

I'm writing about the traditional way of looking at the artist as this 'artist genius'. In which I'm focused on the last 50 years people have started to analyze old masters and old geniuses as homosexual. [In my thesis I'm questioning why that is happening.] Not that I want to debunk Art History for being wrong to analyze this, but I want to question why is this a focus. Why is it important to look at, for example, Da Vinci and say he might have been homosexual? Why is it important for these people to find that in the art? [So my thesis turns] a critical eye on the way we've been writing Art History, and this tradition of romanticizing artists and art pieces and making this myth about this individual.

This scholarship has been done about people who lived in a whole different century who haven't said anything about their sexuality, and who haven't done anything about that matter. It's not to say that it's wrong to say that they're homosexual, it's just more about why [are they saying they are homosexual]. One of the things I also find problematic is the way it glamorizes things that are just human. It feels like when they analyze Da Vinci for being gay it's more a side note, and it doesn't have to do with the things he created. It's just like, 'Oh, he's this weird person in this period who did these things but had all these diseases and these mental illnesses and he might probably be gay.' It glamorizes being gay or having a mental illness because it stands out from the normative.