

The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis in
Contemporary Hollywood Comedies

Timothy Eric Smith

A Thesis

in

The Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Masters of Art (Film Studies) at

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

August 2012

© Timothy Eric Smith, 2012

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Timothy Eric Smith

Entitled: The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis
in Contemporary Hollywood Comedies

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Film Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards
with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

_____ Chair

Marielle Nitoslawska

_____ Examiner

Christine Ramsay

_____ Examiner

Marc Steinberg

_____ Supervisor

Thomas Waugh

Approved by

Luca Caminati
Graduate Program Director

August 1, 2012

Catherine Wild
Dean of the Faculty of Fine Arts

ABSTRACT

The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis in
Contemporary Hollywood Comedies

Timothy Eric Smith

This thesis will show how the Comedic Device Penis (CDP), an original concept to this work, elicits laughter and shock from an audience but remains strictly within the confines of a conservative, heteronormative sphere. This thesis expands on previous scholarly work showing the need to critically engage with the images of men and the male body. Chapter One deals with Sedgwick's theory of Male Homosocial Desire (MHD), from her book *Between Men* (1985), which is corroborated and/or exemplified in Hollywood comedies. The analysis shows how MHD is illustrated very well in Hollywood comedies, such as *The 40-Year-Old Virgin* (Judd Apatow 2005), and *Old School* (Todd Phillips 2003), among others. Chapter Two extrapolates on theories from Lehman's book *Running Scared* (1993), and a subsequent article "Crying Over the Melodramatic Penis" (2001) and the new concept of the CDP is conceived. Through a detailed textual analysis focusing on the aesthetics of film, this thesis will show how the representation of the penis is not eroticized and any positive references to homosexuality are avoided. The six Hollywood comedies that exemplify this new concept are: *Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story* (Jake Kasdan 2007), *Observe and Report* (Jody Hill 2009), *The Hangover* (Todd Phillips 2009), *Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay* (Jon Hurwitz and Hayden Schlossberg 2008), *Zack and Miri Make a Porno* (Kevin Smith 2008), and *Forgetting Sarah Marshall* (Nicholas Stoller 2008).

Dedication

For my mom and dad.

Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have been completed without the help of many people. First, I must express my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Thomas Waugh from the Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema at Concordia University. Without his help, dedication and support this thesis would not have been completed. As well, thanks go to my readers: Dr. Christine Ramsay of the University of Regina and Dr. Marc Steinberg of Concordia University. Next, my gracious compliments to my workshop groupies and all their feedback: Samuel Burd, Kaia Scott, Myriam Tremblay-Sher, Kelsey Haas, Matthew Ogonoski, Lindsey Campbell, Charlie EllBé and Jenny Sung. Thanks to my family: Pat Smith, Dayna Graf, Chris Smith and Jon Graf for helping to push me forward and offering me support at every turn. To those friends who always gave me words of encouragement and allowed me to bounce ideas off them, I am very grateful: Evangelos Tziallis, Tom Fish, Sam Dishaw, Curt Steckhan, Mark Gaspar, Marcin Wisniewski, Nic Bernier, Sarah Bartok, Kristian Ayre, , Jonathon Stradeski Jon Clarke, James Wilson, Davi Almeida, Eric Whedbee, and Kristen Alfaro. Finally, and certainly not least, thank you to the office staff at the Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema for their continuing support for all the students at Concordia University: Olivia Ward, Cheryl Williams and Amely Jurgenliemk.

Table of Contents

Introduction	The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis in Contemporary Hollywood Comedies.....	1
	Literature Review	5
	Thesis Question.....	20
Chapter One	Male Homosocial Desire: The Traffic in Women and Homo/Gyno-Phobia.....	26
Chapter Two	The Comedic Device Penis.....	49
	Phallic Power, Small Dicks and the Melodramatic Penis.....	49
	Comedy and Sight Gags.....	54
	The Comedic Device Penis.....	58
	Summary.....	86
Conclusion	89
References	100
Filmography	106
Appendix	113
	Films with full frontal male nudity between 2006 and 2011.....	115
	Table 1.1 - Films with full frontal male nudity between 2006 and 2011.....	132

The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis in Contemporary Hollywood Comedies

The action packed version of masculinity does not seem to be disappearing any time soon, if the box office is any indication, but another genre has surfaced that may undermine phallic masculinity. The past three decades of popular Hollywood cinema have developed changes in the presentation of the male body on screen. Contemporary Hollywood comedies referred to as “Dude Flicks” have started to put the penis on screen. These comedies have moved from hiding the non-hard body to revealing, and accepting, the flaccid body of the contemporary comic. The onset of nude flaccid bodies in contemporary Hollywood comedies has begun to open up discussions on new concepts of masculinity in popular American cinema. Discussing and referencing the penis, and more recently revealing it, are two sources of humour in these films. Reference to the penis also comments on the changing attitudes heterosexual men have in acknowledging male bodies. Unlike the polarity of phallic power and the “small dick” joke, discussed by Peter Lehman in his book *Running Scared: Masculinity and the Representation of the Male Body* (1993), contemporary comedies have begun to reference the penis in nontraditional and overt comedic ways.

In this thesis, I plan to expand upon Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s theory of Male Homosocial Desire, a social continuum among men, as it relates to the current contemporary Hollywood comedy cycle of “Dude Flicks” and “Bromance” films. In the “Bromance” cycle of films—or arguably film—men actively seek out the company of other men and their manners and actions tend to fall closely in line with

the theory Sedgwick delineated through English literature. In her theory, men actively seek the company of other men through the traffic in women and with inherent homophobia, a concept that will be elaborated on further in this thesis. The “Dude Flick” is similar in concept to this case in literature but the men are already engaged in a social continuum of male sociality at the outset of the film and do not, necessarily, seek out other men. Chapter one will focus on the relationships between these men and show how they adhere to the concepts of Male Homosocial Desire, specifically the traffic in women and homophobia, although the two ideological discourses are veiled behind an assumed acceptance of the gay and lesbian movement and women’s rights issues. I will be demonstrating how this is evident through my analysis.

The second chapter will focus on the representation of the male body on screen and specifically the penis. This chapter will explore how, in situations where the penis is revealed any allusions to homosexuality must be erased and the concept of men seeking the company of men cannot be associated with those men who see or show the penis. These films tend to fall out of the scope of the “Bromance” style. I will show how these films posit men in homosocial situations but the men do not seek the company of other men in the narrative. The penis, which I am calling the Comedic Device Penis in these films, is used as a comedic—and conservative—gag and is attached to a man who either does not reveal it in the presence of other men or, if he does, he cannot have any association with the Male Homosocial Desire in these films for fear of homosexual connotations. Some examples of the Comedic Device Penis cycle are: *The Hangover* (Todd Phillips 2009), *Harold & Kumar Escape*

from Guantanamo Bay (Jon Hurwitz and Hayden Schlossberg 2008), and *Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story* (Jake Kasdan 2007).

The revealing of the penis is not the only visible change in contemporary comedies; the relationship among men has shifted as well. There is a difference in men's relationships with each other from the 1960s and 1970s "Road Movies" to the latest "Bromance" film and "Dude Flicks." Heterosexual men have always been involved in each other's lives, but the contemporary comedy presentation of their "love" for each other has increased the denial of the homoerotic. Although the gay rights movement had begun during the early cycle of "Road Movies" it was very much a growing activist struggle at that time. With the current proliferation of gay characters in film and television, activism in the news media, and rights and equalities either gained or continuously fought for, current contemporary Hollywood comedies have increased the verbal denigration of homosexuals and continue to downplay the homoerotic. In addition, this supposed "love" still remains within the constraints of a patriarchal society as defined by Sedgwick, shaped by both homosocial dynamics of inherent homophobia and the traffic in women. Some titles that exemplify the "Dude Flick" cycle are: *The 40-Year-Old Virgin* (Judd Apatow 2005) as well as *Superbad* (Greg Mottola 2007), and the only "Bromance" film, I argue, is *I Love You, Man* (John Hamburg 2009).

In the 1950s and 1960s the cowboy epitomized the American masculine ideal, in actors such as John Wayne and Clint Eastwood, and more recently in the 1980s the ideal has been the bare skinned action hero, akin to Sylvester Stallone and Arnold Schwarzenegger. These are iconic embodiments of ideal masculinity, which

men can strive to become. In the new century, however, the comic embodies the look of the average American and contemporary Hollywood comedies tend to celebrate the failure of many men in not achieving the phallic hard body. While soft, flaccid men are present in action films, these characters are generally relegated to the role of the funny sidekick who neither gets the girl nor access to any of the stereotypically masculine traits assumed by the phallic hero. The hard body may exist in comedy films, but the nude flaccid body's recent presence on the screen has usurped some of the focus on male bodies and masculinity. As well, the flaccid body, inasmuch as it does not possess any of the stereotypically phallic connotations, has the ability to show the penis because it does not pose the threat of underwhelming phallic power.

Having established this cultural and generic context, I will then embark on a thorough formalist analysis of specific scenes from six recent contemporary Hollywood comedies—*Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story*, *Forgetting Sarah Marshall* (Nicholas Stoller 2008), *Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay*, *The Hangover*, *Observe and Report* (Jody Hill 2009) and *Zack and Miri Make a Porno* (Kevin Smith 2008)—and their presentation of male full frontal nudity vis à vis the Comedic Device Penis. This investigation will compare how the interactions among men remain well within the constraints of patriarchy and heteronormative society even in the face of the exposed penis. The penis remains a taboo subject in society and tends to fall within the same constraints in the academic world as well. Aside from Thomas Waugh, Richard Dyer, Margaret Walters, Susan Bordo, Peter Lehman and a handful of other scholars, most academics dealing with the male body either

forget the existence of the penis, preferring the concept of the phallus instead, or gloss over the penis's impact on cinematic and visual culture in Western society. The obvious gap in academia exists, in relation to contemporary Hollywood homosocial comedies as well¹, and it is something I hope to redress by drawing conclusions from Sedgwick's theory of Male Homosocial Desire that enables me to introduce how the relationships among men in these films adhere to and enhance her arguments. While comedy has many varied forms, discussed further in this thesis, my arguments will pertain to the recent phenomena of Dude Flicks and Bromance films. Then, I will show how the penis as comic device neither subverts or denies the power white heterosexual men currently possess.

Literature Review

The two scholars whose work is most pertinent to this thesis are Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Peter Lehman. Their respective work is elaborated extensively in further sections where I will integrate my synthesis and assessment of their contributions as they pertain to my arguments and analysis. Another important body of literature, which built on Laura Mulvey and analyzed discourses of masculinity within cinematic and visual culture, is also relevant to this thesis and I will summarize it at this point.

A plethora of books and anthologies released in the early 1990s, and after, began dealing directly with the changing representations of the male body in

¹ No scholars have dealt extensively with the idea of Male Homosocial Desire in relation to contemporary Hollywood comedies and few have made mention of the penis in this genre of film either.

cinema. They include, alongside Lehman's *Running Scared: Masculinity and the Representation of the Male Body* (1993); *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema* (Cohan and Hark 1992), *You Tarzan: Masculinity, Movies and Men* (Kirkham and Thumim 1993), *Spectacular Bodies: Gender, Genre, and the Action Cinema* (Tasker 1993), *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era* (Jeffords 1994), *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (Kimmel 1995), *Me Jane: Masculinity, Movies and Women* (Kirkham and Thumim 1995), *The Male Body: A New Look at Men in Public and in Private* (Bordo, 1999), and *Impossible Bodies: Femininity and Masculinity at the Movies* (Holmlund 2002). These books, along with their predecessor *Big Bad Wolves: Masculinity in the American Film* (Mellen 1977), pay particular attention to the hard-phallic bodies of the contemporary action star, their effects on culture and how representation has changed from the covered bodies of prior decades.

Margaret Walters' book *The Nude Male* (1978) lays out a comprehensive look at the nude male throughout the last few millennia. She highlights the fact that the male figure was a key component in art until approximately 200 years ago. Before that time "the naked gods and athletes of the ancient world, Christ stripped and suffering on the cross, [and] Michelangelo's sensuous but spiritual nudes" were at the epicentre of high art (Walters 7). In Western society today, however, "the word nude conjures up the image of a naked woman" (Walters 7). The hysteria of the Catholic Church and their desecration of nude male statues and paintings, by covering the genitalia with fig leaves, left the male figure wanting and paved the way for the female figure to come to the forefront. However, even though the Catholic

Church covered the penis, the phallus remained a symbol of patriarchal, religious and political power, even to this day.

Walters discusses how the phallus is revered in patriarchal culture and how it represents “abstract paternal power” and “remains the basis of present day religious and political attitudes” (Walters 8). At times, the entire male body may represent the phallus, in the overt structuring of male musculature, and at other times, it is represented with a penis, or phallic object.

While being nude can be challenging, the desire to see and the desire to be seen are strong impulses and forge crucial links in Walters’s argument: “To be naked can mean humiliating exposure, discomfort and shame. Or it can satisfy some of our profoundest narcissistic needs, the desire to be seen which is as basic as the desire to see” (Walters 10). Walters elaborates on this idea by stating that while earlier artisans would revel in the self-image of the nude male, they eventually transferred their “enhanced image” of manhood and its exposure onto the “submissive female” (Walters 13). As shown through advertising campaigns, pornography and other media the body is “an effective sales gimmick” and this can only be true because the world views the naked body as something that is still considered taboo (Walters 11).

While Walters’ book is very thorough and informative it bases its arguments on culturally accepted “High Art.” While Walters shows how, during the last 200 years, the male nude has relatively “disappeared” in High Art, Thomas Waugh

reveals its ubiquity in photography and film. He has published three books² collecting gay authored male nudes and erotic graphics in pre-1970 illicit or underground collections, as well as a monograph, *Hard to Imagine* (1996), focusing on two less disreputable parallel traditions of homoerotica in pictorial photography and art cinema, as well as in so-called “physique” photography and cinema, a soft-core erotic genre of the same period. Although not in the spotlight for various political and personal reasons, the nude male has never officially disappeared in the art world, nor in cinematic and visual culture more generally.

Furthering Walters’ work, Richard Dyer’s informative and influential article “Don’t Look Now: The Male Pin-Up” (1982) articulates the look given by the male pin-up. The woman, presented in a photograph, is meant to be looked at as she gazes modestly, and with patience, off frame; she is perceived as inviting the viewer to look. The man, on the other hand, “looks either off or up” suggesting his “interest in something else that the viewer cannot see” or “his mind is on higher things” (Dyer 63) and is perceived as lacking interest in the viewer. The instability generated by these images of men are: the male model is being looked at, but is attempting to deny it, and “the apparent address to women’s sexuality [veils] the actual working out of male sexuality... [and] what is at stake is not just male and female sexuality, but male and female power” (Dyer 66). Furthermore, the “emphasis on muscularity and the symbolic association of male power with the phallus” (Dyer 66) underpins these instabilities in terms of active/passive looking. While Laura Mulvey has

² *Out/Lines: Underground Gay Graphics from before Stonewall* (2002), *Gay Art: A Historic Collection* (2004), and *Lust Unearthed: Vintage Gay Graphics from the DuBek Collection* (2004).

clearly shown in her article “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” (1975) that women are meant to be looked at, and passive in certain contexts, Dyer is showing here that men must “disavow this element of passivity if they are to be kept in line with dominant ideas of masculinity-as-activity” (Dyer 66). Men are not supposed to simply offer themselves up for objectification, or more precisely, men are not objectified in the same way women are on film or in photographs. The male body, as opposed to the female body, is not meant for consumption. The male body is offered as a site of power, something to be achieved, not acquired.

Dyer furthers these ideas by showing how even if the male in a pin-up is not shown in action, the pose, and the muscular tautness still give the promise of eventual activity. The promise of sporting activity also lends itself to the notion of “relative affluence in Western society, where people have time to dedicate themselves to the development of the body for its own sake” (Dyer 68), where developed musculature is of key importance, in real life and in photographs. While women have “done” things to their body to achieve the “female body beautiful,” men have “achieved” their muscles, which “legitimizes male power and domination” (Dyer 71).

Citing Walters’ *The Nude Male*, Dyer shows that this muscular hardness is phallic; it is not that the muscles resemble a penis, but that the muscles represent “abstract paternal power” (Walters qtd. in Dyer 71). As Dyer elaborates: “The phallus is not just an arbitrarily chosen symbol of male power; it is crucial that the penis has provided the model for this symbol” (Dyer 71). Dyer emphasizes that the

penis can never live up to the power of the phallus, thus for the last few centuries the penis has been kept relatively hidden from view.

Originally published in *Screen* in 1983, the article "Masculinity as Spectacle: Reflections on Men and Mainstream Cinema," by Steven Neale, opens the anthology *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema* (1993). Neale begins his article by discussing Laura Mulvey's "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" and how influential her article was to film studies after its first publication in *Screen*. In discussing Mulvey's argument, Neale states that there is a need to borrow and adapt her frameworks, showing how "her remarks apply directly or indirectly to images of men, on the one hand, and to the male spectator on the other" (Neale "Prologue" 10). Neale further complicates Mulvey by claiming that she does not take into consideration the masochistic nature of the spectator, or the eroticism produced by the images of men. He continues his discussion of the male by looking at Mulvey's proposed voyeuristic and fetishistic looking. Mulvey says men are active and look while women are objectified and passive. The voyeuristic gaze is evident in male genres, specifically films that deal with a hero and male villain or any film "concerned largely or solely with the depiction of relations between men" (Neale "Prologue" 16). Using Sergio Leone's westerns as a basis for discussion, Neale uses the gunfight sequences to show how the gaze oscillates between the voyeuristic and fetishistic in the way the gun duelers are framed in lingering close-ups. However, Neale claims: "We are offered the spectacle of male bodies, but bodies unmarked as objects of erotic display" (Neale "Prologue" 18). He continues this argument and states that while the spectator is offered images of men, the

fragmented male body is not offered for direct viewing, or eroticism, but is mediated by the looks of the characters on the screen. However, the pauses in narrative do not rest on the male body: they are moments that ultimately resolve the drama. Images of Marlene Dietrich in her early von Sternberg films have lingering shots of her body that halt the narrative. These close-up shots of Dietrich, lounging and offering her body for display, have no direct impact on the narrative flow of the film. In contrast, the close-ups involving the male body, for instance Clint Eastwood in *A Fistful of Dollars* (Sergio Leone 1964), highlight the action taking place on screen. During a duel, the close-ups of Eastwood are used to increase narrative tension and push the story forward; they are not merely or “intentionally” objectifying Eastwood’s body.

These instances of objectifying the male body “involve an imbrication of both forms of looking [voyeuristic and fetishistic], their intertwining designed to minimize and displace the eroticism they each tend to involve, to disavow any explicitly erotic look at the male body” (Neale “Prologue” 18). Neale clarifies his position, using Rock Hudson as an example: in instances when the male body is eroticized, his body is feminized, thus strengthening Mulvey’s argument that women are “the objects of an explicitly erotic gaze” (Neale “Prologue” 18). Ultimately, Neale agrees with Mulvey’s assertion that the look is implicitly male, but states there is a need to use her theses and arguments to further reveal how the images of men on screen are operating. As Neale further elaborates, however, if critics and theorists were to look deeper into the male figure they would have to come to terms with homosexuality, something cinema has fought hard to disavow and denigrate. This

article, one of the first instances of looking critically at men on screen, concludes with the hopes that it will open a dialogue with and begin an investigation of the male image on screen.

The remainder of the anthology *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*, edited by Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark, also takes up Laura Mulvey's discussion of objectified women on screen, but extrapolates the argument in relation to the representation of men on screen. While they, and this author, agree there is a lot of work to be done on the representation of women in cinema, there is an important aspect of film that has been underdeveloped, the representation of men. Through a collection of essays, in four separate categories, they discuss the changing representation of the male body on screen. The first three essays deal with male dancers from the 1910-30s and how the display of their bodies is "made inextricable from their star images" (Cohan and Hark 4). The next four essays deal with the feminization of men in a range of genres from horror, to rape-revenge to Science Fiction and show how "a simultaneous repulsion accompanie[s] the attraction" to the men in these films (Cohan and Hark 5). The final two collections of essays are especially relevant to the discussion laid out in this thesis.

The third section incorporates three articles that deal with the structuring of masculine identities in relation to other men, not women. Through an analysis of male bonding and homoeroticism, Ina Rae Hark's article "Animals or Romans: Looking at Masculinity in *Spartacus*" (1993) dissects the film *Spartacus* (Stanley Kubrick 1960) for its polarity in portraying masculinities. Ultimately Hark claims

that finding an alternate masculine subjectivity is not possible in this film. Robyn Weigman's article "Feminism, 'The Boyz,' and other matters regarding the Male" (1993) uses *Boyz N the Hood* (John Singleton 1991) to discuss how race has been eliminated from most feminist critiques of masculinities. She formulates that the binary of masculine/feminine needs to incorporate the issues of race, as well as class. She concludes that she is not trying to appropriate African American film into the context of feminism but "that their representations provide an important (though not the only) public moment through which the entire domain of sexual difference can be rethought in the cultural context of white racial supremacy" (Weigman 189). On a similar theme, Cynthia J. Fuchs's article "The Buddy Politic" discusses the proliferation of interracial buddy films in the post-Vietnam era. She claims that the transgressiveness of racial tension replaces the homosexual anxiety inherent in male bonding: "these films efface the intimacy and vulnerability associated with homosexuality by the 'marriage' of racial others, so that this transgressiveness displaces homosexual anxiety" (Fuchs 195). The homophobia in such films also needs to be heightened, implicitly and explicitly, due to the removal or minimal use of women, as they "emphatically heterosexualize their homosocial protagonists" (Fuchs 196).

The final collection of three essays focuses on muscular men. The opening article by Chris Holmlund, "Masculinity as Multiple Masquerade: The 'mature' Stallone and the Stallone clone" (1993), uses Rivière, Lacan, Doane, Butler, Fanon and Bhabha's discussions of "interlocking masquerades" as a starting point for her ultimate discussion of the "cloning" of Sylvester Stallone in *Lock Up* (John Flynn

1989) and *Tango and Cash* (Andrey Konchalovskiy 1989). One of the key elements in Holmlund's argument pertinent to this thesis is:

The reflection of Stallone in the clones, combined with their constant framing, muscles bulging, in doors, mirrors, newspaper photos, and TV screens, leaves no doubt that these are men who are meant to be looked at, by men as much as if not more than by women. Clearly they are spectacles as well as actors. (Holmlund 220)

Holmlund is quick to point out, however, that a majority of viewers would not be cognizant of the fact these men are masquerading.

Yvonne Tasker's article furthers the discussion of Stallone in both *Lock Up* and *Tango and Cash*, but brings in Bruce Willis and his involvement in *Die Hard* (John McTiernan 1988) and *Die Hard 2: Die Harder* (Renny Harlin 1990) in her article "Dumb Movies for Dumb People: Masculinity, the body, and the voice in contemporary action cinema" (1993). Tasker determines that stardom is directly linked to masculine performance, spectacle, acting, and men's "anxieties to do with difference and sexuality increasingly seem to be worked out over the body of the male hero—an economy in which the woman has little space or function" (Tasker "Dumb Movies" 236).

The final essay in this anthology, "Can Masculinity be Terminated?" (1993) by Susan Jeffords, deals with the image of Arnold Schwarzenegger in *The Terminator* (James Cameron 1984) and *Terminator 2: Judgment Day* (Cameron 1991) and his shifting masculinities between the 1980s and 1990s. Schwarzenegger goes from having "the male body itself becoming often the most fulfilling form of spectacle"

(Jeffords "Can Masculinity" 245) to a type of father figure who internalizes his previous violent tendencies and learns to accept his personal traumas and work through them:

The Terminator [from *T2*] offers the ostensible explanation for why men of the 1980s are changing their behavior: they learn that the old ways of violence, rationality, single-mindedness, and goal-orientation ... were destructive, not only for individual men, but for humanity as a whole. And the solution for this dilemma? According to this film, for the 1980s man to learn from his past (future?) mistakes to produce a change in character, a "new," more internalized man, who thinks with his heart rather than with his head—or computer chips. (Jeffords "Can Masculinity" 253)

The 1980s man clearly evolves through the 1990s as a type of "new man" who tends to use the "voice" over the "body" to vent his frustrations. The male characters dealt with in the remainder of this thesis are certainly more in keeping with the man who uses his voice and his words to comment on and deal with his image, rather than his body, actions or explosions.

