.
becomes apparent that there is a bright strip behind the man's feet, which looks like a piece of cloth hanging off the bed. This very bright but hardly identifiable light spot causes an irritation, suggesting that something may have been jumbled up in this well-arranged scene. From this ambience, the man looks at the woman's face without any significant emotional involvement. Let us now have a closer look at the whole scene between the two of them.

Fig. 6: segment 5 - the scene between the two figures

The contrast between the two figures could not be any sharper. She is presented as an erotic, well-shaped woman, who would certainly be considered as attractive by many people. The man, on the other hand, appears to have a reserved and controlled attitude, embedded in a rather asexual ambience. However, one notices a certain amount of tension between the two, which probably arises from the contrast. The figures are related to each other by the direct eye contact between them. Without it, the bodies would merely be two independently placed objects.

The woman is the provocative one. Her mouth is opened, her eyes are directed towards him. He reciprocates her look, but his face and the closed mouth rather signify devotion, even though he may be even adoration, paired with shyness or insecurity, yet it shows no visible sign of instant expectation. The man seems rather intent on waiting and watching. But instead of looking at her body he focuses on her face. This is what makes the scene erotic. The look, intense and charged with tension, indicates that some sort of emotion – perhaps even love, at least on the man's part – is (also) at stake here. But at the same time the woman who is in the position to move, if something were to happen here. Still, the man seems to control the situation with his devoted yet reserved attitude. If the woman were to move on, she would have to do something to open his hands and his body. But should she indeed move on? Or does the appeal and purpose of the picture lie in the fact that it portrays the tension of the scene, which is further highlighted by the static pictorial character? Does it possibly capture a specific kind of desire, which seeks stimulation in one place and acts out the created fantasies in another place and context? In any case, it is not only bodies meeting here, but faces and eyes which belong to two sharply contrasting figures. The situation remains ambiguous, however, and we cannot decide whether this picture is about love, prostitution, or both.

Some other ambivalences and contrasts become visible as we turn to the shoes. Whereas the man's shoes are situated within the cone of light and in being placed so close to each other suggest a kind of conservativeness, the woman's high heels with their black-and-white classical form rather express elegance, even nobleness. At the same time, one of her shoes is placed in the dark area outside the light cone, which again highlights the contrast between her position on the 'shadow line' and his lighted reserve. If the picture is indeed about prostitution, then certainly only in a stylistically very 'cultivated' form.

This is underlined by the lamp in the space between the man and the woman. It provides the room with a cultivated ambience, which adds some normality to this rather bizarre scene. In the perspective, the lamp becomes part of the tension between the two figures, thus taking a relevant position in the pictorial structure of the photograph. It serves as a light point, which creates distance between the figures. If it is covered up, the two bodies seem much closer to each other. But then the scene would be reduced to woman-man-bed. The lamp thus is the element

that opens up the figures' constellation and constitutes a new focal point, not least because it is exactly placed in the middle of the picture.

The background, as an individual segment, does not add much interpretative potential to the scene. It is filled by some wallpaper, which contains some kind of a painting. This is a part of the scene just like one of the accessories (e.g., the lamp), whose purpose is to create a specific pictorial ambiance. In the whole construction of the picture, however, it does not have a particular scene or thematic function. Yet in a summarizing view of the whole picture it becomes relevant as background framing for the upper body of the woman, whose hair style with its temporal references contrasts with the pattern of the wallpaper. This shift in itself creates a tension that keeps one's attention on the picture. The persons and accessories cannot be intuitively matched within a congruent time frame. The composition, a play with different elements, thus appears more like a painting than a photograph in the traditional sense.

Fig. 7: The picture as a whole

Let us finally turn to the connections between the different viewing directions, which constitute and enliven the scene, not least in relation to the position of the external viewer. This pictorial construction of the scene draws our attention to the position of the man on the one side, leading us to look at the woman with his eyes. He defines the observer's position and thus latent the potential for identification. At the same time, he is not merely an observer just like an external viewer, but enters the tension and creates it together with the woman. Thus he also becomes a participant. But what is even more important, through his participation the woman is no longer a mere object. Something actually happens between two persons in this scene.

The position of the camera, which does not comply with the viewing angle, takes another view that is in a way directed toward the woman, as they are positioned right in front of us, we perceive the woman's look, her face and body rather than from an observer's position. There is no pictorial animation that would lead us to see the scene with her eyes. It is she who is looking at us, as not in a position from which things are seen. If, as an external viewer, we focus on this position, the man becomes a marginal figure. But this does not match the scenic or the plane pictorial construction of the photo. In which – as we have seen – the contrasts between the figures are the most important structural elements. Considering this tension, the two-dimensional dimensions of this picture become more relevant than its construction in the spatial perspective. The thematic issues emerging from this perspective, in which the man slightly dominates, therefore present a potentially richer field of interpretation.