In her book *Spectacular Bodies: Gender, Genre and the Action Cinema* (1993), Yvonne Tasker furthers the argument made in her above-mentioned article. She takes a critical look at a genre of films that had been largely passed over by academics: the action film. Tasker assumes that action films are glossed over in academia because they seem "both *simple* and *obvious*" (Tasker *Spectacular Bodies* 10 emphasis in original) and are intended for the working class, whereas academic

cinema is for the privileged middle classes. While I agree with her that a critical eye needs to be turned towards popular cinema, a definite thrust of this paper, there are some aspects of these films that are “simple and obvious.” The meanings and existence of masculinities were being made increasingly apparent in the 1980s through the muscular bodies of Stallone and Schwarzenegger. Their images on screen were commenting on the “new man” of the early 1980s, a created image in advertising purporting to reflect the gains of 1970s feminism; this muscular hero was the antithesis of the “new man.” As his body was being revealed more and more in cinema, he became in turn a “category within the criticism of the day” (Tasker *Spectacular Bodies* 1). As well, “bodybuilding and health culture have generated an industry comparable to that of beauty culture, with competing systems and products marketed through different magazines” (Tasker *Spectacular Bodies* 10). By dissecting some of these films, specifically the bodies of the heroes and heroines, however, Tasker points out that these bodies are the focus of attention at times.

Tasker’s main man, so to speak, is Sylvester Stallone and his late 1970s and early 1980s film work in comparison to his changing image in the late 1980s and early 1990s. While Stallone embodied “muscularity” in films such as *Rocky* (John G. Avildsen 1976) and the *Rambo* series, preferring to use the body as his means of expressing his masculinity, he changes tack in the late 1980s and begins to use his voice. In films such as *Tango and Cash* Stallone chooses to cover his body and dresses in Armani suits, wears glasses and uses his words, first, to get out of difficult situations, but of course violence and aggression nevertheless remain a close second in the action genre.

Tasker's two main premises in the book are: 1) muscular action cinema was redefining "cinematic and cultural discourses of race, class and sexuality"; and 2) she is attempting to give an "account" of these films, not an "explanation," of the "pleasures and the political significance of these popular films" (Tasker *Spectacular Bodies* 5). Tasker ultimately believes that these popular films have something to say and she helps to determine what that is with a specific emphasis on the importance of visual spectacle. These types of films address a working class demographic and as such are glossed over by the academic elite. They do, however, have important cultural relevance to gender, race, class and sexualities and Tasker elucidates these claims throughout her book. Another key aspect of the book deals with the concepts of restraint and excess; the hero typically exhibits restraint in terms of his musculature and this is articulated through his body, whereas the villain is excessive in his use of strength.

Thomas Waugh briefly discusses, among other things, the issues of the muscular heroes of 1980s and 1990s in his recent article in Christine Ramsay's edited collection *Making it Like a Man* (2011). Waugh's article "What Do Heterosexual Men Want? Or 'The (Wandering) Queer Eye on the (Straight) Guy'" (2011) discusses male-male pedophilia in some recent Canadian films. While fleshing out his argument he does touch on an interesting feature of the action cinema Tasker is discussing:

[Visual artist] Hall's intuition is that these moments [of the suffering hero] are more essential to these films' appeal than their final perfunctory moments of ambiguous triumph, and one would be justified in concluding,

based on this evidence and Gibson's and Stallone's impeccable heterosexual credentials, that what heterosexual men really want is to sweat, strain, and struggle, to indulge in shame, suffering, pain, abjection, and humiliation, and to flaunt their bombastic pectorals and vulnerable effulgent armpits at audiences of millions in an excess of vulnerability, exhibitionism, and surrender. (Waugh "The (Wandering) Queer" 236)

Waugh astutely points out, albeit from a queer perspective, that these men possess the "looked-at-ness" Mulvey postulates in her famous article. As two of the top grossing stars of the 1980s and 1990s, Mel Gibson and Stallone are presumably well aware of what the presentation of their "bombastic pectorals" and "effulgent armpits" constitute for Western ideologies of masculinities, most importantly phallic masculinities.

In his 2009 book, *Manhood and Hollywood from Bush to Bush*, David Greven maps out his claim "that the struggle between narcissistic and masochistic modes of manhood defines the Hollywood masculinity in the Bush-to-Bush period" (Greven *Manhood and Hollywood* 3). While the George H.W. Bush era opened Hollywood to queer themes and homoeroticism, the themes of "death of gay" movies were still prevalent in the George W. Bush era. Greven shows how narcissism, while predominantly a pejorative term, may give license to the queer viewer to read these films, such as those discussed by Tasker and mentioned by Waugh, with an erotic tone, and may allow them to identify more readily with the characters. Greven further delineates how fetishism, in movies such as *Silence of the Lambs* (Jonathan Demme 1991), can be read as a strategy to avoid the homosexual, and that it is

closely equated with masochism in his line of arguing. The use of the “double protagonist” in film, one in which the two male leads combat each other for supremacy³, is developed through a look at *Fight Club* (David Fincher 1999). Greven shows how the perceived softening of masculinities of the Clinton era were relieved of femininity and queer sexualities by using violence and aggressive manhood. He furthers his investigation with a brief touching on the early queer narcissistic films of Vin Diesel and his ultimate turn to the more normative masochistic films.

In the anthology *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema* (2009), editor Santiago Fouz-Hernandez presents a collection of essays widening the scope of masculinity studies in cinema. Instead of reflecting on Hollywood proper, the essays in this collection broaden the horizon to other contemporary cinemas from France, Australia, and Asia. The three categories explored in the book are: national and ethnic identities; the body as a cinematic canvas; and the vulnerability and versatility of those gender and sexual identities usually associated with masculinity. Focusing on *The Pillow Book* (Peter Greenaway 1996), Fouz-Hernandez shows how the male penis is now a site for contemplation in contemporary narrative cinema: “[The Pillow Book] further emphasize[s] the vulnerability of a male body which is no longer to be perceived as monolithic, hard and invincible” (Fouz-Hernandez 4). The remaining articles in the book further his contemplation on the penis.

From an article dealing with the male Jewish body as originally a site of “suffering, humiliation, victimization, stereotyping, idealization and sexual

³ This is not to be confused with the “Buddy Film” where the two men aid each other rather than combat each other.

inadequacy” (Abrams 13), to an article on the working class body of the Australian male, this collection certainly allows the reader to understand experiences of a varied male body around the world, which is similar in themes and tensions. Particularly apropos for the research presented in this thesis is the article “Closer than Ever: Contemporary French Cinema and the Male Body in Close-Up” (2009), by Gary Needham. Needham points to several instances where the penis is a site of intense regulation and management, specifically in the cinematography, mise-en-scene, and editing. As well, he shows how the penis, if shown, is rarely given a point of view shot. If the penis is shown, it is not being looked at by anyone in particular, especially by other men. Through analysis he shows how the penis is usually relegated to long-shots and typically flaccid, which directly relates to Peter Lehman’s discussion of the penis in Hollywood films and various others from around the globe, a major critical launch pad for my argument in this thesis.

Thesis Question

As shown above Mulvey began a much needed look at the images of women on film which lead to the realization that the male body is also part of the ideological construction of the image and deserves a critical investigation. Dyer and Neale have clearly shown, very early in the discussion of masculinities, that the male body is not objectified but is available to be looked at by the viewer. The muscularity evident in pinups and the male body on screen was not offered for eroticism; rather these bodies were spectacularized. The body was as effective in characterizing phallic masculinities generally as the gun fights and explosions are in action films.

However, these 1980s and early 1990s muscular males were evolving and the focus of these men has moved from the body to the voice as they begin to think with their hearts and not their heads.

If the male body had “disappeared” from art 200 years ago, it certainly made a comeback in the 1980s action genre. However, the spectacle did not last and these muscular men donned clothing again. The 1990s brought the male body back, but a different body. With the less muscular body starting to appear and the penis starting to show itself more readily on camera, it is evident there is a critical cultural need to talk about the penis. As can be seen, and discussed periodically throughout this thesis, critical reviews of these films in magazines, newspapers and the Internet tend to devote a majority of their space to a few seconds of screen time involving the penis. The penis is still considered taboo in American culture but its presence is now a site/sight for the audience to contemplate and desire. The lack of phallic hard bodies in contemporary Hollywood comedies, in the face of the penis, shows how men are reclaiming their masculine power through their average bodies. They have failed to achieve the phallic body of the 1980s yet they celebrate their failure through their voice and the presentation of the penis, a topic to be further discussed later in this thesis. While there has been academic work on the penis, by Waugh and Lehman to name a few, there has been no critical look at the socializing of men in contemporary Hollywood comedies, especially when faced with overt representations of and/or references to the penis. This thesis is here to open up the discussion of contemporary Hollywood comedies, to show there is a need to take a

critical look at these types of films and that the taboo subject of the penis is important to grasp.

At this point, I feel the need to clarify my position in this reading of these texts and films. As Thomas Waugh states in his article "Homosociality in the Classical American Stag Film" (2001): "Sentimentality is something I myself may well be guilty of, however, for to me, as for many 'objective' observers who lean towards the homo end of the homosocial spectrum, the collective rituals of male homosociality are blatantly and inescapably homoerotic" (Waugh "Homosociality in the Classical" 280). I am a gay male and I definitely agree with Waugh's observation of the "blatantly and inescapably homoerotic" nature of Male Homosocial Desire enacted in these films and I, too, have read them as such. As well, it can be argued that a homosexual viewer would have a more vested interest in the male body as opposed to a heterosexual viewer and may interact with its representation on a more personal level. The topics discussed in this thesis, while readily available to all readers, are particularly pertinent to queer studies. The queer readings in this thesis are based on the research of a heterosexual man, Peter Lehman, but the inclusion of preeminent queer scholars such as Sedgwick, Waugh and other pioneers in the field of queer studies helps to clarify these issues affecting a queer reading and bring Lehman's work more readily into the queer world.

The "Dude Flick" and now "Bromance" comedies present predominantly white middle-class men in homosocial situations who are resentful, anxious and perceived as the victim. As Peter Alilunas discusses in his recent article "Male Masculinity as the Celebration of Failure" (2008), this representation stems from an

apparent “female evaluation that nothing they do is ‘ever good enough’” (Alilunas n. pag.). Beginning in the early 1990s, the proliferation of teen comedies “offers a fascinating record of the fluctuations and new currents in the shaping of masculine identity” (Greven “Dude” 14). The teen comedy films have grown to increase the “feminization” of men in Hollywood comedy that “construct their humor from the inadequacies and failures of white male masculinity” (Alilunas n. pag.). Although, as Alilunas further points out in his article, these films are sure to foreground the containment of a threat posed to masculinity by women.

Ultimately, in this genre of film white men succeed and triumph over the emasculating female. In films such as *Dodgeball* (Rawson Marshall Thurber 2004) and *Old School* (Todd Phillips 2003), the men end up as a “portrait of the latest cinematic version of ‘successful’ manhood: the celebration of failure” (Alilunas n. pag.). The films to be discussed in the following thesis subscribe well to the theories and thoughts presented by Alilunas, who has elaborated on earlier theorists. As well, the films discussed all stem from, or are directly connected with, producer/director/writer Judd Apatow and his entourage of actors, writers and directors, or follow the same stylistics to which Apatow et al adhere.

David Greven suggests that these new Hollywood comedies tend to be “part of the feminist and gay movements’ efforts to challenge dominant culture” (Greven “Dude” 14), but I argue they tend to fall short in terms of adequate representations of homosexuality and female power (Greven “Dude” 14). In line with Sedgwick’s theory on Male Homosocial Desire, “western culture has a long tradition of ‘romantic friendships’ between men, intensifying homosocial relations to the point

where they blur into the homoerotic” (Jenkins “Reception Theory” 175-76). Heteronormative patriarchal culture however, relies on homophobia to maintain its control over society. While early “Dude Flicks” could foreground homosocial relationships bordering on the homoerotic or even homosexual (for instance the prolonged kiss between Ashton Kutcher and Seann William Scott in *Dude, Where’s My Car?* (Danny Leiner 2000)) with the revealing of the penis all allusions to homosexuality must be eradicated. The penises presented in each of these films cannot be portrayed in overt homosexual situations. The directors of each film are careful to place the penis in strictly heterosexual situations and even show most male characters present having adverse reactions to the sight of the penis.

Through a thorough analysis of the relationships among men in recent Hollywood comedies this thesis will delineate how Sedgwick’s theory of Male Homosocial Desire is exemplified in these films and how, although failing in their attempts to attain traditional phallic superiority, the men in these films are still celebrating their success: their success at failure to conform to behaviour standards set for them by women. As well, through an analysis of film sequences and the use of framing, shot composition, editing, camera angles, and other film aesthetics, this thesis will show how the penis is presented in unusual situations where it is not called for and used as a comedic device. The scenes with full frontal male nudity firmly (flaccidly?) place the penis within heterosexual situations and eliminate any reference to homosexuality as demanded by heteronormative patriarchy and Male Homosocial Desire.

As laid out in this introduction, and elaborated on at the beginning of subsequent chapters, there is a definite need to pay critical attention to popular Hollywood films. The male body and the penis are definite taboos in American culture and the hysteria caused by their presentations is a symptom of American fear and suppression of homosexuality.⁴ The puritanical nature of American culture, its inability to look at or accept the naked male body, is in a state of flux in current Hollywood comedies. As Peter Lehman has shown through his work, discussed in detail further in this thesis, the sight of the penis can be caused by, or cause, melodramatic situations that are seen as detrimental to phallic power. However, the sight of the penis still falls strictly within the realm of Sedgwick's theory of Male Homosocial Desire, also discussed at length in the next chapter. While academic literature regarding men on screen has expanded since its emergence in the early 1980s, this thesis will further the discussion and investigation of the male body in contemporary Hollywood comedies, something that requires attention. Through the lens of Sedgwick's Male Homosocial Desire and my own theory of the Comedic Device Penis in contemporary Hollywood comedies this thesis will expand the academic lexicon on masculinities in contemporary American cinema.

⁴ As noted in the Appendix to this thesis, thirty-five of the eighty-five American productions are gay themed, or in the least gay positive. However, it is important to note that only three of the films were released by a major Hollywood studio; *Zack and Miri Make a Porno*, *Brüno* and *Taking Woodstock* and only one of these films, *Brüno*, actually highlights gay sex.

Chapter One

Male Homosocial Desire: The Traffic in Women and Homo/Gyno-Phobia

The term homosocial has been used occasionally since the 1960s to signify any relationship between two, or more, people of the same gender, be it nonsexual or otherwise. In her book *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (1985), Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick determines that in current, and historical, Western patriarchal societies men base their relationships with other men on the inherent dynamic of homophobia and the traffic in women. Her theory is derived from the study of seventeenth to nineteenth-century literature because the novels of those periods tended to focus on “condensed, self-reflexive and widely influential change in economic, ideological and gender arrangements” (Sedgwick 1). Although based on literature, her theory of Male Homosocial Desire is meant as groundwork for applying to other texts and media. Her theory cannot “be understood outside of its relation to women and the gender system as a whole” (Sedgwick i) and class is also a vital component. It is important to stress that Male Homosocial Desire is dichotomous with homosexuality, they are not one and the same, and in fact Male Homosocial Desire is fraught with and requires intense homophobia according to patriarchal structuring.

According to Heidi Hartman, patriarchy is built on “relationships between men which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women” (Hartman “The Unhappy Marriage” 15). Also important to this discussion is the treatment of homosexuality in patriarchy. Gayle Rubin, a cultural anthropologist

and sex theorist, states: “The suppression of the homosexual component of human sexuality, and by the corollary, the oppression of homosexuals, is... a product of the same system whose rules and regulations oppress women” (Rubin qtd. in Sedgwick 3). Patriarchy, according to Sedgwick “structurally includes homophobia, therefore patriarchy structurally requires homophobia” (Sedgwick 4). Furthermore, Male Homosocial Desire is based on the following assumptions:

The concomitant changes in the structure of the continuum of “male homosocial desire” were tightly, often causally bound up with the other more visible changes; that the emerging pattern of male friendship, mentorship, entitlement, rivalry and hetero- and homosexuality was in an intimate and shifting relation to class; and that no element of that pattern can be understood outside of its relation to women and the gender system as a whole. (Sedgwick 1)

The recent phenomenon of “Dude Flicks,” and the related category Segwick’s theory of Male Homosocial Desire continuously plays out in the following homosocial comedies. “Bromance,” evolved from the late 1960s and 1970s male road movie, such as *Easy Rider* (Dennis Hopper 1969) and *Smokey and the Bandit* (Hal Needham 1977). The road movie evolved in the 1980s and 1990s with the interracial buddy films, discussed by Fuchs and Tasker, *Lethal Weapon* (Richard Donner 1987) and one that is inexplicably missed, *Beverly Hills Cop* (Martin Brest 1984), which in turn metamorphized into the teen comedies and “Dude Flicks” of the late 1990s and early 2000s with titles such as *American Pie* (Paul Weitz 1999) and *Dude, Where’s My Car?*. Finally, the late

2000s brought us the “Bromance” film *I Love You, Man* and furthered the “Dude Flick” cycle with *Superbad*, among others. Throughout these films, men have become progressively weaker, both physically and mentally. The austere butchness and “phallic spectacle” of Peter Fonda, in his biker gear, and Burt Reynolds, in his cowboy attire, transformed into the aloof characters of Mel Gibson in his trailer on the beach, and Judge Reinhold in his social ineptitude. These men got younger as the years went by and became sexually frustrated and confused characters; Jason Biggs has sex with pies and Ashton Kutcher and Seann William Scott kiss passionately to one-up Fabio and his girlfriend. Finally, Paul Rudd as the consummate failure in stereotypical masculinity goes on an expedition to find a best man in the epitome of “Bromance” films *I Love You, Man*. As well, women become increasingly emasculating and as always homophobia is ever present, especially when homoeroticism may be involved.

While women are part of the narrative at almost every turn they are used as currency among the men to strengthen their bonds: Riggs (Mel Gibson) and Murtaugh (Danny Glover) trade stories about their wives; Jim (Jason Biggs) uses a Spanish exchange student as a sexual object to increase his fame and notoriety within his circle of friends; and Jesse (Ashton Kutcher) and Chester (Seann William Scott) swap numerous stories about girlfriends even though the latter are absent for most of the film. These films evolved in the mid-2000s to reincorporate female characters but this thesis will show how the women who cannot be used as a means to strengthen male/male relationships are relegated to the role of emasculating women. On the other hand, those women whom the men can use to solidify their

relationships are suggested by these narratives to be appropriate representations of women.

This chapter will outline Sedgwick's argument and use a variety of "Dude Flicks" and the "Bromance" film, among others, to show how her theory is substantiated in these contemporary Hollywood comedies. *The 40-Year-Old Virgin* is particularly relevant here. The film is a comedy about a group of men who all work together at Smart Tech, an electronics store, and their continuing struggle to help Andy (Steve Carrell) lose his virginity. The entire structuring of the film falls closely in line with Sedgwick's theory of the traffic in women and is rife with homophobia.

Sedgwick lays out her research and support for her theories in ten separate chapters. Chapter One focuses on the triangular relationship of heterosexual desire and lays out "the basic paradigm of 'male traffic in women' that will underlie the entire book" (Sedgwick 16). Basically, the bond between one man and his female love interest is as strong as the bond between the two men competing for her affections. At times one man selects the love interest only because she is already the object of desire of another man and in these cases the homosocial bond between the men is stronger than the bond between either man and the woman.

The film *Dumb and Dumber* (Bobby and Peter Farrelly 1996) has a classic example of this type of bonding. In the film, Lloyd Christmas (Jim Carrey) is in pursuit of the woman of his dreams, Mary Swanson (Lauren Holly), and when Harry (Jeff Daniels) feels he is losing his friend he, in turn, pursues Mary. The two friends ultimately become closer to each other because of the potential relationship with

Mary, which does not happen for either man. During their road trip across the USA Lloyd constantly regales Harry with stories of the future he imagines with Mary, to which Harry happily listens. When the friendship between the two men is strained because Lloyd is too devoted to Mary, Harry steps in and also woos Mary in a successful attempt to win Lloyd back. Lloyd and Harry constantly bicker and even get physically aggressive with each other, having a sort of wrestling match, but it is clear that Mary has little or nothing to do with this; she is either absent or relegated to the sidelines. Lloyd and Harry love each other and to avoid the assumed complications involved with homosexuality they resort to using a woman to strengthen their bond.

Sedgwick compares these erotic triangles to the Oedipal triangle. The boy must pass “through the stage of the ‘positive’ Oedipus, a homoerotic identification with his father, a position of effeminized subordination to the father, as a condition of finding a model for his own heterosexual role” (Sedgwick 23). Furthering this idea Sedgwick declares that:

In any male-dominated society, there is a special relationship between male homosocial (including homosexual) desire and the structures for maintaining and transmitting patriarchal power: a relationship founded on an inherent and potentially active structural congruence. (Sedgwick 25)

Therefore, even in the absence of a “beloved” or female component to the triangle the bond between the two men may take on the ideologies of homosexuality, or more often than not, homophobia. However, it can be argued that in some instances

one of the men in these triangles may not be pursuing the woman. In cases such as this the woman is still used as a means to strengthen the bond between the men and to help deny homosexuality. If our society were to eliminate homophobia, according to Sedgwick, the entire social and economic structures of our society would have to change.

In *The 40-Year-Old Virgin*, on their first evening out on the town in an attempt to find Andy a woman, Jay (Romany Malco) lays out the codes for finding the appropriate woman. Jay describes the perfect woman to Andy: drunk, not tipsy, perhaps with some vomit in her hair and a broken heel would be a plus. Thus, such a woman is one who is incapable of making an informed decision, a woman you can basically rape.⁵ As Jay further points out there is a “genetic code” imprinted on men which says: “tackle drunk bitches.”

When Jay finally shows Andy how to scope out potential women he does not even have to look at them directly. Andy is to find the “perfect woman” by using his peripheral vision. Not only do women not need to be present, these men do not even have to look at women to use them to bond. When Andy eventually tracks down his first woman of the movie, she is definitely drunk enough. While driving him back to her place she sideswipes a half dozen cars and eventually has an accident with another vehicle, after which she vomits all over Andy. She may not have vomit in her hair, but Andy certainly does and she will still have sex with him if

⁵ Ronnie (Seth Rogen), from *Observe and Report*, has the same “epiphany” with his love interest Brandi (Anna Faris). Ronnie spends the movie talking about Brandi with his male coworkers and how his attempts to woo her have been largely unsuccessful. In the end, however, he gets her blackout drunk and rapes her, and, true to form, she even vomits during coitus.

he wants, but Andy declines the offer. This unsuccessful tryst leads to Andy's ability to bond further with his coworkers. Even when presented with the opportunity to lose his virginity Andy declines but in turn uses this failed opportunity with a woman to endear himself with his male comrades. Andy now has a story to share with these men about his experience with women, as will be shown further in this chapter. When Andy does manage to get a phone number from a woman, Trish (Catherine Keener), who is sober, it is further cause for celebration.

The four friends: Andy, Jay, Cal (Seth Rogen) and David (Paul Rudd), go out to a bar for drinks, with no women present, to praise and congratulate Andy. These men are obviously using women to strengthen the bonds between themselves. In relation to the class structures that Sedgwick talks about, it is here that these working class men determine that Andy needs to go "through a bunch of hood rats" (or lower class women) before he gets to the "upper echelon," or Trish, the sober woman with a job, a woman of higher class.

In Chapter Two Sedgwick's discussion of Shakespeare's Sonnet forty-two further elaborates on the use of the triangular relationship in Male Homosocial Desire. Both the speaker and the "fair youth" have a desire for the "dark lady," but it is also evident that the speaker desires the "fair youth." The speaker is not lamenting on the loss of his "dark lady," he is lamenting on the loss of his "fair youth" to the "dark lady:"

That thou hast her, it is not all my grief,

And yet it may be said I loved her dearly;

That she hath thee is of my wailing chief

A loss of love that touches me more nearly.

(Shakespeare qtd in Sedgwick 29)

The love in the homosocial bond between the men exists to give rise to the heterosexual coupling between one “rival” and the “beloved.” Male bonding is a necessary facet to heterosexual love, regardless of whether homosexual desire is enacted upon, or even existed between the rivals.

In light of the above observations it is also important to note that a man who would rather spend time with his wife or girlfriend is considered “pussy whipped,” and is subsequently teased by his friends. Essentially, his power within homosocial patriarchy is diminished. However, communing with other men about a woman is an acceptable code of practice. Because male/male homosocial relationships are so stable, or “spatially conceived,” they can easily serve as the foundation for building a patriarchal world. Because lust, or male/female relationships are volatile, or “temporally conceived” and time can change everything, men must structurally incorporate homophobia into their relationships to elide any reference to homosexuality. As well, this whole scenario relegates women to subservient and/or emasculating positions of powerlessness (Sedgwick 45).

During a scene where Andy and David share a coffee and discuss the issues of Andy’s virginity, David admits the emasculating effect of his ex-girlfriend Amy (Mindy Kaling). Previously, David lauded Jay because of his sexual promiscuity, having multiple lovers outside of the relationship with his wife; Jay is seen as a virile man because of his sexual prowess. However, the supposed love of David’s life, Amy, performed fellatio on another man while dating David and it ruined him: “If

she wants to be some immature little bitch and blow everybody, that's love man." She is deemed a whore for her actions and by correlation an emasculating woman. Because of her transgression David drinks too much, cannot cope with life or stress and is less of a man in the eyes of his peers. His failure is not his own, it belongs to the woman who did this to him, and, by eventually denying Amy the power she possesses, David celebrates his own failures. By the end of the film David does celebrate and accept his failure, first by becoming celibate, then by proving his mastery over another, more conventionally attractive, and white, woman he can flaunt in front of his friends. There is definitely a double standard in place in these movies. The character of Amy falls in line with Sedgwick's next area of investigation.

In Chapter Three Sedgwick expands on how "the routing of homosocial desire through women is clearly presented as compulsory" (Sedgwick 49). She uses the idea of the cuckold to illustrate this. Sedgwick clearly shows how the action of cuckolding is actually performed by one man on another man. When women are unfaithful the act of betrayal is performed by one man on another man through the use of a woman. This is one of the few instances where a woman must actually be present in Male Homosocial Desire. In her analysis of *The Country Wife* (1675), by William Wycherley, Sedgwick further shows how men use women to strengthen their bond with other men. In typical fashion one of the characters parades his woman in front of the other men. Sparkish parades his fiancée around asking: "Do you approve of my choice?" He is clearly looking for affirmation within his bond with other men by using the woman as a device for approval.

Jim's online sexual encounter in *American Pie* can attest to this fact. Not only does he manage to gain access to the gorgeous female exchange student, Nadia (Shannon Elizabeth), he publicly airs his sexual encounter via the Internet. This is certainly not done to aid in his relationship with Nadia, as she is completely unaware of the act. It is indeed Jim parading around the gorgeous currency he has acquired in order to improve his relationship with his male friends. It is obvious Jim's intent was to have sex with Nadia, but even in the failed sexual encounter he does increase his social standing with his male friends.

A man who lusts after another man's female love interest is not always doing so because he wants the woman. He may be doing so to prove his mastery over another man. Even if the homosocial bond in these instances may be invisible, his power to take the "currency" of another man proves his mastery over men, thus proving his masculinity. Furthermore, as happens at times in these movies, the woman involved in the affair is shown as emasculating. In *Old School*, Mitch (Luke Wilson) catches his wife Heidi (Juliette Lewis) in the act of a sexual three-way with another woman and a man. Because of her treachery Mitch can now put the blame for his failures on her and not on himself. Mitch leaves Heidi and moves into a home located on the nearby college campus where he, Bernard (Vince Vaughn) and Frank (Will Ferrell) start one of the most notorious of homosocial institutions, a fraternity. Mitch's failures with Heidi ultimately lead to his success in maintaining and strengthening his homosocial bonds.

Throughout the course of the movie Dean Pritchard (Jeremy Piven) threatens to shut down the fraternity. Dean Pritchard's motives stem from his college years

when Mitch, Frank and Bernard made him a social outcast and did not allow Pritchard access to the homosocial group. Yet, the strength of this grouping, and their determination to succeed despite their respective wives, ultimately lead to their success. Bernard wants to escape the trappings of marriage and fatherhood, Frank wants to relive his glory days as a drunken fool in spite of his wife's WASPish tendencies and Mitch can only do this because he has to prove to himself, and ultimately to his emasculating wife, that he is a man. Granted, this film ends with a heterosexual marriage, typical in Hollywood films, therefore one may assume that a sequel would play out similarly, as the multitudes of other sequels in this genre have proven: *American Pie 2* (J.B. Rogers 2001) and *American Wedding* (Jesse Dylan 2003). Both of these films follow a narrative structure similar to the original *American Pie* and other films in this genre.

In Chapter Four Sedgwick shows how there is a strong division in homosocial bonds along class lines. In *A Sentimental Journey* (1768), by Laurence Sterne, LaFleur the servant is childlike and belongs *with*, not *to*, Yorick, the master and adult of the relationship. Yorick feels compelled to treat LaFleur as a servant but since he is a man he also sees in him his own flesh and blood. The childlike LaFleur has a much easier time cavorting with women, the servants of the matrons that Yorick is courting. But both men use each other as a means to obtain women: "Yorick's bourgeois and male-homosocial needs lead him to adopt a pastoral, split view: LaFleur can be both cast as feckless, dependent child and sexually expert father/advisor" (Sedgwick 71-72). In this instance, women of a lower class are viewed as sexually one-sided. They are there to test the will of the male; will he

succumb to temptation? Women of equal and especially higher-class can “express reproach, severity or sexual refusal” (Sedgwick 78) and a bigger challenge for men’s sexual conquests.

Jay, Cal and David assume that Andy needs to lose his virginity to a lower-class woman, or “hood rat” as they call such women. It is Trish, the more affluent, upper middle-class woman who sexually refuses Andy, while Beth (Elizabeth Banks), another lower-class individual, throws herself at Andy, even masturbating for him. Even though Andy is the titular virgin, it is Trish who makes the initial offer to withhold sex in their relationship. As well, the other three men use these lower-class women as sexual objects and trade in them on a regular basis. Beth is temptation and Trish is the prize. In order to “get with” Trish, Andy has to remove himself from the lower class and give up his immaturity. This film, and many others in the corpus, use lower-class women as sexual objects—they are the most common form of “currency” men trade in—whereas higher-class women are frequently cast as emasculating. Because a woman of higher standing is shown as having power, strength and a semblance of control over men in these movies, thanks in part to 1970s feminism, the male directors ensure their demise, or, at least fashion them as characters the audience will not like. Andy accomplishes both, acquisition of a higher-class woman and a move up in social standing, and the leaving behind of his immaturity, by selling off all his collectible toys and making nearly half a million dollars. Now that he has wealth, status and maturity, what white patriarchal society deems a necessity, he can finally consummate his relationship with Trish. Andy finally has more power than the upper-class Trish and may usurp her authority.

The film finishes in the standard Hollywood heteronormative ending of a wedding between a man and a woman after which Andy proves his virility by literally fucking Trish into submission.

The next two chapters of Sedgwick's book deal insightfully with the homophobia inherent in Male Homosocial Desire. In the late seventeenth century, as Sedgwick states, there is evidence of legal pogroms against men based on their homosexual identity and

while male genital homosexuality may or may not be "a function of society itself"—that is to say, a necessary, noncontingent element in the structure of social continuity and exchange—it should be clear that the larger category of male homosocial desire does have that signal importance. (Sedgwick 85-86)

By systematically terrorizing the molly houses, and other gathering places of homosexual behaviour, the majority (patriarchy) exerts a force over homosocial bonds. No man would decide to be homosexual, because this could lead to blackmail, terrorism or other such threats. Therefore, the homosocial bonds between men would be possible with few instances public of homosexual flare-ups. Or as Sedgwick succinctly states it: "For a man to be a man's man is separated only by an invisible, carefully blurred, always-already-crossed line from being 'interested in men'" (Sedgwick 89).

In her treatment of *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824), by James Hogg, Sedgwick expands on the idea of the traffic in women and its relation to internalized homophobia in homosexual men. If a man enters into a

relationship with a woman, with the idea of removing himself from the realm of the homosocial, he is feminized in the eyes of the same men he was associated with, and is assumed to be attempting to deny or diminish the homosocial bond.

In *Old School* Frank is accused of ruining the friendship he, Bernard and Mitch have at his own wedding. Bernard audibly derides Frank for entering into marriage and begs him to rethink his decision, even as his bride is walking down the aisle. Bernard cites his own marriage and family as the cause of his greatest anxieties and flaws. It is interesting, however, that Bernard is rarely seen cavorting with his wife. Her only influence in the film is through Bernard's voicing of her emasculatory nature and it is always in the presence of Mitch and/or Frank. Although Bernard entered into a relationship with a woman he denies her emasculating powers by using them to strengthen his ties to his male friends. By the end of the film Frank leaves his wife. His ties to his brethren prove much stronger than his commitment to heterosexual marriage. Thus Bernard exemplifies Sedgwick's point further by showing that if a man enters into the male/female relationship with the guise of maintaining and strengthening his homosocial bond with other men, to prove his virility and masculinity, he is lauded.

Another example of this can be found in *The Hangover*. Stu (Ed Helms) can be used as an example for both these types of men. His relationship with his emasculating wife Melissa (Rachael Harris) is constantly remarked on by Phil (Bradley Cooper) as the biggest strain on their friendship. Stu has to lie to his wife about going to Las Vegas with his friends because Melissa would not approve. Phil knows this and uses it as a means to publicly flog his friend. When Phil and the gang

arrive to pick up Stu for the road-trip, Phil screams at Stu from the car, calling him “Dr. Faggot!” Because Stu chose a woman over his homosocial bonds he is effeminized, but because the rest of the crew wants him back they are sure to frame their desire for him with homophobic remarks. They have to be sure this need for Stu is not construed as homosexual. Stu’s eventual, albeit illegal, marriage to Jade (Heather Graham) is seen as palatable because she is a stripper and lower class. The merry gang of men can use Jade as a means to gain access to a plethora of sexually overt women, in one of the greatest homosocial spaces, the strip club. This could easily be related to the class of these women too. Melissa is higher class, thus emasculating, and Jade is lower class and accepts being used as currency—as most strippers do in film.

However, if a man does not use women to appropriate for himself the homosocial bond he is again feminized or ostracized from the group, which can be applied to homosexual men, or assumed homosexuals. In *Private Memoirs* the younger, nerdy, feminine Robert “cannot desire women enough to be able to desire men through them” and the older, sporty, masculine George “relates to his male acquaintances as a man, because he has the knack of triangulating his homosocial desire through women” (Sedgwick 102). Since Robert is codified as homosexual, and as he is unable to “desire women enough,” he finds it difficult to ingratiate himself in the world of George and his companions. Similarly, Andy is assumed to be gay until he manages to find a way to use women to enhance his social standing with his male friends.

Peter Klaven (Paul Rudd) has a gay brother, Robbie (Andy Samberg), in the film *I Love You, Man*. While the first out gay character in this genre of films and a definite positive step in the right direction for these types of films, Robbie is still denied any access to the homosocial world of Peter. While Peter is not the best at ingratiating himself among men, at least he is given the opportunity. Robbie is at all times relegated to the outside of the homosocial bonds apparent in this film. It is only at the end of the film, during a heterosexual marriage, that Robbie is shown as part of the group. However, it is his brother's wedding and a family affair and as such it would be assumed Robbie would be allowed to participate, as his family accepts his homosexuality, regardless of how society interprets it.

In other films where a character is thought to be homosexual, but still maintains ties within the homosocial group, another tactic may be used. Echoing Fuchs and Weigman's arguments about the use of the "other," specifically black "others," *The 40-Year-Old Virgin* uses the character of Jay to displace the homosexual anxiety between Andy and Jay. Jay is the key mentor for Andy's foray into the world of women and since Jay is an "other" the audience may read the assumed racial tensions as more problematic than the possibility of homosexual connotations. During a grossly stereotypical scene, another black man who asks for a special deal for another "brother" confronts Jay. When Jay refuses, the customer berates him by saying Jay is in the employ and control of the "white master" and has lost his integrity as a black man. Jay retaliates with his own rhetoric of stereotypes laid upon lower-class black men. When Andy comes to the "rescue," the racial tensions hit an apex. At this point the assumed racial tensions throughout the film are shown

point blank and any homosexual anxiety is displaced. In addition, the uses of homophobic comments in this film help to further enhance the heterosexuality of these men.

Sitting around a poker table, a stereotypically masculine space in cinema, Jay, David and Cal swap stories about recent sexual conquests to prove their virility as men. Jay has a woman with whom he can perform any sexual act imaginable; Cal has a woman with whom he continually has sex; while David, however, is love-struck by an ex-girlfriend from two years previous. David is effeminized in the eyes of his friends because he still “loves” a woman who left him. He should not care that this woman is gone, he should be on the prowl for the next sexual conquest, and by reminiscing about this woman he is essentially “killing the vibe” the men had going on swapping stories about “pussy” and “tits.”

Andy, sensing the dynamics of this male grouping, makes up a story about having sex with a woman. Andy wants to fit in and can plainly see that the only way into this group of men is to trade in the currency of women. His story is fake and it is evident that he has not had sex with a woman. Jay instantly asks if he is gay, which Andy promptly denies. The men clarify that it is ok if Andy is gay because Jay has “friends who fuck guys” in jail (a space without women). When the other men determine that Andy is indeed a virgin they decide to make it their personal mission to find him a woman. Moreover, as Jay puts it “From now on your dick is my dick.” The woman, who is not even present, forms the basis of this relationship among these men. They never cared for Andy before, but now they know they can use women in order to get closer to Andy. Even in the absence of the “beloved,” she is

used as a tool to strengthen the bond between these men. When Andy returns to work the next day, fearing ridicule, all the men at the store, even some customers, begin to deride him. When Andy flees, the only person to go after him is David, a man who knows all about feeling effeminized. But again, these two men swap stories about women who are not present in order to bridge the gap between them and strengthen their bond.

Chapter Seven of Sedgwick's book furthers the discussion on class and the traffic in women elaborated above. In Alfred Lord Tennyson's *The Princess: A Medley* (1847) the Prince is promised marriage to the Princess as a means to unite the north and south of the country. By refusing his advances the Princess inadvertently begins a war between the North and the South. The Prince winds up a casualty of the war and the Princess nurses him back to health and they wed. The two important concepts that Sedgwick gleans from this are: 1) "the Prince's erotic perceptions are entirely shaped by the structure of the male traffic in women—the use of women by men as exchangeable objects, as counters of value, for the primary purpose of cementing relationships with other men" (Sedgwick 123) and 2):

the cataclysmic pressure of male homosocial complicity is uncannily supra-individual. At its most stressed moments, it can bridge class at the same time as generic/ontological difference—it can melt into one the forge and the forger, or the man who works with his hands and the man who writes fifty of them. (Sedgwick 132)

In Chapter Eight Sedgwick begins to show some of the changes that occurred when the

transfer of sexual regulations [moved] from religious institutions and ideologies to a complex of secular ideologies such as the state and the sciences of medicine and individual psychology... [which] increasingly stressed and invasive homophobic division of the homosocial spectrum. (Sedgwick 134)

Many of these changes occurred as people moved from agrarian cultures to the cities and Sedgwick specifically cites the use of women in relation to the desires of men. Men, as Sedgwick shows, both desire and condemn women for the traits they share with them. Men call women whores if they sleep around, but at the same time want to sleep with them. In William Makepeace Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq.* (1852), the character of Rachel is continually flogged by her brother for being too flirtatious with and dressing up for men. At the same time, however, he uses this quality of hers to attempt to give her to one of his friends. As well, men tended to use women who had power, or status, in society to elevate their own positions and in turn relegate the women into positions of powerlessness: "Sex as such not only resembles and conveys but represents powers including—but not only—the power relations of gender" (Sedgwick 157).

Again, Stu's marriages to Melissa and Jade can be used here to exemplify this configuration. Melissa is deemed a whore because she cheated on Stu. The men hate her because she cuckolded Stu. However, Jade's assumed whore status is praised by the men because it grants them access to other women and ultimately strengthens the bond between the friends. Mitch's wife is deemed a whore for exploring her sexuality; Mitch, conversely, is praised for exploring his sexuality with

a variety of college women. Beth is a wanton woman and Cal, Jay and David warn Andy to stay away, but Jay has already had sex with her and Cal presumably has sex with her too. Thus, their traffic in women works to strengthen their phallic power and sexual prowess, while turning the women into disposable objects.

In Chapter Nine Sedgwick uses Charles Dickens' *Our Mutual Friend* (1865) to show how homophobia is sustained in the literature she is reviewing. As well, she discusses the homosocial/homosexual lifestyles of Victorian England. She cites the "Wilde Affair" and the "dissemination across classes of language about male homosexuality," the advent of psychology and the medicalization of homosexuality as key turning points in homophobic discourses and the traffic in women (Sedgwick 179). The aristocracy had distinct "homosexual role[s] and culture[s]" (like the individuals involved in the American Stonewall revolution) and people knew this; they were involved with effeminacy, transvestism, promiscuity, and prostitution. The educated middle-class had a form of sexual freedom, but nothing like the aristocracy. The middle-class sexualities were generally given to denials: "the sexuality of a single gentleman was silent, tentative, protean, and relatively divorced from expectations of genre, though not of gender" (Sedgwick 173-174). For the working class, there are few literary accounts. Due to the power structures in Victorian England, literacy and access to information were restricted to the middle and upper classes and the working class was glossed over in a lot of the literature of the day. Sedgwick points out, or at least assumes, that any acts of homosexuality among the lower classes took the shape of acts of violence.

As seen in many prison movies, like *Tango and Cash* and *Lock Up* and especially in the graphic anal rape scene in *American History X* (Tony Kaye 1998), the act of male-male anal penetration is used as a violent act against men and most of the men engaged in such physical acts, or simply in the verbal threatening of such acts, are lower class citizens. However, as seen with Beth in *The 40-Year-Old Virgin*, the act of male-female anal penetration is seen as a desired sexual experience. Granted, the former is a forced sexual act and the latter is an allowed sexual act. In either case to be penetrated is demeaning for the man (and the woman), whereas being the penetrator is acceptable. A common joke found in many films, and used as a means to keep men from committing crimes is the reference to the anal rape that occurs in prison. It is not enough that a man may be incarcerated for an indefinite length of time; it is the thought of being anally assaulted by his roommate that further deters him from breaking the law.

Sedgwick lays out her theory on male/male sexual contact thusly:

Between the extremes of the upper-class male homosocial desire, grouped with dissipation, and working class male homosocial desire, grouped perhaps with violence, the view of the gentleman [educated middle-class], the public school product, was different again. School itself was, of course, a crucial link in ruling class male homosocial formation. (Sedgwick 176)

Quoting Benjamin Disraeli in *Coningsby, or The New Generation* (1844) Sedgwick further points to youth and schooling in regard to Male Homosocial Desire: "It's all right for fellows to mess one another about a bit at school. But when we grow up we

put aside childish things, don't we?" (Disraeli qtd. in Sedgwick 176). During the poker scene mentioned above, Cal admits to a homosexual experience in Hebrew school where he touched another guy's balls. It is glossed over by the men at the poker table because it remained behind in his youth.⁶

Sedgwick furthers her discussion by incorporating *The Mystery of Edwin Drood* (1870), by Dickens, and showing how "the denied erotics of male rivalry are discussed more sentimentally than in *Our Mutual Friend*—which means, a novel in which the mechanisms of the denial and division of male homosocial eros are more openly a subject" (Sedgwick 181). Sedgwick is saying that the social constructs of Male Homosocial Desire are more salient in this later novel. While an informed writer such as Dickens would recognize the social continuums among men the fact remains that instances of male traffic in women and homophobia are still evident in his, and his contemporary's, writings. Although changes have occurred in the role of men in Male Homosocial Desire, due to industrial and cultural advances the world over, the basics ultimately remain the same.

Sedgwick sums up her theory in a final chapter, using Walt Whitman as her source of inspiration. Homosexuality, in the face of homophobia, made men susceptible to manipulation, blackmail, punishment and even death. Thus, the derogatory and unpalatable treatment of women in the face of homosocial desire was paramount to proving one's heterosexuality, or in the least, being acceptable to the heterosexual population. Becoming effeminized by a woman, however, was still

⁶ Such youthful schoolboy romance, later disavowed, can also be seen in some earlier queer films from Britain and Canada: *Maurice* (James Ivory 1987), *Lilies* (John Greyson 1996), *Beautiful Thing* (Hettie Macdonald 1996), *The Hanging Garden* (Thom Fitzgerald 1997) and *Get Real* (Simon Shore 1998), among others.

an unwanted charm as it removed men from a place of power within a patriarchal society. Not only were gay men at risk in this schema of thinking, it is important to note as well that: “while male homosexuality does not correlate in a transhistorical way with political attitudes towards women, homophobia directed at men by men almost always travels with a retinue of gynophobia and antifeminism” (Sedgwick 216). Women were just as much at risk from the traumatizing powers of homophobia.

As I have laid out above, Sedgwick’s theory of Male Homosocial Desire is still evident in the plots of contemporary Hollywood comedies. These films substantiate the classic dynamics of homosociality as laid out by Sedgwick. However, the following chapter will show how these dynamics take a specific form in the Comedic Device Penis cycle that constitutes my main corpus, that of an hysteria and anxiety surrounding the foregrounding of male nudity. Any changes to the established gender and sexual roles of men are still viewed as unwarranted. The penis creates volatility within the equilibrium that Male Homosocial Desire tries to arrange for men and as I will show, when the penis appears on screen, homoeroticism must be denied and homosexuality must be eliminated.

Chapter Two

The Comedic Device Penis

Phallic Power, Small Dicks and the Melodramatic Penis

While the nude female body has been revealed so often as to be normalized on screen, the male body, and more specifically the penis, is something that has remained relatively well hidden. As Margaret Walters discusses in her book *The Nude Male*, the male body was the site of the greatest preoccupation in high art until only a few hundred years ago. The Ancient Greeks worshipped the athletic male and his muscular prowess and penis were predominant in the sculpture of that era. Even early Christian art exalted the male body in its renditions of a nude Christ and the early Christian martyrs. Since the Renaissance period, however, when the Vatican removed or covered all the penises in St. Peter's Basilica, and paintings were touched up to cover the penis, the penis has had a very slow comeback.

The body's "musculinity," described by Tasker as the "physical definition of masculinity in terms of a developed musculature" (Tasker *Spectacular Bodies* 3), still exists in contemporary action films such as *300* (Zack Snyder 2006), but many writers point out that while the male action hero's body is prominently on display, his penis rarely is.

While not uncommon in independent, art-house and queer films, the penis has been almost completely avoided and suppressed in mainstream Hollywood

cinema⁷. The penis, while commonly referred to in dialogue both discreetly and overtly, could not be revealed in action films as it held the power to destroy the phallus. Phallic masculinity requires the penis to remain hidden as revealing the penis may destroy the power the phallus possesses, because showing the penis could be damaging to the phallus as the penis may not be as large as the phallus leads one to believe.; the soft penis may undermine the mystique of the erect penis. Reference to the phallic attributes of the penis is used in Hollywood cinema for the representation of virile masculinity. While male actors actively portray phallic masculinity, the penis is rarely revealed.

There are further concerns in male dominated cinema, according to Peter Lehman: the penis, in regards to male heterosexuals, may be used as a basis for women to compare or judge, and homophobic men may fear they will be aroused by the sight of the penis (Lehman "Crying Over the Melodramatic Penis" 27). Further in his argument, Lehman argues against Mulvey's male gaze polemic, demonstrating that men actually do look at other men's bodies and both joke about and wish to emulate the body as is clearly evident in many contemporary Hollywood comedies. Since the phallus became the representation of the penis, which can be discussed and shown, it is "crucial that the penis provided the model for [the phallus]" so it remains solely a masculine trait. As women do not possess a penis, the power of the image or representation remains well within patriarchy (Dyer 71).