* * *

This is a photograph of which we expect to get some information about the life situation, social strata, or the individual tastes of the depicted persons, it would make sense at this point to find out more about the time and place, in which this particular photograph has been taken. Yet in the case of this particular photograph we have already come to the conclusion that it is clearly not a documentary picture of any kind.

It is necessary that, we also notice that the horizontal line at the back wall of the room divides the picture in two parts. From this perspective, we can't see the woman's upper torso, as well as between the woman's lower abdomen and legs and the whole of the man's body. For lack of space, however, these aspects will not be discussed in detail.

Looking at a photograph from a purely visual perspective, it is possible to find out more about the man's face and the woman's face. The woman's face becomes the main focal point, which is a good thing. But the other hand rather inadvisable considerations about a conventional, (male-determined view of the camera) on the naked woman. But this will have to prove in another context.
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who can or should not be touched but, in spite or even because of that inaccessibility, ignites his imagination? Considering the specific pictorial construction of the photograph, this hypothesis appears to be the most plausible.

In view of these findings, we can now turn back to the question as to why this picture, or this kind of pictures, is so provocative, even though the analysis has shown that provocation is not its thematic focus. Is it the mere nudity of the woman, which sharply contrasts to the suited man, that provokes? In my opinion, this would be too easy an explanation, because it is mainly based on the prudery of the external viewer. Or does the provocation lie in the fact that the created erotic scene remains ambiguous and does not exclude a context of prostitution, even if only in a certain sense, because it may be put into practice with other 'objects' in another context? Yet this would still be the case that we see something that belongs to another world and even though it feeds our imagination does not really touch us. My guess is rather that we, as the external viewers, are drawn into this picture (and this kind of pictures), even if not entirely voluntarily. From a spatial perspective, we observe and gaze at a beautiful woman, without being able to leave aside our identification with him (he is the timid and shy one), maybe it may even be noticeable at first glance. Another aspect that could be provocative is that the woman in this scene — which in the perspective plane of the picture is dominated by the man, not the nudity of the woman — is not only an object, but seems to be 'looking back', thus turning her picturesque object into a protagonist as well. In this view, she appears as the one who uses her body. And this is where it could start to be provocative for a male viewer. The man is not only confronted with the beauty of a woman who, as a saint or a whore, belongs to another world where she is untouchable, which probably makes his capitulation in the face of her beauty more bearable. Instead, she looks at the man as well, thus taking part in the interaction and transforming his fantasies, notions and fantasies to 'our' reality. However, this remains un-substantiated, since it is unclear who takes and, especially, who remains in the dominant position in this sexual play. The determined-undetermined gender play from a male perspective with an unclear distribution of power would in this case be the main thematic issue of the picture. Its outcome remains open.

In summary, the undetermined dynamic relation, which is made more ambiguous by the tensions and contradictions of the scene, and the male viewer of the picture is the subject and who object of the scene, could be the most provocative element. This ambiguity in the relationship between men and women in general, and the rather blurred line that distinguishes the erotic sphere from prostitution, power/dominance from powerlessness/subordination. As a result of the ongoing changes in gender relations and their emancipation from traditional societal norms, the lines may have moved and what possibly have to be redrawn. For us as external viewers, who hesitate to re-define these boundaries in actual interaction, this happens mainly in our imagination. Pictures in general, and the photographs of Helmut Newton in particular, allow us or even provoke in our imagination, even though its visible structure (both with regard to the pictorial elements and the action depicted therein) is rather static. It enables the production of fantasies, which go far beyond what is actually shown and which make it comprehensible in various contexts.

In contrast, the medium of photography suggests an actual encounter between two persons who are not entirely stylized as mere figures, as (traditional) photography generally does not erase individual forms of expression. Photography as a medium thus creates an idiosyncrasy which presents a contrast to a thoroughly staged, almost 'painted' composition.

6. Final remarks

In the analyzed photograph by Helmut Newton, we see as the external viewer — are drawn in our imagination into a particular scene, even if not entirely voluntarily. This is mainly our fantasy, which is stimulated by but not limited to the picture, that charge it with meaning. The peculiarity of this picture is therefore its potential to create room for imagination, which is open but also remains rather ambiguous. The picture provokes us to deal with this ambiguity and with the fact that some very different and contrasting imaginations and fantasies can be connected to it. This photograph mainly visualizes ambiguities within the dimension of gender relations, which are guided by eroticism-love-power, as well as the tensions between dominance and subordination, subject and object. Since it offers no clear answers, it shows a certain level of insecurity, both in terms of gender roles and in terms of what we do and do not find acceptable in the erotic play between the sexes.