⁷ As evidenced by the appendix to this thesis only twenty-three of the 183 feature films from 2006-2011 containing full frontal male nudity were produced by major Hollywood studios. And only three of these films have any positive references to homosexuality: *Zack and Miri Make a Porno*, *Brüno* (Larry Charles 2009) and *Taking Woodstock* (Ang Lee 2009).

Most action films relegate women to the “damsel in distress” role in order to maintain masculine authority. Since the late 1970s, and particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, the male action film star became the stereotypical phallic masculine ideal. In contemporary cinema properly framed shots of muscularity and appropriately bulging groins allude to the physical and sexual prowess of action stars. As Richard Dyer determines from Margaret Walters’ book *The Nude Male*: “[muscular hardness] is phallic, not in the direct sense of being like an erect penis but rather in being symbolic of all that the phallus represents of ‘abstract paternal power’”(Dyer 71).

“Paternal” is associated with achievement whereas “maternal” is associated with instinct. Since muscles and their tautness and tightness are something that can be achieved, rather than an innate quality, appropriately framing and highlighting them enhances the phallic power of masculinity; the muscles are an iconographic substitute for the penis, they stand in for it. Highlighting the larger than normal muscularity of male action stars, particularly in situations next to a significantly smaller female, proves to the audience the ability of men to achieve such musculature.

The proliferation of latex covered super men in contemporary Hollywood action films attests to this fact. For example, in the hugely profitable *Batman* series, from the original installments of *Batman* (Tim Burton 1989)⁸ to *Batman & Robin*

⁸ USA Box Office: \$251 188 924. All Box Office Receipts are taken from the site: www.boxofficemojo.com who receive the information directly from the distributors (per e-mail from website).

(Joel Schumacher 1997)⁹ and more recently *Batman Begins* (Christopher Nolan 2005)¹⁰ and *The Dark Knight* (Nolan 2008),¹¹ we see the careful construction of the codpiece and the overt stylization of the muscles exemplifies phallic masculinity.¹² Throughout the film the lighting ensures that shadows create a large bulge where the penis is, and accentuates the definition of the muscles. Batman, and sometimes Robin, is presented next to a female action hero/villain who has a sleek and lithe appearance. The character of Poison Ivy, played by Uma Thurman, is a key example. While Batman and Robin have intricately designed costumes used to highlight their bulging groins and abdominal and pectoral muscles, which may not actually exist, Poison Ivy is dressed in a green spandex body suit that highlights her slim female figure.

In his book, *Running Scared*, Lehman ultimately determines that the representation of masculinity falls between two poles: phallic power spectacles and the comic collapse of the pitiful penis. The polarity around representations of the penis/phallus, prior to the 1990s, consisted of the powerful phallic representation of masculinity, represented by action and porn stars on the one hand; and the often comical, small dick joke and pitiful nature of the phallus embodied by short rotund actors and certain comic actors, on the other hand. In his more recent article, Lehman proposes a third category: the melodramatic penis, one that is “neither the

⁹ USA Box Office: \$107 325 195

¹⁰ USA Box Office: \$205 343 774

¹¹ USA Box Office: \$533 345 358

¹² These films also trade in irony and camp to an extent and definitely adhere to Sedgwick’s Male Homosocial Desire theory: however, this space does not allow for an adequate discussion of these features and this would be best left for another thesis.

phallic spectacle and/or comic collapse” (Lehman “Crying” 26). The melodramatic penis occurs in films where the presentation of the penis happens at the apex of a melodramatic moment or directly influences the beginning of a melodramatic moment. This thesis hopes to further Lehman’s work by discussing the new representations of the penis in relation to sight gags and develop a fourth category I call the Comedic Device Penis.

Lehman delineates his argument about the melodramatic penis with an analysis of six films covering mainstream Hollywood, European art cinema, American independent and British costume dramas¹³. Although Lehman uses a relatively unrelated cross-section of films that are loosely, if at all, connected in theme, style, content or Continent, he does come to some interesting conclusions on the melodramatic moments related to the revealing of the penis in each of these films. In these films, the exposing of the penis is a revelatory experience heightened with melodramatic dynamics. Often previously alluded to in dialogue and out-of-frame references in these films, the penis becomes a focal point of the melodrama once it is unveiled. However, as Lehman says:

While the recent emergence of what I have called the melodramatic penis at least challenges norms of representation, it perpetuates the cultural assumption that the sight of the penis has to be provoked by an extraordinary event that guarantees

¹³ The films Lehman discusses include: *The Crying Game* (Neil Jordan 1992); *Cobb* (Ron Shelton 1994); *Angels and Insects* (Philip Haas 1995); *Carried Away* (Bruno Barreto 1996); *Boogie Nights* (Paul Thomas Anderson 1997); and *The Governess* (Sandra Goldbacher 1998).

the sight will have a major impact. These are still penises that are not just penises. (Lehman "Crying" 33)

In contrast to the "melodramatic penis," current comedic representations are no longer "provoked by an extraordinary event."

In the present corpus comprised of my six selected films, the penis is presented without warning to elicit laughter and shock from the audience, the generation of laughter being a process I will deal with below. Throughout the narrative the penis is frequently alluded to in conversation but kept from sight until unexpected, which in turn increases the gag effect. In the same vein as the "melodramatic penis," however, these penises mean more than just a presentation of the penis. The men exposing their penises are not the phallic embodiment of patriarchal masculinity, they are not subjects of the pitiable and/or small dick joke, nor are they the subject of a melodramatic event that specifically leads to, or is caused by, the unveiling of their penis. The penis in these films is presented in a casual moment to increase the shock of and laughter at its presentation. This penis will be referred to as the Comedic Device Penis.

Comedy and Sight Gags

According to Steve Neale and Frank Krutnik in their book *Popular Film and Television Comedy* (1990): "Comedy is itself a varied phenomenon, both in the range of forms it encompasses—from the joke to the sitcom—and in the range of defining conventions it can involve: from the generation of laughter, to the presence of a happy ending, to the representation of everyday life" (Neale and Krutnik 1). Neale

and Krutnik claim that two of the mentioned conventions, the generation of laughter and the happy ending, are particularly relevant to film comedy.

Because of its diverse forms, a stable and concise definition of comedy can be both difficult and limiting. Comedy films can, and tend to in many instances, align themselves with the structural features of melodrama. In this sense, the narrative tends to follow a very generic structure that ultimately leads to the happy ending, with short interstices for the generation of laughter. For Neale and Krutnik,

Comedy necessarily trades upon the surprising, the improper, the unlikely, and the transgressive in order to make us laugh; it plays on deviations both from socio-cultural norms, and from the rules that govern genres and aesthetic regimes. (Neale and Krutnik 3)

This chapter will show how the gag style of the Comedic Device Penis is precisely this, a gag that is transgressive and deviant, yet funny.

Film comedy got its start at basically the same time as film itself. One of the first films ever seen, *L'Arroseur arrosé* (*The Sprayer Sprayed*) (Louis Lumière 1895), was a comedy film shown by the Lumière brothers during their inaugural screening in France. The film is a single shot gag where a young boy halts the flow of a garden hose, until the gentleman using the hose looks down the nozzle and the boy allows the water to flow again, for which the boy is spanked. After the release of *The Sprayer Sprayed* a plethora of films from 1896-1905 were shown involving single shot gags or mischievous acts performed by a young boy. These early films tend to employ children as the trickster with easily constructed and implemented gags, typically intended for adults. The gags are usually engineered towards an adult who

has requested something of the child that he does not want to do. There is an infantile attitude in these early short film comedies that this thesis argues is still in use today in comedy features.

In his article, "Crazy Machines in the Garden of Forking Paths: Mischief Gags and the Origins of American Film Comedy" (1995), Tom Gunning argues that these early forms of film comedy "helped shape the later genre of film comedy, which frequently seems to teeter in a precarious position within the classical model" (Gunning 89). As he later suggests, the mischief film slowly evolved to include a narrative structure based on the creation of the gags, but "the necessary roles of rascal and victim" create the primary "difference between many film comedies and the narrative structures of later classical films" (Gunning 94). When early narrative films began to develop, including those of D.W. Griffiths, film comedies attempted to keep up but the early comedies tended to string together single-shot gags, which lacked the formal structure of a narrative film. This eventually led to the "chase" comedy, which allowed for temporal progression. As Gunning puts it: "Mischief gags make things fall apart, whereas narrative structure put things back together" (Gunning 96).

Throughout the last one hundred years, various styles and forms of comedy have existed. One of the major comic subgenres is the homosocial buddy narrative that has played out since the early days of cinema. During the various eras some of the key homosocial players were: Stan Laurel and Oliver Hardy, who began their careers in the 1920s; John Olsen and Harold Johnson in the 1930s; the 1940s brought us Bud Abbott and Lou Costello as well as Bob Hope and Bing Crosby; the

1950s were the time of Dean Martin and Jerry Lewis; in the 1960s Jack Lemmon and Walter Matthau starred in various comedies; the 1970s began the interracial buddy films of Gene Wilder and Richard Pryor, which arguably led to the pairings of Danny Glover and Mel Gibson, and Eddie Murphy with a variety of Caucasian men in the 1980s; the mid-nineties had David Spade and Chris Farley, while the late 1990s began to introduce the “Dude Flicks” and the teen comedies starring Ashton Kutcher and Seann William Scott and Jason Biggs and his entourage of male companions. Finally in the twenty-first century we welcome the era of the Judd Apatow oeuvre with Seth Rogen and the “Bromance” between Paul Rudd and Jason Segel, all of which are structured around, or include, infantile men. In addition, we see the beginning of sight gags involving the penis.

This chapter will show how the stable patterns by which Male Homosocial Desire is narrativized in contemporary Hollywood comedies are disrupted when the penis is on display. As discussed previously, according to Sedgwick’s theory, nude groups tend to be regarded as homophobic. While the following films, and the previously discussed films, are less homophobic than films of previous decades, they still have a fair distance to go in order to thoroughly appreciate and accept homosexual identity, behaviour and desire. The constant references to men’s sexuality and the common use of calling someone “gay,” “cock sucker,” “homo,” and a plethora of other terms, in a derogatory manner are prevalent in these films. However, for the purposes of this study I will be paying more attention to the presentation of the penis and the formal aesthetics employed during the specific scenes where the penis is shown in order to reveal how adherence to

heterosexuality is still mandatory. As well, the transgressive nature of showing the penis still requires that the narrative be brought back to heteronormative and patriarchal stasis. The puritanical and patriarchal structure of American culture is obviously shocked at the presentation of male nudity and while the Comedic Device Penis detailed in this chapter is used as a gag, any instance where the penis is displayed to excess must be restrained.¹⁴

The Comedic Device Penis

The men who show the penis and any man who witnesses the penis must also deny or repress any eroticism in the face of the penis. As Steve Neale points out “in a heterosexual and patriarchal society, the male body cannot be marked explicitly as the object of another male look: that look must be motivated in some other way, its erotic component repressed” (Neale “Prologue” 14). As well, in her discussion of “masquerades of masculinity,” Chris Holmlund states:

these careful restructurings of hints of homosexuality according to binary oppositions of gender betray the nervousness which underlies masquerades of masculinity: desire between men, the overt enjoyment of another man’s body and especially his penis, must be denied. (Holmlund “Masculinity as Multiple...” 221-222)

¹⁴ The films listed in the Appendix to this thesis show how a majority of American releases do not show the penis to excess. Most of the films, not considered gay or gay-positive, either obscure the penis, relegate it to an extreme long shot, or the duration on screen may mean its appearance was inadvertent. As well, the ninety-eight other films produced outside of America tend to, on a whole, present the penis for longer periods of time and the penis typically does not frighten, repulse and/or disgust anyone on screen.

It will be shown that in all instances where the Comedic Device Penis is shown, any man bearing witness in no way eroticizes the penis and the motivation for showing the penis is not sexual. The films selected for this analysis all come from a very short period of time (2006-2009), have similar styles and aesthetics and are produced by the Hollywood film industry. Arguably, there are other instances of the Comedic Device Penis (*Brüno*, *Hall Pass* (Bobby and Peter Farrelly 2011) and *Miss March* (Zach Cregger and Trevor Moore 2009)), but the selection under analysis here was made because of their similar styles. *Brüno* is a mockumentary, obviously commenting on these styles of film and television; *Hall Pass* was released after this thesis was undertaken; and *Miss March* has a different presentation of Comedic Device Penis all of which will be briefly discussed in the conclusion of this thesis.

In his book *Running Scared*, Peter Lehman discusses the presentation of the male body in a variety of films and literature ranging from Hollywood, to the UK, to Spain. At times Lehman tends to draw conclusions from films of different genres, countries and decades that could have been better developed had he dealt with films with clearer links to each other. As well he tends to gloss over the cultural milieu of the host countries, in that many of these cultures encounter nudity on a regular basis in day-to-day interactions and he clearly does not engage with the Puritanism that inflects American cultural response to the sight of the penis. Nevertheless, most of his points are valid. His focus could have dealt with a more specific era of film for each of his chapters as well, but he still does lay important groundwork in his book and a subsequent article "Crying Over the Melodramatic Penis." I will be

extrapolating on Lehman's arguments in order to delineate the presence of what I am calling the Comedic Device Penis.

Lehman uses Laura Mulvey's "Visual Pleasure in Narrative Cinema" as a beginning point for his introduction. Lehman discusses how Mulvey's theory was groundbreaking and incredibly influential for its time:

Mulvey's explicit claim is that visual pleasure for both men and women spectators comes from the display of the female body; women are put in the position of adopting the male gaze. ... [And] in our patriarchal culture women are brought up to survey their own bodies in comparison to the bodies of other women and that process is controlled by a male standard of desire. Thus, women derive pleasure from looking at other women's bodies, not from looking at men's bodies. (Lehman *Running Scared* 20-21)

Approximately two decades later, however, some important changes have taken place. In his critique of Mulvey's theory Lehman argues "that man not only can but is driven to look at, and talk, and write, and joke about his 'exhibitionist like' Mulvey oversimplified both the history of the sexual representation of the male and the nature of male subjectivity" (Lehman *Running Scared* 6). In his argument he stresses that, while the male body is set up in such a way that women do indeed look at men as well, the male body is indeed put on display for other men. Lehman claims, and I tend to agree, that Mulvey made a mistake in theorizing that men only fetishize the female form and bring her under the control of the "powerful male in

the narrative” (Lehman *Running Scared* 22). Men do look at other men too, even if they are not willing to admit it.

Lehman’s argument also suggests that male genitalia and the male body must be kept out of the “critical spotlight” in order to adhere to the dominant phallic masculinity that has been so prevalent in Hollywood cinema. As Lehman puts it: “the phallus dominates, restricts, prohibits, and controls the representation of the male body, particularly its sexual representation” (Lehman *Running Scared* 9). This helps to elucidate the fact that prior to the body of literature I discuss in my introductory literature review, there had been little academic writing, in comparison to other studies, regarding the representation of masculinity and the male body. In line with this idea it is also important to reiterate that the penis can never measure up to the phallus, so showing it, and especially discussing it, may lead to the downfall of phallic masculinity, one of the pillars of current patriarchal culture in the West. As Barbara de Genevieve succinctly states in her article “Masculinity and its Discontents” (1991): “To unveil the penis is to unveil the phallus is to unveil the social construction of masculinity” (de Genevieve 4).

Ultimately, in his book, Lehman discovers that there are two poles to the representation of the male body on film: 1) phallic masculinity, where the penis must remain hidden to maintain phallic dominance; and 2) the small dick joke, where men feel they are under the scrutiny of women and are constantly judged and compared to other men, as threatening their masculinity. It is also important to note that in those rare instances where the penis is revealed, not just the male body, this polarity often structures the representation of the penis. Men presented in full

frontal nudity on film are usually performing, have recently performed, or are about to perform a stereotypically masculine trait: working out, hard labour, or other such manly pursuits.

In his later article, "Crying Over the Melodramatic Penis," Lehman lays out a third category. Again, his choices of films are loosely tied to each other at best, but ultimately his analysis is astute. What Lehman calls "the melodramatic penis" involves

representations of the penis, which are neither the phallic spectacle nor its pitiable and/or comic collapse, [which] on the one hand challenge conventional representations, and on the other hand constitute a troubled site of representation that contains disturbing contradictions. (Lehman "Crying" 26)

The sight of the melodramatic penis is structured in a way that the audience is taken by surprise. Thus, when the penis is presented on screen the level of drama is increased significantly. For example scenes in *The Crying Game* (Neil Jordan 1992), are shot with heavy diagonal lines and the situation is presented as overly melodramatic. In similar fashion to the melodramatic penis, the Comedic Device Penis I am describing, is shown in instances where it is completely uncalled for. However, when the penis is revealed, it does not heighten any melodrama; rather it is used for the purpose of comedy. Since comedy tends to follow the structural features of melodrama, as Neale and Krutnik have pointed out, it can be argued that the Comedic Device Penis evolved directly from the melodramatic penis.

The Comedic Device Penis does not adhere to the structure of phallic masculinity. The men who own these dicks are not the stereotypical masculine male and, more often than not, are not famous actors with a star persona to affect. Their status as stars in the Hollywood system is not put at risk by showing their penis. While the audience is prodded to laugh at the sight of the Comedic Device Penis, these are not small dick jokes. Granted the penises are not the usual engorged members audiences are used to from pornographic films, but they are not mocked or commented on by women or men. The Comedic Device Penis is more closely related to the melodramatic penis in its unveiling and presentation: “These scenes lull the audience into a false sense of conventional expectations—no matter how much talk of and attention to the penis, the film positions its spectators to expect that the organ will not be shown” (Lehman “Crying” 29). The penis arrives at a moment during the film where it is uncalled for, or it is assumed it will not be shown, both within the narrative of the films themselves and within the structure of contemporary Hollywood comedies as discussed in the previous chapter. Unlike the melodramatic penis, however, the Comedic Device Penis does not cause, nor is it caused by, a dramatic event—it simply exists for the purposes of gag comedy.

The Comedic Device Penis also differs from previous allusions to the penis in contemporary Hollywood comedies. In earlier incarnations of the “Dude Flick” the penis is a site of ridicule and/or scrutiny and the penis is not actually shown. As discussed by Elizabeth Stephens in her article “The Spectacularized Penis” (2007), in the film *American Pie*, Jim presumably exposes his penis to his entire school via a webcam setup in his room where he hopes to lose his virginity to a Spanish

exchange student. The actual penis is visible only in a reaction shot of Jim's friends watching on the Internet, and Jim's subsequent premature ejaculation results in his public ridicule. As well in *There's Something About Mary* (Bobby Farrelly and Peter Farrelly 1998), Ted (Ben Stiller) has a flashback of his prom night with Mary (Cameron Diaz) where his penis got caught in his zipper and the resulting scenario has him publicly scorned and ridiculed as a variety of neighbours and friends happen upon the scene. While there is a graphic close-up of his penis and testicles, it is indistinguishable as a penis; it looks like a pile of skin and pubic hair.

The instances of the Comedic Device Penis listed below do not involve any form of scrutiny or scorn of the penis and the penis is just, for the most part, a penis. The first historical Comedic Device Penis appears in *Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story*¹⁵, co-written and produced by Judd Apatow. A parody of the Oscar-winning rock biopics *Walk the Line* (James Mangold 2005) and *Ray* (Taylor Hackford 2004), *Walk Hard* tells a story similar to the life of rock legend Johnny Cash. The film opens before a reunion concert for Dewey Cox (John C. Reilly) and his band. Shortly thereafter the film flashes back to chronicle the life of Dewey. Dewey comes from a troubled childhood where he feels responsible for the brutal death of his brother, an unavoidable accident. Constantly reminded by his father that "the wrong kid died," Dewey leaves home as a young teenager to become a rockabilly legend. However, due to his past and the subsequent guilt trips laid upon him by his father (inadvertently causing his mother's death, for instance) Dewey lapses into a life of drug abuse and alcohol addiction. Dewey spends his life on the road, away from his

¹⁵ USA Box Office: \$18 317 151.

wife and children, in the company of his fellow band mates, who are all male. His life becomes a series of orgies and drug-induced debauchery until his wife eventually leaves him, his career fails, and he becomes a destitute man bent on personal destruction. Dewey's saving grace comes when his father forgives him on his deathbed and the ghost of his dead brother returns to give Dewey hope and the inspiration to write his final masterpiece.

The presentation of the Comedic Device Penis appears during a massive orgy scene approximately thirty minutes into the film and according to Kasdan, Apatow, and Reilly on the DVD commentary: "[They're] about to make movie history." Dewey Cox is framed in bed, wearing nothing but dirty white underwear, with his latest female sexual conquest pressed against him. While talking on the phone with his wife he meanders his way to the floor at the foot of the bed as two naked women walk through the frame, exposing their breasts. Next, Dewey is presented in close-up at centre screen with his girlfriend on screen left in the background. Bert (Tyler Nilson) enters from screen left, obscuring the view of Dewey's girlfriend, and exposes his buttocks to the viewer. Dewey, framed in close-up, glances at Bert's penis, twice, but the penis shot is withheld from the audience. Dewey's expression is deadpan and his recognition of the penis holds no eroticism. Moreover, the fact his girlfriend is on the bed behind him and he is talking to his wife, at home with their kids, proves his heterosexuality. In addition, as discussed in the introduction to this thesis, Needham's account that the penis is rarely given a point of view shot holds true here as well. Dewey looks at the penis but the audience is not given a shot of what he looks at.

After a cut to Dewey's wife at home with the children the viewer is introduced to Bert's penis in full, unobstructed view. While Dewey is still on the phone with his wife, and still centred on the screen with his girlfriend on the left, Bert re-enters the film on screen right. The framing reveals nothing but his thighs and flaccid penis. The penis enters in profile then turns to a $\frac{3}{4}$ profile towards the audience and remains onscreen for approximately six seconds. Dewey pays no attention to the penis at all in this shot. The director cuts to Dewey's wife at home, then back to Dewey on the floor and Bert and his penis are surprisingly gone from the scene.

The penis is presented in such a way as to not influence the narrative or plot structure in any way. Unlike the early gag comedies discussed by Gunning, the Comedic Device Penis gag does not advance the narrative in any way. This penis is a gag used solely as a tool to elicit laughter. The original scene involving the penis was longer and incorporated more close-ups and a variety of angles. According to Apatow, however: "one night we showed it to a test audience and twenty-two people walked out. I think we went too far with too much penis" (WENN.com n. pag.). The test audiences, and arguably audiences as a whole, were not prepared to see so much penis on the big screen.¹⁶ According to Kasdan on the DVD commentary, one woman exclaimed: "Oh god!!" after seeing the penis, "like she was being assaulted." Thus, due to perceived public disgust the penis is relegated to a comedic gag instead of prolonged exposure.

¹⁶ The film *Brüno* has a great scene depicting a real test audience being subjected to Bruno's (Sacha Baron Cohen) penis swinging in a windmill pattern in close-up where some of the "real" test audience walks out at the sight of the penis. This will be discussed in the conclusion.

Bert does not possess the stereotypically phallic body akin to Stallone and Schwarzenegger: his belly is soft and his would be similar to the standard body one may find in middle America. The presentation of his penis is also quite undramatic and unobtrusive. It is flaccid and it does not move, it is simply in stasis. Present on screen for such a brief period it is recognizable as a penis, a relatively average size penis according to the majority of medical research on penis size, but a penis nonetheless. It is not erect or engorged and it would be similar to the type of penis the average American man would see in the showers at his local gym. Yet, men are unaccustomed to laughing at the penis in a locker room, so its presentation on the screen and the hysteria it provoked is rather strange. Why is something, potentially visible on a daily basis, so profound when presented on the big screen? For women, however, they may be entirely unaccustomed to seeing the penis in their day-to-day life so a big screen presentation may feel awkward, hysterical, funny or grotesque.