The medium of photography also creates a peculiar mixture of intimacy and performance directed towards the external viewer, in which we take part more or less voluntarily. Through this medium it is suggested that we participate not only in the pictorial creation of an erotic imagination, but in a ‘real’ situation (or at least in some sort of game we play with reality) which implicitly places us in the position of a voyeur. Maybe this also implies a certain ambivalence, namely to try to explore the erotic play, or at least to be curious about it, but still avoiding to be drawn into the act of viewing in any way.

With this in mind, we can again ask the following general question: What kind of views on bodies are or can be created in the two-dimensional plane perspective of a picture or, more specifically, of a photograph? The materialized portrayal of bodies is, above all, a transformation of their spatial qualities onto a flat surface. By means of perspective and particular pictorial elements we can create spatial qualities and other particularities of objects. However, in contrast to a scene in an actual situation, the plane perspective is limited by a fixed frame and thus creates a new context for the perception of bodies, which constitutes a specific visual approach. Other sensual aspects of an actual situation — such as the concrete experience of space, smell, taste, tones, etc. — get lost. But with the focus being on seeing, on framing and capturing a specific moment with a variety of references to its temporal and spatial context, an analytic approach becomes possible. The actual material dimension of bodies in specific situations is maintained and not just being copied. Rather, an own meaning is created within the picture, which is based on the transformation of material qualities, i.e., from moving bodies to static bodies on a perspective plane. Thus the imaginations connected to specific objects and situations, and likewise to bodies, are captured and framed. Hence, pictures become materialized expressions of imaginations, which can — as they have now turned into objects themselves — also be shaped by them in return.

The ability to capture imaginations in pictures and the possibility to ‘read’ them, however, is limited. Such depictions always open up new and infinite room for interpretation and imagination, whose specific direction is rather difficult to determine. Generally, there is no clear distinguishing line between the imaginations captured in a picture and those stimulated by the picture. Pictures rather get the power to stimulate imaginations, or even the indeterminable, the ambiguity and ambivalence, the both-sides-of-the coin aspect be

23 If this particular structure could be generalized to all of Newton's pictures, we could thereby focus on the question as to why they are perceived and discussed as being so controversial. Hence, an examination of his limited corpus will remain on a rather hypothetic level.

24 Many of his other photographs also contain sexually paired with violence as an important thematic element. The artistic portraits of men who wants to sell a product or the producer of such ambivalences, secondary in view of the fact that his views are so widely debated. The great strength of Newton's photographs so special will have to be cleared up in another context.

25 At this point, the individual titles/descriptions of pictures — which may vary with the different contexts of publication — are in the analysis. In Newton 2000b, from which the picture used in this article was originally taken, it is entitled "In my hotel room. Montecatini 1988", in Newton 2000a it is described as "Enrico Españo and Ida, Montecatini 1988", and on the back of a postcard from a collection published by Teshen (2000) even the woman gets a name: "Enrico Españo and Federica della Volpe, Montecatini, Italy 1988". For lack of space and also because it would not really lead to any substantial new interpretations of the picture, this step is not further elaborated. Yet a detailed analysis could certainly be helpful in the reconstruction of why, how, and under what circumstances this photograph was taken.
come the main theme, which in turn kindles our imagination. All this can be fixed in a certain view, but pictures can also initiate and encourage the production of fantasies. Since our imaginations of the body are increasingly nourished and captured by photographic pictures, it would certainly be worth it to examine this dimension of social action and interaction in greater detail.
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ПИСЬМО РЕДАКТОРОВ

Этот выпуск журнала «ИНТЕР» посвящен визуальной социологии. Парадоксально, но как таковой, признанной социологической дисциплины в пространстве российской социологии, ее не существует. Имеют место отдельные конкретно сфокусированные проекты, использующие визуальные материалы для постановки или формулирования проблем социологического характера. И западный опыт институционализации этого направления (visual studies) не оказывает существенного влияния на преодоление этого маргинального статуса в силу того, что отечественная социология должна пройти самостоятельный путь ответа на вопрос: нужна ли визуальная социология в нашем социо-культурном поле?

Как нам представляется, этот «визуальный поворот» (по аналогии с лингвистическим) реализуем двояко: с одной стороны, это путь рефлексии в рамках самой социологии о критериях валидности и надежности визуальных материалов, разработки методик анализа визуального, имплементации не-вербального в спектр социологических методов. С другой стороны, обоснование визуальной социологии возможно лежит и вне ее, в характеристиках медиализированного и визуализированного мира, опосредующего социальные интеракции. Приспособление к этому изменяющемуся миру требует иных социальных компетенций, осмысление которых запаздывает.

Мы надеемся, что статьи этого номера в какой-то степени приступим к обсуждению проблем визуальной социологии, и социально значимая часть видимого мира будет проговорена.

Е.Ю. Рождественская
В.В.Семенова