The penis does not disappear entirely from this film, although the gag aspect is less effective. Shortly after the first representation there is a knock on the door and Dewey opens it to find his father. While talking to his father, two naked women enter from screen left, both exposing their breasts and one exposing her vulva. Bert reemerges in full frontal nudity, but this time the audience sees his face. The penis is associated with a person, but it is important to note the actor is not a famous actor and his star persona and phallic masculinity are not in danger as a result of showing his penis. There is a quick cut to a reaction shot, not a point of view shot, one of shock and surprise at the exposed penis, from Dewey's father and Dewey exits the room and closes the door on the exposed penis. Although the male characters do

take notice of the exposed penis, Dewey barely registers an expression and his father's is one of surprise, the same surprise the audience just experienced. However, at all times the penis is presented either in the company of naked women or males who are clearly sexual conquests of women in order to confirm the heterosexuality of those men exposed to the penis. All the other men in the room are in the company of at least three women who are all naked and exposing their bodies, while the men are either clothed from the waist down or the bottom half of their bodies are obstructed from view.¹⁷

*Forgetting Sarah Marshall*¹⁸, again produced by Apatow, gives us the second encounter with the Comedic Device Penis, twice. Peter Bretter (Jason Segel)¹⁹ is a composer for a television series starring his girlfriend Sarah Marshall (Kristen Bell). In the opening scene Peter is dumped by his girlfriend and decides to take an extended Hawaiian vacation to get over her. Unfortunately, but to comic surprise, Marshall is in attendance at the same resort with her new boyfriend Aldous Snow (Russell Brand). Peter meets Rachel (Mila Kunis), an employee of the resort, who is sympathetic to his relationship woes. She accompanies him on various outings at the resort, and ultimately they share a sexual encounter. Peter and Rachel split

¹⁷ This interpretation is based on the theatrical release of the film. On the unrated DVD version the scene appears around thirty-seven minutes and is edited differently. The shot of Bert's buttocks is removed and the penis appears on screen twice during the orgy scene for approximately twelve seconds, still intercut with Dewey's wife at home and Dewey taking no notice of the penis at all. The shot with Dewey's father remains unchanged.

¹⁸ USA Box Office: \$63 172 463.

¹⁹ While quite famous at the time of the writing of this paper, Jason Segel's star status in Hollywood was just beginning at the time of *Forgetting Sarah Marshall*. He was primarily a TV actor with only a few brief appearances in film in minor roles.

briefly, after Peter is seduced by Sarah; however, Peter is unable to perform sexually with Sarah, only to be reunited at the end of the film with Rachel.

In *Forgetting Sarah Marshall* Peter exposes his penis to the audience in the first five minutes of the film. However, he only exposes his penis within the privacy of his own home and in the presence of his soon to be ex-girlfriend, Sarah Marshall. There are no men bearing witness to his penis on screen. The audience watches Peter take a shower where he inadvertently leaves the shower curtain open and stands in full view of this opening. The director does not show Peter's penis in a sex scene where he would presumably be naked. After leaving the shower he enters his living room to find Sarah. He turns to Sarah, tells her he has a surprise for her, opens his towel and begins to swing his penis from side to side. While the director keeps the penis hidden from view, framing only from the waist up, the sound of Peter's penis slapping against his thighs is audible. The reverse shot of Sarah shows that she is less than impressed with his expression of machismo. Then in a shot that does not require or immediately reference nudity, Peter's penis is exposed.

When Sarah delivers the news that she is breaking up with him, Peter drops his towel as he raises his hands to his face in desperation. The first exposure of Peter's penis lasts about a half second before the director cuts to a close-up of Peter's face. Peter turns from the camera and a long shot reveals his buttocks. During a rather "effeminate" whimper he bends at the waist and his testicles are revealed from behind for a couple of frames. He promptly stands, turns to face the camera in medium shot from the waist up, and then walks towards the camera. Sarah requests: "Why don't you put on some clothes and we can sit down and

discuss this.” Sarah feels awkward in the presence of the penis and wants it hidden from view, similar to how the audience may feel. The director again cuts to a medium-long shot framing Peter from the knees up, again exposing his penis for approximately a half second. After talking with Sarah while sitting on the couch, and covering his penis, Peter stands up to leave the room and the audience is treated to another shot of his penis, for about a half second. Originally cut to ten frames it was determined this was not enough time to register that Peter’s penis was on screen and it was increased to 13 frames to allow the audience to visually recognize the penis on screen.

In an interview with Chris Lee in *The LA Times* Jason Segel comments on his presentation of his penis in connection with female nudity: “When a woman does nudity in a movie, men immediately switch into a sexual mode,’ ... ‘For women, from what I understand, it’s not like that. They see a naked, out-of-shape man crying and it’s funny ... something weird, disturbing and disgusting we can all laugh at” (Segel qtd. in Lee n. pag). While admitting the humour involved in the presentation of this penis, Segel does hint at the gross nature of a penis. There is something erotic about a naked woman for a man, but the image of a naked man is deemed grotesque by American standards, for both men and women. As many of the academics discussed in this thesis have noted, the eroticism of the male body is denied. However, Segel and perhaps many academics have neglected the gay male viewer who could possibly see the eroticism in these images. As evidenced by the appendix to this thesis, approximately forty percent of recent American releases with full frontal male nudity are queer-themed films. The heterosexual audience may read the

grotesque in the image of the penis but perhaps the queer audience reads eroticism. The exposure time of the penis is almost always longer in a queer themed film and is generally shown during an intimate homosexual encounter.²⁰ Those American films with full frontal male nudity not deemed queer tend to have very limited screen time devoted to the penis, never show it in relation to homosexuality and many are presented as though they were inadvertently captured on film.

Peter's penis remains hidden for the remainder of the film until the last scene. When Rachel, his estranged girlfriend, comes to his dressing room to talk he is standing there nude and noticeably slimmer than the first scene. She enters the room and surprises him, and after seeing his penis for a quarter second she begins to laugh. She is not laughing at the size of his penis—this is not a small dick joke—she is laughing in shock at his penis. Like the audience who feels embarrassed or awkward at the sight of the penis, the common reaction is to laugh it off. However, in this scene where a woman is laughing at his penis, Peter gets quite worried and anxious and asks: "Can you please stop laughing?" As in the first scene, Peter is in a room with only one woman, a woman Peter has had sex with. The penis is positioned in a strictly heterosexual situation but, unlike in *Walk Hard* however, Stoller completely eliminates any allusion to homoeroticism during the presentation of the penis by eliminating any male presence. As well, there is never a point of view shot of the penis. It is also interesting to note that Peter's penis frames the breakup of his relationship with Sarah at the beginning of the film but ultimately

²⁰ For example; *Eating Out* (Q. Allan Brocka 2004), *Eating Out 2: Sloppy Seconds* (Phillip J. Bartell 2006), *Another Gay Movie* (Todd Stephens 2008), *Hollywood, je t'aime* (Jason Bushman 2009) and *Shortbus* (John Cameron Mitchell 2006).

returns and solidifies a heteronormative relationship with Rachel at the end of the film.

Kevin Smith's *Zack and Miri Make a Porno*²¹ is a film about two best friends, Zack (Seth Rogen) and Miri (Elizabeth Banks), who have fallen on hard times financially. After a comedic mishap where Miri ends up on the Internet in her “granny panties” she becomes an Internet sensation. Cashing in on the instant, and more than likely short, fame, Zack and Miri decide to produce and star in a pornographic film. Enlisting the help of coworkers and friends, they embark on this life-changing film. Zack engineers the script to make himself the only person Miri will have sex with. After co-star Stacey (Katie Morgan) propositions Zack, and Miri believes he accepts, Miri rewrites the film to allow herself to have sex with Lester (Jason Mewes). Appalled with the idea that Miri would have sex with Lester after sleeping with him, Zack leaves Philadelphia. Upon learning that Miri did not have sex with Lester, he returns three months later to admit he never slept with Stacey and profess his undying love for Miri.

In *Zack and Miri* the viewer may believe they will get a full dose of penis on screen as the title suggests. In heterosexual pornography the viewer is subjected to not only fully naked women, but also fully naked men who almost always have an erect penis. In this film adaptation of an amateur porn shoot the audience gets a full dose of breasts but no vulva or penis, even though the film stars two famous porn stars: Traci Lords and Katie Morgan. In a variety of sexual positions (from male pegging, reverse cow-girl, doggie-style and, apparently the only “romantic” way to

²¹ USA Box Office: \$31 457 946.

make love, missionary position), the audience never once sees a vulva, any act of actual penetration or a penis, until it is unexpected—thus heightening its comedic power.

The multitude of Internet pornography sites may leave the average male American viewer desensitized to the “grotesque” sight of the erect penis and to the penetration, vaginally, anally and orally, foregrounded in pornography. Still the erect penis remains a site of erotic contemplation in pornography but in a mainstream popular American film there is no room for the upfront eroticizing of the male body. While pornographic films feature extreme close-ups of the male body, particularly the erect penis, MPAA rating guidelines stipulate that such gratuitous exposure warrants an “X” to “XXX” rating. In the money-hungry world of Hollywood such a rating would garner a limited release and subsequently less of a take at the box office. Also, the lack of the penis in scenarios where an audience would assume to see one exponentially increases the shock value of a flaccid penis in a scene where the audience is not expecting to see one.

The final scene of the film has Zack returning to his old home to profess his love for Miri. Zack declares he did not have sex with Stacey and then informs her he knows she did not have sex with Lester. At this point Lester exits what was Miri’s old bedroom, as she has moved into a different room, fully naked. The scene is framed so that Zack notices Lester, but not necessarily his penis, as Zack is professing his undying heterosexual love for a woman. This scene challenges Zack’s heterosexual masculinity. Another penis has entered the home he used to share with Miri and has the power to usurp his manhood and steal the woman he loves.

Lester acknowledges Zack and casually walks by into the kitchen to get some juice; his penis is on full display and well lit from the side and above for about six seconds. Zack, curious about the naked man who just passed him in the hallway, peeks into the kitchen, but does not get a full view of Lester's penis. Lester is framed in a long shot rummaging through the fridge with his buttocks in the centre of the frame when he drops the lid to his juice. In a scene similar to *Forgetting Sarah Marshall* he bends over at the waist and the viewer is subjected to a silhouette shot of his testicles hanging between his legs. After seeing Lester's testicles, Zack continues more vehemently proclaiming his heterosexual love for Miri: even if she is having sex with Lester, Zack will wait for her forever.

Zack does not get a full-frontal view of Lester, does not see his penis directly and there is no point of view shot of the penis. While getting a view of his testicles from behind he shakes his head with a puzzled look; he realizes that Lester is completely naked. Zack's response to seeing a naked man is to reassert his love for Miri. This naked man does nothing for him sexually and his heterosexuality is evident since he will wait forever for Miri, even with Lester only a few feet away. Lester leans against the doorframe beside Zack and informs Zack that he did not have sex with Miri. Lester even offered Miri an alternative to sex by proposing a "dutch-rudder," which he goes on to explain and demonstrate for Zack. Lester grasps his own penis, off-screen, and places Zack's hand on his bicep at which point Zack is to begin moving Lester's arm to simulate someone else masturbating Lester. Zack almost immediately removes his hand at which point Lester proposes a "double dutch-rudder" to Zack. In this instance each man grabs his own penis and

they move each other's arms so "it's like jerking off together but not gay, [they're] not touching dicks."

Homoeroticism surfaces as a gag in the fact that Zack looks at Lester and acknowledges his naked state, as well as the "dutch-rudder" sequence. Homosexuality, however, is negated by Lester's words and Zack's actions of pulling away from Lester, disgusted, and returning to Miri and ultimately performing a typical Hollywood heteronormative technique as the man and woman are together in the end. Finally, the fact that this film is about an amateur porno shoot only heightens the gag nature of the penis, as it is completely unexpected at the point it is revealed, when a penis has not been shown for the entirety of the film.

In one of only two films in this selection not involving Apatow or one of his entourage, *Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay*²² is a sequel to the cult favourite *Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle* (Danny Leiner 2004). Beginning where the first installment left off, airborne Harold (John Cho) and Kumar (Kal Penn) are en route to Amsterdam to reunite with Harold's ex-girlfriend Maria (Paula Garces). When Kumar's bong is mistaken for a bomb the two are incarcerated at Guantanamo Bay with assumed connections to North Korea and al-Qaeda. After escaping Guantanamo Bay the two attempt to clear their names by enlisting their friend Raza's (Amir Talai) help along with Kumar's ex-girlfriend, Vanessa, and her fiancée, Colton (Daneel Ackles and Eric Winter). Colton, who has ties to the Republican Party, promises to help but ultimately turns Harold and Kumar over to the authorities. After escaping custody, again, the two parachute into the backyard of

²² USA Box Office: \$38 108 728

George W. Bush (James Adomian) who smokes some pot with them and pardons their behaviour. Both men are ultimately reunited with their female love interests and presumably live happily ever after.

The film *Harold and Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay* gives another instance of the Comedic Device Penis. As in *Zack and Miri*, the comedic nature of the Comedic Device Penis is heightened in this film by keeping the penis hidden when one would assume to see it. While incarcerated in Guantanamo Bay Harold and Kumar are almost subjected to oral rape. Big Bob (Randal Reeder), an incredibly heavysset hulk of a man and a guard, announces that Harold and Kumar must perform fellatio on him. During the scenario Big Bob's penis is obscured from view by Harold's head. Although Harold and Kumar are racial "others" they are American citizens by birth, while the Arab men in the adjacent cell, who have already been orally raped and have warned the newcomers of what is in store for them, are not American. The Arab men can be subjected to "demeaning" homosexual acts, off-screen of course, because they are already "lower-class" and "abject" citizens. An "other" can be forced to perform, but a sympathetic American lead comic actor has to be rescued from performing such "heinous" acts in order to maintain the American heteronormative standards and maintain the status quo.

Harold and Kumar seek refuge with a friend in Florida after their daring escape from Guantanamo Bay. Their friend Raza is hosting what he calls a "Bottomless Party" attended by no less than two-dozen women wearing shirts and absolutely no clothing below the waist. According to Harold "there is exposed vagina all over [his] house:" however not a single man other than Raza is in

attendance. Moreover, there are multiple point of view shots of vulva. As Harold and Kumar roam Raza's house they take notice of all the naked women and, in keeping with Mulvey, the audience receives an objectified look at the female body. Harold begs Raza, who is submerged in a hot tub, for help in their ultimate escape from the authorities. Before Raza will offer any help he requires the two men to "get into the spirit of the party" by removing their pants, at which point he exposes his own penis.

Approximately a half hour into the film Raza steps out of the hot tub and exposes his penis in a close-up shot. Although, it is evident that Raza's penis and pubic area are indeed prosthetic, this is the only instance in the Comedic Device Penis oeuvre where the actual penis is replaced by a prosthetic penis and merkin.²³ It is interesting to note, as Gary Needham points out about French films, in his article "Closer than Ever" (2009), that the prosthetic penis is on the upper side of the size spectrum: "It is no surprise... [the] prosthetic penises have opted for the upper end of the size scale as a sort of phallic compensation for the vulnerability of the male nude and the penis from which the notion of the phallus has been fashioned" (Needham 137-138). While a prosthetic is not officially a true bona fide penis, I argue for its inclusion in this corpus. Because the film follows themes and styles similar to the other listed films and came out during the same timeframe, it is continuing the tradition of having a penis on display. As well, since the instance of the penis on screen is so short, at first viewing it may be difficult to determine if the

²³ This is not entirely uncommon in other films showing full frontal male nudity. Such as *Boogie Nights* (Paul Thomas Anderson 1997), *Orgazmo* (Trey Parker 1997), and *Antichrist* (Lars von Trier 2009), etc.

penis is real or a prosthetic. In the end, however, regardless of whether or not the penis is real or a prosthetic, its overt inclusion in a Hollywood comedy, or any other genre of film, is a rare occurrence and deserves critical attention.

When Raza emerges from the hot tub the head of his penis barely protrudes through a plethora of pubic hair. This initial shot lasts for approximately one second and cuts to a medium shot of Harold and Kumar physically distancing themselves from the penis by retreating, audibly resisting the penis and expressing disgust. For another one second Raza's penis is shown on screen in a medium long shot while Harold and Kumar continue to be repulsed by the sight of another man's penis. A rare occurrence in film, this shot is a point of view shot of a man's penis. However, the penis is not eroticized or objectified here. The penis is shown as an over-the-top replication of a penis and any eroticism for male viewers is disavowed by the protagonists' obvious disgust at its presentation. A majority of the women in attendance all laugh at the episode, but it can be inferred they are laughing at the disgust shown by Harold and Kumar and not the penis: again this is not a small dick joke. Raza is entirely comfortable with his nudity and with the lack of other exposed penises; he has no one to compare himself to, and the women cannot compare him to anyone else either. While certain cultural and stereotypical paradigms may be in place regarding middle-eastern men and their nakedness, it can be assumed that Raza was raised in a Westernized country due to his North American accent. Aside from his name and ethnicity there are no identifying features of a middle-eastern upbringing. Harold and Kumar are then forced to drop their pants, however, the

audience is only given a shot of their buttocks and there is no presentation of their penises on screen.²⁴

As in previous encounters with the Comedic Device Penis, there is no homoeroticism evident and all allusions to homosexuality are nonexistent or denied at the moment of presentation. Kumar, in a comedic gesture similar to Peter Bretter, shakes his penis from side to side off-screen, however, without the soundtrack accompaniment of a penis slapping his thighs. He, as well, does move closer to Harold during this display and Harold instinctively moves out of the way of the flapping member. With the inclusion of at least two-dozen women, and the exclusion of other men altogether, this is definitely a sight and site for heterosexual men. To heighten the shock value of this Comedic Device Penis as well, previous narrative references to the penis do not show the penis. As noted above, while incarcerated in Guantanamo Bay Harold and Kumar are required to perform fellatio on one of the guards. Here, as discussed earlier, in prison the act of homosexual sex is used as a means of violence and torture. The guards who enact this oral rape scene are not considered homosexual because penetrating is not seen as “gay” in these scenarios, whereas being penetrated is effeminizing, degrading and demeaning. However, while narratively referenced in this scene, the penis is withheld from view.

The film *Observe and Report*²⁵ is a contemptible, racist, and misogynistic portrayal of Americana. Nevertheless, due to its generic hybridity (comedy plus

²⁴ It is important to note here, regarding star status, that Kumar is obviously portrayed by a stand-in: from behind the audience can clearly see the stand-in has his hair tied back whereas Kumar has short hair, and one can reasonably assume Harold has a stand-in as well.

socio-psychological drama), relative success at the box office, its stars and other above-the-line crew, it deserves placement in this study of the Comedic Device Penis. *Observe and Report* centres on a mall security guard, Ronnie (Seth Rogen), on the hunt for a Flasher (Randy Gambill) who is baring his genitalia to female customers in the parking lot. Ronnie aspires to join the police force, but his bipolar psychological disorder and his aggressive violent tendencies keep him out of the training academy. Ronnie is infatuated with the local makeup counter girl Brandi (Anna Faris), whom he rapes while she is blacked out from alcohol abuse, then subsequently forgets about when he sees her have sex with his nemesis, and local police officer, Harrison (Ray Liotta). When the Flasher arrives on the scene, breaking up a romantic encounter between Ronnie and Nell (Collette Wolfe), Ronnie makes chase and ends the fiasco by shooting the Flasher. The instance of the Comedic Device Penis comes from the Flasher, who only bookends the film. Appearing during the opening sequence only shot from behind, the flasher bares it all during the final sequence of the film in full frontal nudity.

Framed in medium shot, Ronnie is sitting at a table in the food court talking with his latest love interest, Nell, when the Flasher happens upon them. He pulls open his coat and exposes his penis framed in the centre of the screen between the two actors. While this man could be the butt of a small dick joke not one is ever made in the course of the movie regarding his penis. The director places Ronnie in a heterosexual situation and to further enhance his sexuality cuts to a close-up of Ronnie turning away from and physically retching at the sight of the penis. Ronnie

²⁵ USA Box Office: \$24 007 324

finds the sight of a flaccid penis atrocious. The Flasher is one of the main narrative threads throughout the film. The audience is constantly reminded of his presence but only through oral cues and, as mentioned, he is only physically present at the beginning and end of the film. By constantly referring to the presence of the Flasher, but denying the audience interaction with him, the director heightens the surprise and shock value of the penis when it is ultimately revealed. This is the instance of the Comedic Device Penis in the film. There is another two and a half minutes of penis in this film, but it is a running joke. However, it does deserve critical attention here for its elaboration on the significance of the penis in contemporary Hollywood comedies.

After flashing Ronnie and Nell, the Flasher proceeds to run through the mall with his coat trailing open behind him for almost two and a half minutes. The sequence is shot entirely in slow motion and the penis is shown to excess. In his analysis Lehman clearly shows how the penis has been obscured in film by the male body being in motion. However, in this case the motion is not included to limit the view of the nudity; it is used to highlight the penis to excess.

In the opening shot the Flasher rounds a corner and runs directly into the camera for 11 seconds with his penis and testicles flapping wildly. However, with the use of slow motion the audience is witness to the intricacies of a penis in motion. His penis flops up and down, sways from side to side, and at all times the camera is in focus and the penis is fully visible, not even obstructed by his coat or hands. As the flasher passes a shopper he gives her the middle finger then proceeds to point directly at his own penis with the same finger. The director is essentially giving the

middle finger to censors and the viewer, asserting himself and his desire to show the penis. This sequence lasts for about two and a half minutes and during this time the Flasher's penis is exposed for about twenty-five seconds. It is intercut with a variety of long shots, medium-long shots and medium shots where the Flasher's genitalia are fully exposed, partially exposed or obscured from view altogether. The scene ends when Ronnie shoots the Flasher.

The director cuts from the gunshot to a close-up shot of Ronnie lowering the gun to his side. The gun is framed on screen left still smoking, and it is juxtaposed with Ronnie's own penis behind a pair of sweat pants. The gun is equated with the power of the phallus and masculinity, and of course in this instance of phallic power the penis cannot be shown or it may undermine Ronnie's power as a man.²⁶ As well, it can be inferred that the destruction of the Flasher is a necessity. The Flasher is transgressive in his presentation of nudity: not only does he flash his penis to Ronnie and Nell, he parades through a mall showing his penis to hundreds of people, even provoking them by gesturing with his middle finger. The puritanical nature of the average American citizen in the face of the penis is brought to the forefront. Hill puts a penis on display in one of America's "greatest" achievements in capitalism, a shopping mall, and shows all of its consumers fearing, running from or disgusted by the sight of a penis. The concerns of Kasdan, Apatow and Reilly I stated above have come to fruition: the Flasher has shown too much penis and must pay for his crime against decency. This act of transgression must be remedied and the male body must be returned to a state of normality and stasis. Thus, Ronnie shoots the flasher

²⁶ Let alone Seth Rogen's star status. Yet another instance where a star fails to, or decides not to, show his penis.

in cold blood. As Steve Neale points out in his article “Masculinity as Spectacle,” while discussing Anthony Mann films: “The mutilation and sadism so often involved in Mann’s films are marks both of the repression involved and of a means by which the male body may be disqualified, so to speak, as an object of erotic contemplation and desire” (Neale “Prologue” 14). The Flasher has put the penis on display for far too long and in order to remove it as an object of “contemplation or desire” Ronnie mutilates him and leaves him lying in a pool of his own blood, something the Flasher brought upon himself. In retaliation for the Flasher’s transgression, the penis is returned to the pants and the gun stands in for the phallus again.

This scene is indicative of the puritanical nature of American culture in regard to the penis. The penis has created a state of hysteria and panic and violence is used as a means to reinforce, rather than subvert, the status quo. The Flasher, harmless as he is, is subverting the status quo and is transgressive in his performance of male nudity. He has no qualms with exposing his penis. However, the “law” in this film eliminates the threat to phallic masculinity by eradicating the Flasher with a stereotypical phallic stand-in, the gun.

The final presentation of the Comic Device Penis, in another film not involving Apatow or his entourage, occurs in *The Hangover*²⁷ and actually has two separate instances. The film opens with Phil informing the bride to be, Tracy (Sasha Barrese), that the groom, Doug (Justin Bartha), was “misplaced” the night before, during his bachelor party. Stu is married to a local stripper named Jade, Mike Tyson (playing himself) would like his tiger the gang stole back, and inexplicably there is an effete

²⁷ USA Box Office: \$277 322 503.

Asian gangster in the trunk of their car, the final Comedic Device Penis to be discussed in this chapter.

After Alan throws a used condom at Phil, Phil pulls their car over to get the “jizz” off his cheek, at which point they hear a banging coming from the trunk of the car. Believing it to be their lost friend the men immediately open the trunk. Mr. Chow (Ken Jeong) leaps out of the trunk, naked, buries his groin into Phil’s face, and begins beating him with a tire iron. The audience only gets a clear view of Mr. Chow’s buttocks in this shot.

When Mr. Chow goes after Alan the audience is given a clear shot of his penis, well lit from the desert sun, and on screen for about five seconds. Similarly to *Observe and Report*, this penis could be construed as a small dick joke. Mr. Chow’s pubic region is incredibly bushy and his small penis is barely visible. However, as in *Observe and Report*, there is no comment on, discussion of, or joking about Mr. Chow’s size and this time there are no women present to compare or judge. And as with all the films where a penis is exposed in front of other men, there is no talk of or about the penis.

This penis, although strictly in the company of men, adheres to the heteronormative framework argued in this thesis. While Mr. Chow is presented as effeminate and is an assumed homosexual because he does press his penis against Phil’s face, this is not an act of sexual aggression. Mr. Chow has been locked in a trunk for hours and is protecting himself from his assailants. If Mr. Chow indeed wanted to pursue a sexual encounter with any of these men he could easily have done so after beating them half-unconscious with the tire iron. As well, Phil is

married and lauded as a womanizer, Stu is married to two women, and Alan, while his sexuality is unknown at this point, is revealed as heterosexual at the end of the film. Akin to the racial “othering” in *The 40-Year-Old Virgin*, any homosexual tensions may be minimized by the use of a racial “other.” Mr. Chow poses little threat, sexually, to these white heterosexual men.

The end credit sequence shows a selection of photos from a camera found after the night of blackout drinking. The four protagonists are shown in a variety of scenarios with various different women: in the back of a limo, the back room of a strip club, even Alan in bed with a topless woman. Also striking are the images of Mr. Chow receiving fellatio from a buxom woman on the hood of an SUV. Near the end of the credit sequence there are four shots of Alan receiving fellatio from an older woman in an elevator. The audience is given four shots of this situation: two medium shots with her mouth engulfing his penis, one long shot with the woman’s head obscuring the audience’s view of the penis and one medium shot where she smiles at the camera and holds his penis in plain sight for the audience to see. After the plethora of underwear shots of Alan throughout the movie and the various jokes regarding fellatio it comes as a shock and surprise to see Alan’s penis. This penis is a little different however: it is erect. This is the only instance of the Comedic Device Penis where the penis is not flaccid and because the penis is erect it is not presented in close-up or as the focal point for the frame. It is shown in a smaller photograph taken from a fair distance away. The snap shot takes up approximately half the screen and the composition of the photo has Alan in a long shot. Therefore, the image of the erect penis is relegated to an extreme long shot. As well, it is

impossible to determine if this is Galifianakis' penis or a prosthetic due to the extremely small image size.

Summary

While director and producer Judd Apatow fails to live up to his promise made in 2007 to “get a penis in every movie [he does] from now on” (WENN.com n. pag.), there is no doubt the presentation of the Comedic Device Penis starting in *Walk Hard*, is not representative of phallic masculinity. None of the seven men discussed is physically linked with the hard-body men of Hollywood action films. Bert has a soft and doughy belly, as do Peter and Alan. Lester, who comes the closest to the muscular hardness described by Dyer, is portrayed as a mentally and socially inferior man. The Flasher is overweight and deemed a pervert and Mr. Chow and Raza are “others” placed in an overwhelmingly white world and as such cannot claim patriarchal authority.

The humour of the Comedic Device Penis is heightened because the films reinforce the tradition in comedy by referencing the penis in dialogue but not showing it. Aside from the moments listed above, the penis remains hidden—especially during scenes where one would assume it would be revealed. During an orgy scene in *Walk Hard* no less than six pairs of breasts and two vaginas parade around in full view but all the men present wear underwear or use their bodies to obscure the view of their penises. During a shower scene and a dialogue and aural reference to his penis, Peter's penis is not shown. Through the entirety of a pornographic film shoot Lester's, and every other male actor's, flaccid or erect penis

is hidden. The Flasher is consistently framed from behind, in *The Hangover* the men who constantly undress are always in their underwear, and while they pee on camera, the penis is not revealed.

When men are unable to prove their virility through muscular hardness, however, they may resort to comedic forms of maleness. Recent Hollywood comedies have provided a model for the “celebration of failure” of masculinity provided these men still triumph over the emasculating female. The proliferation of the Comedic Device Penis has not destroyed phallic masculinity. It has generated a different and concurrent form of maleness, one the audience will hopefully laugh with, not at.

The Comedic Device Penis is attempting to assuage the fear of the male body in popular American film by giving the audience a chance to laugh at its presentation. As shown through *Observe and Report* any attempt to lengthen penis screen time must be dealt with harshly. However, these short, brief exposures of the Comedic Device Penis are the talk of the town, so to speak. A quick review of interviews with Judd Apatow and even Jason Segel establishes that almost all of them deal with, or mention, the penis²⁸. Critics and reviewers are fascinated with the penis and why not—it is fascinating to see something that has remained very

²⁸ The penises that are shown in these films may be no more than a publicity stunt on the part of the directors, producers and stars (or even by the myriad of writers usually hired to doctor scripts in Hollywood): a means to increase the hype surrounding a film. There is, however, no doubt that the presentation of a penis on screen is an incredibly rare act in mainstream American cinema, and for its presentation to occur in six similarly themed and styled movies in such a short span of time requires attention and discussion.

well hidden for over one hundred years of cinema, or at least in mainstream American cinema... .

Conclusion

Male Homosocial Desire was clearly evident in the literature, and by correlation the culture, of seventeenth to nineteenth-century Britain. While Sedgwick's theories derived mostly from the literature of that age, they are also particularly relevant in the contemporary Hollywood comedies discussed in this thesis. While some academics may see a causal link between the advances of feminism and the gay and lesbian movement in the nature of these "Dude Flicks," I have shown how homophobia and the traffic in women are still clearly at play and prevalent in this style of comedy. Men still use women as a means to strengthen their bonds with other men. Women who are sexually promiscuous are deemed whores in this fictional universe and are used as objects by men, but the male counterpart is applauded for his prowess and masculinity for performing similar sexual acts. While there is rarely any overt gay bashing or physical attacks on homosexuals, this style of comedy certainly heightens the homophobic dialogue to deny any allusions to homosexuality. As a matter of fact, out of the discussed films, only *Zack and Miri Make a Porno* has any positive images, or at least non-hysterical ones, of homosexuals, or homosexual acts.

Cal and David, in *The 40-Year-Old Virgin*, play video games together and verbally spar, declaring: "You know how I know you're gay..." in attempts to demean each other. Since the "Dude Flick" style of comedy is contingent on the social relationships men share with each other, it is still important to disavow any homosexuality. Even in the "Bromance" film *I Love You, Man*, where one of the

characters is gay, the audience is still exposed to homophobia. The lead male character, the one actively seeking a man, Peter Klaven, has a gay brother, Robbie. Robbie is not allowed to participate in any of the male bonding rituals in the film. He is relegated to the role of a comic figure on the outskirts of the narrative. And the relationship Peter has with Sydney (Jason Segel) is rife with homophobic incidents and diatribe; but here as well Peter's heterosexuality is reinforced throughout the film, eventually ending with yet another example of a heteronormative male-female wedding.

As I have outlined in this thesis, the Comedic Device Penis is a new phenomenon in contemporary Hollywood comedies. "Dude Flicks" use the verbal referencing of the penis on an alarmingly large scale but rarely show the penis. One of Judd Apatow's recent films, *Funny People* (2009) has a very relevant scene discussing the trope of referencing of the penis in these styles of films. Ira (Seth Rogen) attends a concert with his comedy idol George (Adam Sandler), where they listen to James Taylor play one of his most famous songs. Standing on the balcony, Ira asks of James: "Do you ever get tired of singing the same songs, you know, over and over?," to which James replies: "Do you ever get tired of talking about your dick?"

While I have outlined selected instances of the Comedic Device Penis, I will discuss three more films here. As mentioned above they were left out of the initial discussion, but do deserve attention here because they further the argument for the occurrence of the Comedic Device Penis and will allow me to synthesize my findings by way of conclusion. Two fall within the time frame circumscribing my discussion

and one occurred outside the timeframe of the Comedic Device Penis. These were left out because of two key factors. 1) I wanted to ensure that the reading of the Comedic Device Penis was limited in range and scope and selected those six films that were thematically and stylistically similar; and 2) the other instances, referenced here, were either presented differently or from a different genre of film. There is another Comedic Device Penis (or actually, penises) stemming from the same genre and style of comedy I discuss, but this film was released after this thesis was undertaken and I chose, again, to limit the parameters of my discussion.

The first two Comedic Device Penises that occurred during the same time frame as my discussion come from *Brüno* and *Miss March*. The film *Brüno*, and its Comedic Device Penis, was not discussed because the film is a mockumentary, a satirical take on the state of the world of television and celebrity culture in the United States at the time.

Brüno is a film about Brüno (Sacha Baron Cohen), an Austrian TV personality who is blacklisted in his home country when he crashes a runway show. Having lost his stardom in Austria he decides to come to America to make a name for himself in Hollywood, like so many people before him. He begins his climb to the top with a celebrity interview show, interviewing actor/singer Paula Abdul and politician Ron Paul, which takes a disastrous turn when Brüno escorts him into a bedroom for a possible sexual rendezvous. Throughout the remainder of the film Brüno finds himself in various situations, which Cohen is using as a commentary on the state of the film and television industry and celebrity culture in America: he adopts an African baby (à la Angelina Jolie); appears on “Today: With Richard Bey” (à la “Jerry

Springer”); attends gay reversion therapy; stages a wrestling cage match (although complete with a homosexual encounter); and even pitches a pilot for CBS called “A-list Celebrity Max Out mit Brüno.” This is the scene where the Comedic Device Penis occurs.

Sitting behind a two-way mirror, Brüno, his agent Lloyd Robinson and CBS Network Producer Denny Bond watch as the focus group views the montage that may become “Max Out.” The opening montage has Brüno in a leopard print t-shirt and matching briefs, followed by a commentary on celebrity fetuses with former reality show star Brittny Gastineau, a split second interview with Harrison Ford and then the Comedic Device Penis. For no apparent reason, a close-up of a TV screen taking up the entire frame with a windmilling penis, being controlled by the thrusting hips of its owner, appears on the screen for two seconds. The scene is cut with reaction shots from the focus group, abject horror from one woman and an older gentleman, then a cut to one man looking away from the screen and shaking his head. There is then another brief close-up of the penis and then a cut to a long shot with the whole focus group on screen and the penis in the background, still on the television. The film cuts to a medium shot of one woman strapping on her purse, signaling her intention to leave, a cut to the viewing booth where Brüno claims the penis is his,²⁹ then back to the close-up of the penis on the TV screen.

This time, the penis is being controlled by an unknown entity and it swings in circles of its own accord, as if it is possessed. It rotates in a clockwise direction then up and down and side-to-side. Similar to the extended penis scene in *Observe and*

²⁹ According to the DVD commentary the penis is actually a stand-in and does not belong to Sacha Baron Cohen.

Report, this penis is shown in motion. However, in this instance it is the penis in motion and not the body in motion and therefore there is no covering of the penis, intentionally or not. There is nothing else in the frame (save for the “Sharp” logo on the TV) and the audience has no choice but to focus on the sight of the penis. The instance of the Comedic Device Penis ends with the urethra speaking directly to the camera and we zoom into the shaft and cut away from the penis.

There is definitely homoeroticism and homosexuality in this film. Brüno is overtly and flamboyantly gay, he has a variety of male partners in the film, or at least he attempts to have various male partners. Brüno is not shy about his sexuality and usually throws it in the face of those around him. Even the scenes in gay reversion therapy, which are definitely a comment on the political state in California at the time,³⁰ are commenting on the homophobic nature of Hollywood. Even the opening sequence of the film has Brüno engaged in various sexual practices with his boyfriend. It is interesting to note how these kinds of scenes help to make the presentation of the penis comedic. During the sex scene, and a few other scenes, where one would assume to see the penis, it is blacked-out in post-production. During all the sexual acts Brüno and Diesel (Clifford Banagale) perform, in every instance where one would assume there would be a penis, or even penetration, it is covered. As well, there is the issue with Brüno’s velvet body suit. The suit is made of pink velvet and is anatomically correct; however Brüno’s actual penis is always obscured from view. Here, as mentioned before, the audience is left with the impression that they will not see the penis, even in situations where it

³⁰ “Proposition 8,” which rescinded same-sex marriage in California had recently passed in November of 2008, just before this film’s release.

would be pertinent to see it; it heightens the effect of the Comedic Device Penis when it is actually shown.

The film *Miss March* has another instance of the Comedic Device Penis. While released during the same time frame and following in the same style of comedy as the films mentioned in the core of this thesis, the Comedic Device Penis (or lack thereof) is significantly different in this film. Eugene Bell (Zach Cregger) preached abstinence with his girlfriend Cindi (Raquel Alessi) when in high school, but when the two of them decide to consummate their relationship on Prom night, Eugene accidentally knocks himself unconscious and winds up in a coma for four years. When he comes to he discovers that Cindi has moved on and has actually become a centerfold for *Playboy*. With his best friend, Tucker (Trevor Moore) in tow (a very homosocial relationship), they venture out to track down Cindi so Eugene can once again profess his undying love for her. An old friend from high school, now going by the stage name Horsedick.MPEG (Craig Robinson), constantly harasses the two boys and reminds Eugene that he, Horsedick.MPEG, has had sex with Cindi. It is the character of Horsedick.MPEG that gives the viewer the Comedic Device Penis.

First, the name Horsedick.MPEG leaves the audience with the idea that he possesses a massive penis, worthy of videotaping and posting on the Internet.³¹ He does, however, not even possess a penis; rather, his is a prosthetic one, akin to that in *Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay*, and a very interesting one.

Set in the front yard of the Playboy Mansion, Horsedick.MPEG is accused of not having a penis by Cindi. When the news comes to light, Horsedick.MPEG

³¹ . MPEG is a common format for videos to be uploaded to the Internet.

attempts to change the subject and divert attention away from the revelation proposed by Cindi. His entourage, however, are curious. They realize that despite all this pomp and circumstance regarding the size of his penis none of them has seen his penis. One member of his entourage declares: "Let me see your penis" at which point Horsedick.MPEG is restrained by the remainder of his entourage as the requester pulls down his pants.

A close-up shot follows this diatribe and as Horsedick.MPEG's pants come down the audience gets a full screen shot of his "penis." His "penis" is a fleshy sack of skin, with no testicles, and two juice box straws sticking out from either side. The directors cut to various reaction shots from the people in the area and all of them are disgusted, both audibly and physically. The scene cuts back to an extreme close-up of the prosthetic "penis" for about a half second; the straws are leaking fluid, which is presumably urine, then a cut back to the crowd. Horsedick.MPEG is laughed at and mocked and leaves the scene due to his embarrassment. While this "penis" could be considered a small dick joke, the manner in which it is presented is closely related to the presentation of the other Comedic Device Penises discussed in this thesis.

The final Comedic Device Penis to be discussed here is from the movie *Hall Pass* and falls closely in line with the Comedic Device Penis revealed in this thesis, following closely with the style and themes in the other films mentioned. *Hall Pass* is a film about two friends granted a week long "hall pass" from their respective wives. The "hall pass" allows the men to engage in extra-marital affairs with no consequences on the relationships with their wives. While Fred (Jason Sudeikis)

engages in a sexual affair, he performs oral sex on another woman, Rick (Owen Wilson) fails to engage in an extra-marital affair. This film is an excellent example of the Male Homosocial Desire evident in this genre. The men are actively seeking the company of other women and even drag their married brethren out with them. They spend a vast majority of their time drinking beer, eating wings and talking about what they will do with the women when they find them. However, aside from Fred's oral sex experience, the vast majority of the movie centres on the relationship of the men and their traffic in women. When Rick is offered the potential for meeting another woman and goes to meet her in the local gym, this is where the instance of the Comedic Device Penis, or Penises, occur.

While waiting for his potential rendezvous, Rick has a quick hot tub session. After spending too long in the tub he passes out from the heat and subsequently his muscles atrophy in the process. When he starts to drown two men from the gym come and rescue him from his potential death. Two unnamed individuals appear, Naked Man one (Thaddeus Rahming) grabs Rick's shoulders and pulls him out of the water while Naked Man two (Rich Brown) pulls out Rick's legs. While lying prostrate on the floor of the sauna, Rick, and the audience, get to view instances of the Comedic Device Penis.

The first man is a physically built, large black individual and the second is a red haired flabby, presumably Irish, individual, such that stereotypes are obviously played up in this scene. The first man has a very large, presumably slightly erect, penis and it is framed on screen right beside Rick's face. The penis is within a few inches of Rick. Rick glances at the very large penis, inches from his face, and has an

adverse reaction. Since his muscles are non-functioning he is unable to physically distance himself from the penis. As an alternative, he requests that the second man, whom he calls “Irish,” switch places with the first man. The film cuts to a shot of “Irish”’s face and the camera then pans down to reveal that “Irish” has a very small penis. Here, Rick is more concerned about size rather than just the sight of the penis. Whether Rick is concerned about a comparison with his own penis, which the audience never sees, or the potential of a homosexual encounter, is unclear. If it is a comparison issue one can assume Rick’s penis is bigger than “Irish”’s; if it is a fear of homosexual acts, “Irish” would presumably cause less pain were anal rape to occur.

As this thesis has shown, recent instances of the Comedic Device Penis in contemporary Hollywood Dude Flicks are very conservative comedic moments. While the directors, producers and actors in this particular genre are breaking boundaries on the presentation of male full frontal nudity, I have clearly shown how these films adhere to American conservative and patriarchal cultural values. The presentation of the penis remains well within the confines of the heteronormative sphere despite the claims, by some, that these films are more gay positive. So, what is the future of the penis, Comedic Device or otherwise, in cinema? I believe there are two things at work in this regard within the comedy genre. As Sacha Baron Cohen eloquently asks in the commentary on the *Brüno* DVD: “Do we keep in the penis and the movie will be less of a box office phenomenon, but funnier, or do we chop the penis and put out this slightly less funny movie”—and by conclusion, less offensive. As shown with the Box Office receipts for some of the films mentioned in my analysis, it is plain to see that movies with the Comedic Device Penis, for the

most part, make less money than those in similar style and theme that “chop the penis.” However, as Cohen elaborates, he remembers a scene from *Airplane!* (Jim Abrahams 1980) when a woman appears on screen topless, jumps up and down, then exits frame (perhaps the Comedic Device Breasts?) and recalls how funny and jarring this was. Nevertheless, here we are thirty years later and breasts, in comedy or otherwise, are commonplace. Perhaps by 2040 the penis will be a welcome addition to as many films as the breasts and the vulva are currently. Mainstream Hollywood does not seem to be part of the solution as films produced by white, middle-class, heteronormative men tend to promote their own ideologies and, ultimately, making money tends to be the most important factor.

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick delineated her theory of Male Homosocial Desire by using literature from as far back as the 1600s and one could argue it is evident in even earlier forms of prose. Looking at Greek urns and statuary, as well as the myths of Zeus and Ganymedes, one can easily see the homosexuality involved in early societies (not to mention samurai feudal subcultures in Japan and many other ancient cultures), but one could assume these were early forms of male bonding that evolved into Male Homosocial Desire through the overt pressure of the Christian Church. The puritanical nature of many religions lead to histories of degrading, or even destroying, anything that belies their traditions.

Thus, it can be seen that men looking at and appreciating each other’s genitalia has a rich tradition, despite religious and political pressure to suppress such desires. Perhaps Apatow and his gang are attempting to show that the appreciation of another man’s body is not necessarily homosexual, although a

definite possibility, but something with which Christian patriarchal North American societies need to deal. By presenting the penis in mainstream North American cinema, and particularly comedies, these directors are forcing their audiences to deal with their insecurities about full frontal male nudity. While for the most part, with the exception of *The Hangover*, those films showing the penis do tend to make less at the box office, than say the latex clad groins of super hero movies, but the films discussed in this thesis could be the start of more penis on screen. As of the completion of this thesis the penis is popping up more often in film and television. The penis has a “starring” role in TV shows such as *Oz* (1997-2003) and, following its success on cable television, *Spartacus: Blood and Sand* (2010) again shows a lot of full frontal male nudity. The penis even gets accolades from George Clooney at the most recent Golden Globe awards as a possible contender for Best Actor in *Shame* (Steve McQueen 2011) for Michael Fassbender’s full frontal nude scenes. This author believes the penis should be brought to the foreground more often in cinema not only because it levels the field of objectification for men and women on screen, or because the art form could push an interpretation exploring the human body in its entirety in a cultural landscape crippled by both censorship and the industrialization of porn across the media spectrum, but also because it will perhaps have a positive effect on patriarchal societies: belying heteronormativity for our ever-changing sexual and cultural clime.

References

- Abrams, Nathan. "From Jesus to Jeremy: The Jewish Male Body on Film, 1990 to Present." *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema*. Ed. Santiago Fouz-Hernandez. New York and London: I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., 2009. 13-26. Print.
- Alilunas, Peter. "Male Masculinity as the Celebration of Failure: The Frat Pack, Women, and the Trauma of Victimization in the 'Dude Flick'." *Mediascape: UCLA's Journal of Cinema and Media Studies*. 2008. Web.
- Bordo, Susan. *The Male Body: A New Look at Men in Public and in Private*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999. Print.
- Cohan, Steven and Ina Rae Hark, eds. *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- DeGenevieve, Barbara. "Masculinity and its Discontents." *Camerawork* 18.3-4 (1991): 3-5. Web. 29 Nov. 2011.
- Dickens, Charles. *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*. Ed. Margaret Cardwell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Print.
- Dickens, Charles. *Our Mutual Friend*. Ed. Stephen Gill. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1971. Print.
- Dyer, Richard. "Don't Look Now: The Male Pin-Up." *Screen*. 23.3-4 (1982): 61-73. Print.
- Fouz-Hernandez, Santiago, ed. *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema*. New York and London: I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., 2009. Print.

- Fuchs, Cynthia J. "The Buddy Politic." *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 194-210. Print.
- Greven, David. "Dude, Where's My Gender?: Contemporary Teen Comedies and New Forms of American Masculinity." *Cineaste* 27.3 (2002): 14-21. Print.
- , *Manhood in Hollywood from Bush to Bush*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2009. Print.
- Gunning, Tom. "Crazy Machines in the Garden of Forking Paths: Mischief Gags and the Origins of American Film Comedy." *Classical Hollywood Comedy*. Eds. Kristine Brunovska Karnick and Henry Jenkins. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. 87-105. Print.
- Hark, Ina Rae. "Animals or Romans: Looking at Masculinity in *Spartacus*." Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 151-72. Print.
- Hartmann, Heidi. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more progressive union." *Capital and Class* 3.2 (1979): 1-33. Print.
- Hogg, James. *The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner*. New York: Norton, 1970.
- Holmlund, Chris. *Impossible Bodies: Femininity and masculinity at the movies*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

- , "Masculinity as Multiple Masquerade: The 'mature' Stallone and the Stallone clone." *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 213-29. Print.
- Jeffords, Susan. "Can Masculinity be Terminated?" *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 245-62. Print.
- , *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1994. Print.
- Henry Jenkins. "Reception Theory and Audience Research: The Mystery of the Vampire's Kiss." *Reinventing Film Studies*. Eds. Linda Williams and Christine Gledhill. London: Arnold, 2000. 165-182. Print.
- Jenkins, Henry and Kristine Brunovska, eds. *Classical Hollywood Comedy*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Print.
- Kirkham, Pat and Janet Thumim, eds. *Me Jane: Masculinity, Movies and Women*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995. Print.
- , *You Tarzan: Masculinity, Movies and Men*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993. Print.
- Lee, Chris. "'Forgetting Sarah Marshall' lets it all hang out. The new comedy is Exhibit A in producer Judd Apatow's crusade for full frontal male nudity." *The LA Times*. April 16 2008. Web. Feb. 20, 2012.

- Lehman, Peter. "Crying Over the Melodramatic Penis: Melodrama and Male Nudity in Films of the 90s." *Masculinity: Bodies, Movies, Culture*. Ed. Peter Lehman New York: Routledge, 2001: 25-41. Print
- , *Running Scared: Masculinity and the Representation of the Male Body*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993. Print.
- Mellen, Joan. *Big Bad Wolves: Masculinity in the American Film*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977. Print.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen* 16.3 (1975): 6-18. Print.
- Neale, Steve. "Masculinity as Spectacle: Reflections on men and mainstream cinema." *Screen* 24.6 (1983): 2-16. Print.
- , "Prologue: Masculinity as Spectacle: Reflections on men and mainstream cinema." *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 9-20. Print.
- Neale, Steve and Frank Krutnik. *Popular Film and Television Comedy*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990. Print
- Needham, Gary. "Closer than Ever." *Mysterious Skin: Male Bodies in Contemporary Cinema*. Ed. Santiago Fouz-Hernandez New York and London: I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., 2009. Print
- Ramsay, Christine, ed. *Making it Like a Man: Canadian Masculinities in Practice*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2011. Print.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. Print.

- Shakespeare, William. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Ed. Stephen Booth. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977. Print.
- Stephens, Elizabeth. "The Spectacularized Penis: Contemporary Representations of the Phallic Male Body." *Men and Masculinities* 10.1 (2007): 85-98. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.
- Sterne, Laurence. *A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy*. Ed. Graham Petrie. Hammondsworth, UK, 1967. Print.
- Tasker, Yvonne. "Dumb Movies for Dumb People: Masculinity, the body, and the voice in contemporary action cinema." *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 230-44 Print.
- . *Spectacular Bodies: Gender, Genre, and the Action Cinema*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Tennyson, Alfred, Lord. "The Princess: A Medley." *The Poems of Tennyson*. Ed. Christopher Ricks. London: Longmans, 1969. 743-844. Print.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The History of Henry Esmond, Esq. Written by Himself*. New York: Harper, 1903. Print.
- Walters, Margaret. *The Nude Male: A New Perspective*. London: Paddington Press, Ltd., 1978. Print.
- Waugh, Thomas. *Hard to Imagine: Gay Male Eroticism in Photography and Film from Their Beginning to Stonewall*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. Print.
- . "Homosociality in the Classical American Stag Film: Off-Screen, On-Screen."

- Sexualities* 4.3 (2001): 275-91. Print.
- . *Lust Unearthed: Vintage Gay Graphics from the DuBek Collection*. Vancouver, Arsenal Pulp Press, 2004. Print.
- . *Out/Lines: Underground Gay Graphics from Before Stonewall*. Vancouver, Arsenal Pulp Press, 2002. Print.
- . "What Do Heterosexual Men Want? Or 'The (Wandering) Queer Eye on the (Straight) Guy.'" *Making it Like a Man: Canadian Masculinities in Practice*. Ed. Christine Ramsay. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2011. Print.
- WENN.com. "Apatow Make Penis Promise." www.hollywood.com. N.p. December 17, 2007. Web. 4 Dec. 2010.
- Weigman, Robyn. "Feminism, 'The Boyz,' and Other Matters Regarding the Male." *Screening the Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. Eds. Steven Cohan and Ina Rae Hark. London: Routledge, 1993. 173-93 Print.
- Wycherley, William. *The Country Wife*. Ed. Thomas H. Fujimura. Regents Restoration Drama Series. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1965. Print.

Filmography

The 40-Year-Old Virgin. Dir. Judd Apatow. Perf. Steve Carrell, Catharine Keener, and Paul Rudd. Universal Pictures, 2005. DVD.

300. Dir. Zack Snyder. Perf. Gerard Butler and David Wenham. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2006. DVD.

Airplane!. Dir. Jim Abrahams. Perf. Robert Hays, Julie Hagerty and Leslie Nielsen. Paramount Pictures, 1980. DVD.

American History X. Dir. Tony Kaye. Perf. Edward Norton and Edward Furlong. New Line Cinema, 1998. DVD.

American Pie. Dir. Paul and Chris Weitz. Perf. Jason Biggs, Chris Klein and Seann William Scott. Universal Pictures, 1999. DVD.

American Pie 2. Dir. J.B. Rogers. Perf. Jason Biggs, Chris Klein and Seann William Scott. Universal Pictures, 2001. DVD.

American Wedding. Dir. Jesse Dylan. Perf. Jason Biggs, Seann William Scott and Alyson Hannigan. Universal Pictures, 2003. DVD.

Angels and Insects. Dir. Philip Haas. Perf. Mark Rylance and Kristin Scott Thomas. Playhouse International Pictures, 1995. DVD.

Another Gay Movie. Dir. Todd Stephens. Perf. Michael Carbonaro and Jonathan Chase. Luna Pictures, 2006. DVD.

Antichrist. Dir. Lars von Trier. Perf. Willem Dafoe and Charlotte Gainsbourg. Zentropa Entertainments, 2009. DVD.

Batman. Dir. Tim Burton. Perf. Michael Keaton and Jack Nicholson. Warner Bros. Pictures, 1989. DVD.

- Batman & Robin*. Dir. Joel Schumacher. Perf. Arnold Schwarzenegger, George Clooney and Chris O'Donnell. Warner Bros. Pictures, 1997. DVD.
- Batman Begins*. Dir. Christopher Nolan. Perf. Christian Bale and Michael Caine. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2005. DVD.
- Beautiful Thing*. Dir. Hettie Macdonald. Perf. Linda Henry, Glen berry and Scott Neal. Channel Four Films, 1996. DVD.
- Beverly Hills Cop*. Dir. Martin Brest. Perf. Eddie Murphy and Judge Reinhold. Paramount Pictures, 1984. DVD.
- Boogie Nights*. Dir. Paul Thomas Anderson. Perf. Mark Wahlberg, Julianne Moore and Burt Reynolds. New Line Cinema, 1997. DVD.
- Boyz n the Hood*. Dir. John Singleton. Perf. Cuba Gooding Jr. and Laurence Fishburne. Columbia Pictures, 1991. DVD.
- Brüno*. Dir. Larry Charles. Perf. Sacha Baron Cohen and Gustaf Hammarsten. Universal Pictures, 2009. DVD.
- Carried Away*. Dir. Bruno Barreto. Perf. Dennis Hopper and Amy Irving. New Line Cinema, 1996. DVD.
- Cobb*. Dir. Ron Shelton. Perf. Tommy Lee Jones and Robert Wuhl. Alcor Films, 1994. DVD.
- The Crying Game*. Dir. Neil Jordan. Perf. Stephen Rea and Jaye Davidson. Palace Pictures, 1992. DVD.
- The Dark Knight*. Dir. Christopher Nolan. Perf. Christian Bale and Michael Caine. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2008. DVD.

- Die Hard*. Dir. John McTiernan. Perf. Bruce Willis and Alan Rickman. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1988. DVD.
- Die Hard 2: Die Harder*. Dir. Renny Harlin. Perf. Bruce Willis and William Atherton. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1990. DVD.
- Dodgeball: A True Underdog Story*. Dir. Rawson Marshall Thurber. Perf. Ben Stiller and Vince Vaughn. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 2004. Blu-Ray.
- Dude, Where's My Car?*. Dir. Danny Leiner. Perf. Ashton Kutcher, Seann William Scott, Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1969. DVD.
- Dumb & Dumber*. Dir. Peter and Bobby Farrelly. Perf. Jim Carrey, Jeff Daniels and Lauren Holly. New Line Cinema, 1994. DVD.
- Easy Rider*. Dir. Dennis Hopper. Perf. Dennis Hopper and Peter Fonda. Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1969. DVD.
- Eating Out*. Dir. Q. Allan Brocka. Perf. Scott Lunsford and Jim Verraros. Ariztical Entertainment, 2004. DVD.
- Eating Out 2: Sloppy Seconds* Dir. Phillip J. Bartell. Perf. Jim Verraros and Emily Brooke Hands. EOSS Productions, 2006. DVD.
- Edison Kinetoscopic Record of a Sneeze*. Dir. William K.L. Dickson. Perf. Fred Ott. Edison Manufacturing Company, 1894. DVD.
- Fight Club*. Dir. David Fincher. Perf. Edward Norton and Brad Pitt. Fox 2000 Pictures, 1999. DVD.
- First Blood*. Dir. Ted Kotcheff. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Brian Dennehy. Elcajo Productions, 1982. DVD.

A Fistful of Dollars. Dir. Sergio Leone. Perf. Clint Eastwood and Gian Maria Volonté.

Constantin Film Produktion, 1964. DVD.

Forgetting Sarah Marshall. Dir. Nicholas Stoller. Perf. Jason Segel, Kristen Bell, Mila

Kunis, and Russell Brand. Universal Pictures, 2008. DVD.

Funny People. Dir. Judd Apatow. Perf. Seth Rogen and Adam Sandler. Universal

Pictures, 2009. DVD.

Get Real. Dir. Simon Shore. Perf. Ben Silverstone and Brad Gorton. British Screen

Productions, 1998. DVD.

The Governess. Dir. Sandra Goldbacher. Perf. Minnie Driver and Tom Wilkinson. BBC,

1998. DVD.

Hall Pass. Dir. Peter and Bobby Farrelly. Perf. Owen Wilson and Jason Sudeikis. New

Line Cinema, 2011. Blu-Ray.

The Hanging Garden. Dir. Thom Fitzgerald. Perf. Tory Veinotte, Peter MacNeill and

Kerry Fox. Alliance Communications Corporation, 1997. DVD.

The Hangover. Dir. Todd Phillips. Perf. Zach Galifianakis, Bradley Cooper, and Justin

Bartha. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2009. Blu-Ray.

Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay. Dir. Jon Hurwitz and Hayden

Schlossberg. Perf. John Cho, Kal Penn, and Neil Patrick Harris. New Line

Cinema, 2008. DVD

Harold & Kumar Go to White Castle. Dir. Danny Leiner. Perf. John Cho, Kal Penn and

Neil Patrick Harris. Endgame Entertainment, 2004. DVD.

Hollywood, je t'aime. Dir. Jason Bushman. Perf. Eric Debets and Chad Allen. Lightfoot

Productions, 2009. DVD.

I Love You, Man. Dir. John Hamburg. Perf. Paul Rudd, Jason Segel, and Rashida Jones.

DreamWorks SKG, 2009. DVD.

L'Arroseur arrosé. Dir. Louis Lumière. Perf. Francois Clerc and Benoit Duval.

Lumière, 1895. DVD.

Lethal Weapon. Dir. Richard Donner. Perf. Mel Gibson and Danny Glover. Warner

Bros. Pictures, 1987. DVD.

Lilies. Dir. John Greyson. Perf. Jason Cadieux, Matthew Ferguson and Brent Carver.

Galafilm Productions, 1996. DVD.

Lock Up. Dir. John Flynn. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Donald Sutherland. White

Eagle, 1989. DVD.

Maurice. Dir. James Ivory. Perf. James Wilby, Rupert Graves and Hugh Grant.

Merchant Ivory Productions, 1987. DVD.

Miss March. Dir. Zach Cregger and Trevor Moore. Perf. Zach Cregger and Trevor

Moore. Fox Atomic, 2009. DVD.

Observe and Report. Dir. Jody Hill. Perf. Seth Rogen, Anna Faris, and Ray Liotta.

Legendary Pictures, 2009. DVD.

Old School. Dir. Todd Phillips. Perf. Luke Wilson, Vince Vaughn and Will Ferrell.

DreamWorks SKG, 2003. DVD.

Orgazmo. Dir. Trey Parker. Perf. Trey Parker and Dian Bachar. Kuzui Enterprises,

1997. DVD.

Oz. Creat. Tom Fontana. HBO, 1997-2003. DVD.

The Pillow Book. Dir. Peter Greenaway. Perf. Vivian Wu and Ewan McGregor.

Kasander and Wigman Productions, 1996. DVD.

Rambo. Dir. Sylvester Stallone. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Julie Benz. Lionsgate, 2008. DVD.

Rambo: First Blood Part II. Dir. George P. Cosmatos. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Richard Crenna. Anabasis N.V. 1985. DVD.

Rambo III. Dir. Peter MacDonald. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Richard Crenna. Carolco Pictures, 1988. DVD.

Ray. Dir. Taylor Hackford. Perf. Jamie Foxx and Regina King. Universal Pictures, 2004. DVD.

Rocky. Dir. John G. Avildsen. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Talia Shire. United Artists, 1976. DVD.

Shame. Dir. Steve McQueen. Perf. Michael Fassbender and Carey Mulligan. Film4, 2011. 35mm.

Shortbus. Dir. John Cameron Mitchell. Perf. Sook-yin Lee and Peter Stickles. THINKFilm, 2006. DVD.

The Silence of the Lambs. Dir. Jonathan Demme. Perf. Jodie Foster and Sir Anthony Hopkins. Orion Pictures Corporation, 1991. Blu-Ray.

Smokey and the Bandit. Dir. Hal Needham. Perf. Burt Reynolds and Sally Field. Universal Picture, 1977. DVD.

Spartacus. Dir. Stanley Kubrick. Perf. Kirk Douglas and Laurence Olivier. Bryna Productions. 1960. DVD.

Spartacus: Blood and Sand. Creat. Steven S. DeKnight. Starz, 2010. DVD.

Superbad. Dir. Greg Mottola. Perf. Michael Cera, Jonah Hill, and Christopher Mintz-Plasse. Columbia Pictures, 2007. DVD.

- Taking Woodstock*. Dir. Ang Lee. Perf. Demetri Martin and Henry Goodman. Focus Features, 2009. DVD.
- Tango and Cash*. Dir. Andrey Konchalovskiy. Perf. Sylvester Stallone and Kurt Russell. Warner Bros. Pictures, 1989. DVD.
- The Terminator*. Dir. James Cameron. Perf. Arnold Schwarzenegger and Linda Hamilton. Hemdale Film, 1984. DVD.
- Terminator 2: Judgment Day*. Dir. James Cameron. Perf: Arnold Schwarzenegger, Linda Hamilton and Edward Furlong. Carolco Pictures, 1991. DVD.
- There's Something About Mary*. Dir. Bobby and Peter Farrelly. Perf. Ben Stiller and Cameron Diaz. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 1998. DVD.
- Walk Hard: The Dewey Cox Story*. Dir. Jake Kasdan. Perf. John C Reilly, Jenna Fischer, and David Krumholtz. Columbia Pictures, 2007. DVD.
- Walk the Line*. Dir. James Magold. Perf. Joaquin Phoenix and Reese Witherspoon. Fox 2000 Pictures, 2005. DVD.
- Zack and Miri Make a Porno*. Dir. Kevin Smith. Perf. Seth Rogen, Elizabeth Banks, and Craig Robertson. The Weinstein Company, 2008. DVD.

Appendix

The Male Body, Male Homosocial Desire and the Comedic Device Penis in Contemporary Hollywood Comedies

I attach this list of 183 films from the period 2006-2011 in order to provide the world cinematic context for the Comedic Device Penis that I have analyzed within my narrow corpus of six Hollywood comedies. This appendix was compiled using the Internet resource www.cinemale.com, a website devoted to male nudity in the media. The site has information on thousands of films, TV shows and viral videos and includes clips for almost all of its listed films. The site deals with male nudity from underwear shots to rear nudity to full frontal nudity and is categorized as such. The site is very thorough and includes information from visitors as well as the webmaster. However, it is important to note that the following list is not comprehensive or exhaustive.

Upon compiling the list of movies with male full frontal nudity from 1990 to 2011 I chose to narrow my focus. I selected only films that were given a theatrical release, however minimal, from one year previous to the first instance of the Comedic Device Penis discussed in my thesis. Therefore, this list includes films from 2006 until 2011. While immensely helpful, www.cinemale.com does not include directors, actors (other than those who are naked), or production company information on its database. Upon researching this information on www.imdb.com it came to light that www.cinemale.com records some release dates and title information incorrectly. As well, from my first visit to the site to my most recent, some older titles were added. Therefore, this appendix serves as a general outline

and overview of male full frontal nudity in feature films from around the world and is not a complete list. Titles may be added in the future.

The titles listed below all contain full frontal male nudity. However, unlike the instances of the Comedic Device Penis highlighted in my thesis, the penis in these films may not appear as prominently on camera. Some penises are framed in extreme long shots and are barely visible; some are fleeting glimpses lasting only a frame or two and may have been unintentional; some are obscured by shadow and are only visible when viewing on the proper format, e.g.: thirty-five millimetre projection versus Video. Those films marked with an "*" are gay themed, contain prominent gay characters, incorporate gay sex and/or are directed by an out gay man. Also interesting are the number of films that are independent productions versus major studio releases. Of the 183 films listed only twenty-three were produced by a major Hollywood studio and only three of those fit the criteria listed above to be considered gay. As well, only fifteen of the films were directed by women. Of the films listed, those considered gay more prominently display the penis and, for the most part, actively engage in homoeroticism while the penis is on display. Those films that eroticize the penis but fall outside the gay criteria eliminate any homoeroticism while the penis is on display.

Films with full frontal male nudity between 2006 and 2011

2 Days in Paris. Dir. Julie Delpy. Perf. Julie Delpy and Adam Goldberg. Polaris Films, 2007. France.

**2 Minutes Later*. Dir. Michael Gaston. Perf. Michael Molina and Jessica Graham. 2ML Productions, 2007. USA.

**3-Day Weekend*. Dir. Rob Williams. Perf. Chris Carlisle and Joel Harrison. Guest House Films, 2008. USA.

3some (Castillos de carton). Dir. Salvador Garcia Ruiz. Perf. Adriana Ugarte and Biel Duran. Castafiore Films, 2009. USA.

Accomplices (Complice). Dir. Frédéric Mermoud. Perf. Gilbert Melki and Emmanuelle Devos. Tabo Tabo Films, 2009. France.

All About My Bush (Allt om min buske). Dir. Martina Bigert. Perf. Ola Rapace and Maria Kulle. Film I Väst, 2007. Sweden.

**Another Gay Movie*. Dir. Todd Stephens. Perf. Michael Carbonaro and Jonathan Chase. Luna Pictures, 2006. USA.

**Another Gay Sequel: Gays Gone Wild*. Dir. Todd Stephens. Perf. Jonah Blechman and Jake Mosser. Luna Pictures, 2008. USA.

**Antarctica*. Dir. Yair Hochner. Perf. Ofer Regirer and Guy Zoaretz. Here! Films, 2008. Israel.

Antichrist. Dir. Lars von Trier. Perf. Willem Dafoe and Charlotte Gainsbourg. Zentropa Entertainments, 2009. USA.

April in Love (Avril). Dir. Gérald Hustache-Mathieu. Perf. Sophie Quinton and Miou-Miou. Dharamsala, 2006. France.

Art School Confidential. Dir. Terry Zwigoff. Perf. Max Minghella and Sophia Myles.

United Artists, 2006. USA.

The Baader Meinhof Complex (Der Baader Meinhof Komplex). Dir. Uli Edel. Perf.

Martina Gedeck and Moritz Bleibtreu. Constantin Film Produktion, 2008.

Germany.

Baptism of Blood (Batismo de Sangue). Dir. Helvecio Ratton. Perf. Caio Blat and

Daniel de Oliveira. Quimera Produções, 2006. Brazil.

Bedways. Dir. Rolf Peter Kahl. Perf. Miriam Mayet and Matthias Faust. Independent

Partners, 2010. Germany.

The Belly Dancer (Lirkod). Dir. Marek Rozenbaum. Perf. Meital Dohan and Alon

Aboutboul. Israeli Film Fund, 2006. Israel.

**Between Love and Goodbye*. Dir. Casper Andreas. Perf. Simon Miller and Justin

Tensen. Embrem Entertainment, 2009. USA.

**Between Something and Nothing*. Dir. Todd Verow. Perf. Robert Axel and Gil Bar-

Sela. Bangor Films, 2008. USA.

Blitz. Dir. Elliott Lester. Perf. Jason Statham and Paddy Considine. Lionsgate, 2011.

USA.

Boogie Woogie. Dir. Duncan Ward. Perf. Gillian Anderson and Alan Cumming.

Autonomous, 2009. USA.

Book Of Blood. Dir. John Harrison. Perf. Jonas Armstrong and Sophie Ward. Matador

Pictures, 2009. UK.

The Book of Revelation. Dir. Ana Kokkinos. Perf. Tom Long and Greta Scacchi.

Wildheart Zizani, 2006. Australia.

- Boondock Saints II: All Saints Day*. Dir. Troy Duffy. Perf. Sean Patrick Flanery and Norman Reedus. Stage 6 Films, 2009. USA.
- Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan*. Dir. Larry Charles. Perf. Sacha Baron Cohen and Ken Davitian. Four by Two, 2006. USA.
- *Born in 68 (Nés en 68)*. Dir. Olivier Ducastel and Jacques Martineau. Perf. Laetitia Casta and Yannick Renier. Les Films Pellés, 2008. France.
- Boy*. Dir. Taiki Waititi. Perf. James Rolleston and Te Aho Aho Eketone-Whitu. Whenua Films, 2009. Philippines.
- Bride Flight*. Dir. Ben Sombogaart. Perf. Karina Smulders and Anna Drijver. Samsa Films, 2008. Netherlands.
- *Broken Sky (El cielo dividido)*. Dir. Julián Hernández. Perf. Miguel Ángel Hoppe and Fernando Arroyo. Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematográficos, 2006. Mexico.
- Bronson*. Dir. Nicolas Winding Refn. Perf. Tom Hardy and Kelly Adams. Vertigo Film, 2008. UK.
- *Brüno*. Dir. Larry Charles. Perf. Sacha Baron Cohen and Gustaf Hammarsten. Universal Pictures, 2009. USA.
- The Buffalo Night (El búfalo de la noche)*. Dir. Jorge Hernandez Aldana. Perf. Diego Luna and Liz Gallardo. La Neta Films/Naco Films, 2007. Mexico.
- Bug*. Dir. William Friedkin. Perf. Ashley Judd and Michael Shannon. Lions Gate Films, 2006. USA.

- *Bulldog in the White House.* Dir. Todd Verow. Perf. Theodore Bouloukos and Michael Burke. Bangor Films, 2006. USA.
- Chronicle of an Escape (Crónica de una fuga).* Dir. Adrián Caetano. Perf. Rodrigo De la Serna and Pablo Echarri. 20th Century Fox de Argentina, 2006. Argentina.
- *Clandestine (Clandestinos)* Dir. Antonio Hens. Perf. Israel Rodriguez and Mehroz Arif. Darkwind Seven, 2007. Spain.
- Confetti.* Dir. Debbie Isitt. Perf. Martin Freeman and Jessica Hynes. Confetti Productions Ltd., 2006. UK.
- Consequences.* Dir. Stephen Stahl. Perf. Ernest E. Brown and Chris Cannon. FIN Pictures, 2006. USA.
- Cousin Basílio (Primo Basílio).* Dir. Daniel Filho. Perf. Débora Falabell and Fábio Assunção. Lereby Productions, 2007. Brazil.
- *Cover Boy: L'ultima rivoluzione.* Dir. Carmine Amoroso. Perf. Eduard Gabia and Luca Lionella. Paco Cinematografica, 2007. Italy.
- *David's Birthday (Il compleanno).* Dir. Marco Filiberti. Perf. Alessandro Gassman and Maria de Medeiros. Zen Zero, 2009. Italy.
- *Deleted Scenes.* Dir. Todd Verow. Perf. Ivica Kovacevic and Michael Vaccaro. Bangor Films, 2010. USA.
- Descent.* Dir. Talia Lugacy. Perf. Rosario Dawson and Chad Faust. City Lights Pictures, 2007. USA.
- Diary of a Nymphomaniac (Diario de una ninfómana).* Dir. Christian Molina, Perf. Belén Fabra and Leonardo Sbaraglia. Canonigo Films, 2008. Spain.

- *The Distance (La Distancia)*. Dir. Iñaki Dorronsoro. Perf. Miguel Ángel Silvestre and José Coronado. Ábaco Movies S.L., 2006. Spain.
- *Dog Tags*. Dir. Damion Dietz. Perf. Paul Preiss and Amy Lindsay. New Media Entertainment LLC, 2008. USA.
- Dogtooth (Kynodontas)*. Dir. Giorgo Lanthimos. Perf. Christos Stergioglou and Michele Valley. Boo Productions, 2009. Greece.
- Don't Look Down (No mires para abajo)*. Dir. Eliseo Subiela. Perf. Leandro Stivelman and Antonella Costa. Centre National de la Cinématographie, 2008. Argentina.
- Donkey Punch*. Dir. Oliver Blackburn. Perf. Sian Breckin and Nichola Burley. EM Media, 2008. UK.
- Eastern Promises*. Dir. David Cronenberg. Perf. Naomi Watts and Viggo Mortensen. Focus Features, 2007. USA.
- *Eating Out 2: Sloppy Seconds* Dir. Phillip J. Bartell. Perf. Jim Verraros and Emily Brooke Hands. EOSS Productions, 2006. USA
- *Eating Out 3: All You Can Eat*. Dir. Glenn Gaylord. Perf. Rebekah Kochan and Daniel Skelton. EOSS Productions, 2009. USA.
- *Eating Out 4: Drama Camp*. Dir. Q. Allan Brocka. Perf. Chris Salvatore and Daniel Skelton. Ariztical Entertainment, 2011. USA.
- Eden Lake*. Dir. James Watkins. Perf. Kelly Reilly and Michael Fassbender. Rollercoaster Films, 2008. UK.
- El Cortez*. Dir. Stephen Purvis. Perf. Lou Diamond Phillips and Bruce Weitz. Three-Four Productions LLC, 2006. USA.

Everyone Else (Alle Anderen). Dir. Maren Ade. Perf. Birgit Minichmayr and Lars Eldinger. Komplizen Film, 2009. Germany.

Eyes Wide Open (Einayim Petukhoth). Dir. Haim Tabakman. Perf. Zohar Shtrauss and Ran Danker. Das Kleine Fernsehspiel (ZDF), 2009. Israel.

**Fig Trees*. Dir. John Greyson. Perf. Van Abrahams and Zackie Achmat. Greyzone, 2009. Canada.

Finding Bliss. Dir. Julie Davis. Perf. Leelee Sobieski and Matthew Davis. Cinamour Entertainment, 2009. USA.

Finishing the Game. Dir. Justin Lin. Perf. Roger Fan and Dustin Nguyen. Barnstorm Pictures, 2007. USA.

Flannel Pajamas. Dir. Jeff Lipsky. Perf. Justin Kirk and Julianne Nicholson. Gigantic Pictures, 2006. USA.

**Focus/Refocus*. Dir. Ben Leon. Perf. Cole Streets and David Taylor. Raging Stallion, 2010. USA.

Forgetting Sarah Marshall. Dir. Nicholas Stoller. Perf. Jason Segel, Kristen Bell, Mila Kunis, and Russell Brand. Universal Pictures, 2008. USA.

Forgiving the Franklins. Dir. Jay Floyd. Perf. Teresa Willis and Robertson Dean. Grinning Idiot Entertainment, 2006. USA.

The Free Will (Der Freie Wille). Dir. Matthias Glasner. Perf. Jürgen Vogel and Sabine Timoteo. Colonia Media, 2006. Germany.

Fur: An Imaginary Portrait of Diane Arbus. Dir. Steven Shainberg. Perf. Nicole Kidman and Robert Downey Jr. Edward R. Pressman Film, 2006. USA.

Ganes. Dir. Jukka-Pekka Siili. Perf. Eero Milonoff and Jussi Nikkilä. Helsinki Filmi Oy, 2007. Finland.

Ghost Son. Dir. Lamberto Bava. Perf. Laura Harring and John Hannah. Star Edizioni Cinematografiche, 2006. Italy/South Africa/Spain/UK

**Greek Pete*. Dir. Andrew Haigh. Perf. Peter Pittaros and Lewis Wallis. Peccadillo Pictures, 2009. UK.

Hall Pass. Dir. Peter and Bobby Farrelly. Perf. Owen Wilson and Jason Sudeikis. New Line Cinema, 2011. USA.

The Hangover. Dir. Todd Phillips. Perf. Zach Galifianakis, Bradley Cooper, and Justin Bartha. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2009. USA.

Hanna Takes the Stairs. Dir. Joe Swanberg. Perf. Greta Gerwig and Kent Osborne. Film Science, 2007. USA.

Harold & Kumar Escape from Guantanamo Bay. Dir. Jon Hurwitz and Hayden Schlossberg. Perf. John Cho, Kal Penn, and Neil Patrick Harris. New Line Cinema, 2008. USA.

**Hollywood, je t'aime*. Dir. Jason Bushman. Perf. Eric Debets and Chad Allen. Lightfoot Productions, 2009. USA.

**The Houseboy*. Dir. Spencer Schilly. Perf. Nick May and Blake Young-Fountain. TLA Releasing, 2007. USA.

Human Centipede. Dir. Tom Six. Perf. Dieter Laser and Ashley C. Williams. Six Entertainment, 2009. Netherlands.

Human Zoo. Dir. Rie Rasmussen. Perf. Rie Rasmussen and Nikola Djuricko. Europa Corp., 2010. France.

- Hunger*. Dir. Steve McQueen. Perf. Stuart Graham and Laine Megaw. Channel Four Films, 2008. Ireland.
- **I Dreamt Under the Water (J'ai rêvé sous l'eau)*. Dir. Hormoz. Perf. Hubert Benhamdine and Caroline Ducey. Wide Management, 2008. France.
- I'll Come Running*. Dir. Spencer Parsons. Perf. Jon Lange and Kjartan Arngrim. Film Science, 2008. Denmark.
- **I'm Not There*. Dir. Todd Haynes. Perf. Christian Bale and Cate Blanchett. Killer Films, 2007. USA
- I'm Still Here*. Dir. Casey Affleck. Perf. Joaquin Phoenix and Antony Langdon. They Are Going to Kill Us Productions, 2010. USA.
- **In Paris (Dans Paris)*. Dir. Christophe Honoré. Perf. Romain Duris and Louis Garrel. Gemini Films, 2006. France.
- The Informers*. Dir. Gregor Jordan. Perf. Billy Bob Thornton and Kim Basinger. Senator Entertainment Co., 2008. USA.
- InSearchOf*. Dir. Zeke Zelker. Perf. Emily Grace and Keith Nobbs. Independent Dream Machine, 2009. USA.
- Into the Wild*. Dir. Sean Penn. Perf. Emile Hirsch and Vince Vaughn. Paramount Vantage, 2007. USA.
- Jackass Number Two*. Dir. Jeff Tremaine. Perf. Johnny Knoxville and Steve-O. Paramount Pictures, 2006. USA.
- Jackass 3D*. Dir. Jeff Tremaine. Perf. Johnny Knoxville and Steve-O. Dickhouse Productions, 2010. USA.

Japan Japan. Dir. Lior Shamriz. Perf. Imri Kahn and Amnon Friedman. Jehuti Films, 2007. Germany/Israel.

**Kaboom*. Dir. Gregg Araki. Perf. Thomas Dekker and Haley Bennett. Why Not Productions, 2010. USA.

**Keillers Park*. Dir. Susanna Edwards. Perf. Mårten Klingberg and Pjotr Giro. Cine-Qua-Non, 2006. Sweden.

Kinky Killers. Dir. George Lekovic. Perf. Michael Paré and Charles Durning. Justice for All Productions, 2007. USA.

The Dog Pound (La Perrera). Dir. Manolo Nieto. Perf. Pablo Riera and Martin Adjemián. Ctrl Z Films, 2006. Argentina/Canada/Uruguay.

Lady Chatterley. Dir. Pascale Ferran. Perf. Marina Hands and Jean-Louis Coullo'ch. Maïa Films, 2006. France.

The Last Mistress (Une vieille maîtresse). Dir. Catherine Breillat. Perf. Asia Argento and Fu'ad Aït Aattou. Flach Film, 2007. France.

The Last King of Scotland. Dir. Kevin Macdonald. Perf. James McAvoy and Forest Whitaker. Fox Searchlight Pictures, 2006. UK.

Life is Hot in Cracktown. Dir. Buddy Giovinazzo. Perf. Evan Ross and Stephanie Lugo. Karmic Productions, 2009. USA.

**Light Gradient (Rückenwind)*. Dir. Jan Krüger. Perf. Sebastian Schlecht and Eric Golub. Salzberger & Company Medien, 2009. Germany.

**Lost Song*. Dir. Rodrigue Jean. Perf. Suzie LeBlanc and Patrick Goyette. Transmar Films, 2008. Canada.

- *Love Life*. Dir. Damion Dietz. Perf. Keith Bearden and Stephan D. Gill. New Media Entertainment LLC, 2006. USA.
- The Man in the Lighthouse (Ang lalake sa parola)*. Dir. Joselito Altarejos. Perf. Harry Laurel and Jennifer Lee. Beyond the Box, 2007. Philippines.
- A Man's Work (Miehen työ)*. Dir. Aleksi Salmenperä. Perf. Tommi Korpela and Maria Heiskanen. Blind Spot Pictures Oy, 2007. Finland.
- Máncora*. Dir. Ricardo de Montreuil. Perf. Jason Day and Elsa Pataky. Hispafilms, 2008. Spain.
- Map of the Sounds of Tokyo (Mapa de los sonidos de Tokio)*. Dir. Isabel Coixet. Perf. Rinko Kikuchi and Sergi López. Mediapro, 2009. Spain.
- The Mark of Cain*. Dir. Marc Munden. Perf. Gerard Kearns and Matthew McNulty. Red Production Company, 2007. UK.
- Messy Christmas (Meine schöne Bescherung)*. Dir. Vanessa Jopp. Perf. Martina Gedeck and Heino Ferch. X-Filme Creative Pool, 2007. Germany.
- Miss March*. Dir. Zach Cregger and Trevor Moore. Perf. Zach Cregger and Trevor Moore. Fox Atomic, 2009. USA.
- *Naked Boys Singing*. Dir. Robert Schrock and Troy Christian. Perf. Andrew Blake Ames and Jason Currie. Funny Boy Films, 2009. USA.
- Natasha*. Dir. Jag Mundhra. Perf. Algina Lipskis and Sheyla Shehovich. Inspired Movies, 2006. UK.
- *Newcastle*. Dir. Dan Castle. Perf. Lachlan Buchanan and Xavier Samuel. Dragonfly Pictures, 2008. Australia.

- Nightwatching*. Dir. Peter Greenaway. Perf. Martin Freeman and Emily Holmes.
ContentFilm International, 2007. UK.
- Now and Later*. Dir. Philippe Diaz. Perf. Erwin Elian Arauz and Greg Arrowood.
Cinema Libre Studio, 2009. USA.
- Observe and Report*. Dir. Jody Hill. Perf. Seth Rogen, Anna Faris, and Ray Liotta.
Legendary Pictures, 2009. USA.
- **One to Another (Chacun sa nuit)*. Dir. Pascal Arnold and Jean-Marc Barr. Perf. Lizzie Brocheré and Arthur Dupont. Zentropa Entertainments, 2006. France.
- Open Water 2: Adrift*. Dir. Hans Horn. Perf. Susan May Pratt and Richard Speight Jr.
Orange Pictures, 2006. USA.
- The Orgasm Diaries*. Dir. Ashley Horner. Perf. Nancy Trotter Landry and Liam Browne. Pinball Films, 2010. UK.
- **Otto; or, Up with Dead People*. Dir. Bruce La Bruce. Perf. Jey Crisfar and Marcel Schlutt. Jürgen Brüning Filmproduktion, 2008. Canada/Germany.
- **Pornography: A Thriller*. Dir. David Kittredge. Perf. Matthew Montgomery and Pete Scherer. Triple Fire Productions, 2009. USA.
- Postal: The Movie*. Dir. Uwe Boll. Perf. Dave Foley and Verne Troyer. Boll Kino Beteiligungs GmbH & Co. KG, 2007. Canada/Germany/USA.
- **Praxis*. Dir. Alex Pacheco. Perf. Tom Macy and Andrew Roth. Damaged Films, 2008.
USA.
- The Princess of Montpensier (La princesse de Montpensier)*. Dir. Bertrand Tavernier.
Perf. Mélanie Thierry and Lambert Wilson. Paradis Films, 2010.
France/Germany.

A Prophet (Un prophète). Dir. Jacques Audiard. Perf. Tahar Rahim and Niels Arestrup.

Why Not Productions, 2009. France/Italy

**R U Invited? (Sur invit...)*. Dir. Israel Luna. Perf. Oscar Contreras and John de los

Santos. La Luna Entertainment, 2006. France.

**Raging Sun, Raging Sky (Rabioso sol, rabioso cielo)*. Dir. Julián Hernández. Perf. Jorge

Becerra and Javier Oliván. Mil Nubes-Cine, 2009 Mexico.

The Reader. Dir. Stephen Daldry. Perf. Kate Winslet and Ralph Fiennes. The

Weinstein Company, 2009. UK.

Red is the Color of... Dir. Anne Norda. Perf. Irina Björklund and Peter Franzén. Bear

Island Films, 2007. USA.

Red Road. Dir. Andrea Arnold. Perf. Kate Dickie and Tony Curran. Advanced Part

Scheme, 2006. Denmark/UK

**Redwoods*. Dir. David Lewis. Perf. Matthew Montgomery and Brendan Bradley.

Funny Boy Films, 2009. USA.

**Release*. Dir. Darren Flaxstone and Christian Martin. Perf. Daniel Brocklebank and

Garry Summers. FAQs, 2007. USA.

Rise of the Footsoldier. Dir. Julian Gilbey. Perf. Ricci Harnett and Terry Stone.

Carnaby International, 2007. UK.

**Rock Haven*. Dir. David Lewis. Perf. Sean Hoagland and Owen Alabado. Morning

View Films, 2007. Canada.

A Rose of France (Una rosa de Francia). Dir. Manuel Gutiérrez Aragón. Perf. Jorge

Perugorria and Álex González. Instituto Cubano del Arte e Industrias

Cinematográficos, 2006. Spain.

Savage. Dir. Brendan Muldowney. Perf. Darren Healy and Nora-Jane Noone. SP Films, 2009. Ireland.

**Savage Grace*. Dir. Tom Kalin. Perf. Julianne Moore and Eddie Redmayne. 120dB Films, 2007. USA.

The Science of Sleep (La science des rêves). Dir. Michel Gondry. Perf. Gael Garcia Bernal and Charlotte Gainsbourg. Partizan Films, 2006. France.

The Secret in Their Eyes (El secreto de sus ojos). Dir. Juan José Campanella. Perf. Ricardo Darín and Soledad Villamil. Torrasol Films, 2009. Spain.

The Sentiment of the Flesh (Le sentiment de la chair). Dir. Roberto Garzelli. Perf. Thibault Vinçon and Annabelle Hettmann. Stella Films, 2010. France.

Service (Serbis). Dir. Brillante Mendoza. Perf. Gina Pareño and Jacklyn Jose. Centerstage Productions, 2008. Philippines.

Sex and the City Movie. Dir. Michael Patrick King. Perf. Sarah Jessica Parker and Kim Cattrall. New Line Cinema, 2008. USA.

Shame. Dir. Steve McQueen. Perf. Michael Fassbender and Carey Mulligan. Film4, 2011. USA.

**Shank*. Dir. Simon Pearce. Perf. Wayne Virgo and Marc Laurent. FAQs, 2009. UK.

**Shock to the System*. Dir. Ron Oliver. Perf. Chad Allen and Sebastian Spence. Insight Film Studios, 2006. Canada.

**Shortbus*. Dir. John Cameron Mitchell. Perf. Sook-yeon Lee and Peter Stickles. THINKFilm, 2006. USA.

**Shut Up and Kiss Me*. Dir. David Hamilton. Perf. Ronnie Kerr and Scott Gabelein. Kerrdog Productions, 2010. USA.

Shutter Island. Dir. Martin Scorsese. Perf. Leonardo DiCaprio and Emily Mortimer.

Paramount Pictures, 2009. USA.

Silent Resident (Weisse Lilien). Dir. Christian Frosch. Perf. Brigitte Hobeier and

Johanna Wokalek. KGP Kranzelbinder Gabriele Productions, 2007. UK.

**Socket*. Dir. Sean Abley. Perf. Derek Long and Matthew Montgomery. Dark Blue

Films and Velvet Candy, 2007. USA.

Someone's Knocking at the Door. Dir. Chad Ferrin. Perf. Noah Segan and Ezra

Buzzington. Mirage Pictures JR, 2009. USA.

**Starrbooty*. Dir. Mike Ruiz. Perf. RuPaul and Lahoma Van Zandt. RuCo Pictures,

2007. USA.

Starship Troopers 3: Marauder. Dir. Edward Neumeier. Perf. Casper Van Dien and

Jolene Blalock. Sony Pictures Home Entertainment, 2008. USA.

**Stealth (Comme des voleurs (à l'est))*. Dir. Lionel Baier. Perf. Natacha

Koutchmoumov and Lionel Baier. Saga-Productions, 2006. France.

**The Stranger in Us*. Dir. Scott Boswell. Perf. Raphael Barker and Adam David.

Paperback Films, 2010. USA

Summer '04 (Sommer '04). Dir. Stefan Krohmer. Perf. Martina Gedeck and Robert

Seeliger. Ö-Filmproduktion, 2006. Germany.

The Switch. Dir. Josh Gordon and Will Speck. Perf. Jennifer Aniston and Jason

Bateman. Mandate Pictures, 2010. USA.

**Taking Woodstock*. Dir. Ang Lee. Perf. Demetri Martin and Henry Goodman. Focus

Features, 2009. USA.

- Talk to Me*. Dir. Kasi Lemmons. Perf. Don Cheadle and Chiwetel Ejiofor. Sidney Kimmel Entertainment, 2007. UK.
- **Tan Lines*. Dir. Ed Aldridge. Perf. Jack Baxter and Lorena Arancibia. Peccadillo Pictures, 2006. Australia.
- Taxidermia*. Dir. György Pálfi. Perf. Csaba Czene and Gergely Trócsányi. Amour Fou Filmproduktion, 2006. France/Hungary.
- Teeth*. Dir. Mitchell Lichtenstein. Perf. Jess Weixler and John Hensley. Teeth, 2007. USA.
- Tell No One (Ne le dis à personne)*. Dir. Guillaume Canet. Perf. François Cluzet and Marie-Josée Croze. Les Productions de Trésor, 2006. France.
- The Three Little Pigs (Les 3 p'tits cochons)*. Dir. Patrick Huard. Perf. Claude Legault and Guillaume Lemay-Thivierge. Zoofilms, 2007. Canada.
- Three Pieces of Love in a Weekend (Tres piezas de amor en fin de semana)*. Dir. Salvador Barraza. Perf. Adriana Barraza and Juan Carlos Barreto. De Cuernos Al Abismo, 2009. Mexico.
- Tokyo!: Merde*. Dir. Leos Carax. Perf. Ayako Fujitani and Ryo Kase. Comme des Cinémas, 2008 France/Japan
- Tony Manero*. Dir. Pablo Larrain. Perf. Alfredo Castro and Amparo Noguera. Fabula Productions, 2008. Chile.
- Triage*. Dir. Danis Tanovic. Perf. Colin Farrell and Jamie Sives. Parallel Film Productions, 2009. USA.
- The Tripper*. Dir. David Arquette. Perf. Jaime King and Thomas Jane. Coquette Productions, 2006. USA.

- *Tropical Flavor (Sabor Tropical)*. Dir. Jorge Aneer. Perf. Matthew Leitch and Jose Rosete. A.J. Productions, 2010. USA.
- *Twelve Thirty*. Dir. Jeff Lipsky. Perf. Reed Birney and Jonathan Groff. Twelve Thirty Productions, 2010. USA.
- Upside Down (Pevrteno)*. Dir. Igor Ivanov Izi. Perf. Milan Tocinovski and Sanja Trajkovic. Sektor Film Skopje, 2007. Macedonia.
- *Vacationland*. Dir. Todd Verow. Perf. Brad Hallowell and Gregory J. Lucas. Bangor Films, 2006. USA.
- Vice*. Dir. Raul Inglis. Perf. Michael Madsen and Justine Warrington. Arcview Entertainment, 2008. USA.
- Walk the Line*. Dir. James Magold. Perf. Joaquin Phoenix and Reese Witherspoon. Fox 2000 Pictures, 2005. USA.
- Watch Out*. Dir. Steve Balderson. Perf. Matt Riddlehoover and Amy Kelly. Dikenga Films, 2008. USA.
- Watchmen*. Dir. Zack Snyder. Perf. Jackie Earle Haley and Patrick Wilson. Warner Bros. Productions, 2009. USA.
- *Watercolors*. Dir. David Oliveras. Perf. Tye Olson and Kyle Clare. SilverLight Entertainment, 2008. Germany.
- We Are From the Future (My Iz Budushego)*. Dir. Andrey Malyukov. Perf. Danila Kozlovskiy and Andrey Terentev. A-1 Kino Video, 2008. Russia.
- *Weekend*. Dir. Andrew Haigh. Perf. Tom Cullen and Chris New. EM Media, 2011. UK.
- Welcome Home (Bienvenido a casa)*. Dir. David Trueba. Perf. Alejo Sauras and Pilar López. Fernando Trueba Producciones Cinematográficas S.A., 2006. Spain.

While You Are Here (Solange Du hier bist). Dir. Stefan Westerwelle. Perf. Michael

Gempart and Leander Lichti. Academy of Media Arts Cologne, 2006. Germany.

**Whispering Moons (Das Flüstern des Mondes)*. Dir. Michael Satzinger. Perf. Franz

Robert Ceeh and Mischa Fernbach. Magic Movie, 2006. Germany.

White Irish Drinkers. Dir. John Gray. Perf. Nick Thurston and Geoffrey Wigdor. Annus

Mirabilis Inc., 2010. USA.

**The Witnesses (Les témoins)*. Dir. Andrés Téchiné. Perf. Michel Blanc and

Emmanuelle Béart. UGC Distribution, 2007. France.

Wrecked. Dir. Michael Greenspan. Perf. Adrien Brody and Caroline Dhavernas.

Independent Edge Films, 2009. USA.

**Zack and Miri Make a Porno*. Dir. Kevin Smith. Perf. Seth Rogen, Elizabeth Banks,

and Craig Robertson. The Weinstein Company, 2008. USA.

Two unsurprising patterns emerge from the above listing, both tentative and in need of analysis, namely that the Comedic Device Penis as I have analyzed it reflects a specifically American cultural phenomenon, and no doubt institutional pressure pertaining to the American film industry (and its infrastructure of agents, ratings, corporate censors, and other gatekeepers), and secondly that gay filmmakers or those addressing gay audiences and/or themes have greater freedom and cultural permission to explore the male body and specifically the penis on screen.

Table 1.1 – Films with full frontal male nudity between 2006 and 2011

Country	Straight	Gay Or Gay Positive	Female Directors	Major Studio Productions	Total Films
Argentina	3	0	0	1	3
Australia	1	2	1	0	3
Brazil	2	0	0	0	2
Canada	2	5	0	0	7
Chile	1	0	0	0	1
Denmark	2	0	1	0	2
Finland	2	0	0	0	2
France	13	7	2	0	20
Germany	8	3	2	0	11
Greece	1	0	0	0	1
Ireland	2	0	0	0	2
Israel	2	1	0	0	3
Italy	1	2	0	0	3
Macedonia	1	0	0	0	1
Mexico	2	2	0	0	4
Netherlands	2	0	0	0	2
Philippines	3	0	0	0	3
Russia	1	0	0	0	1
Spain	6	2	1	0	8
Sweden	1	1	2	0	2
UK	14	3	2	2	17
USA	50	35	3	17 *3	85
Total:	120	63	15	23	183