FASHION IN CINEMA: REFRAMING THE FIELD

Marketa Uhlirova

In March 1985 the film scholar Charlotte Herzog sent a brief letter to the German film theorist Heide Schlüpmann, who was at this point preparing a special issue of *Frauen und Filme* (Women and Film) – the journal she edited – on costume in cinema. In the letter, Herzog expressed her desire to contribute to this, and, fearing she may be too late, resolved at least to share a preliminary outline for her own collection of essays on the subject, which she was planning with her colleague Jane Gaines. This volume, provisionally titled *Fabrications: Body and Costume in Our Screen History,* would eventually become something of a manifesto for a field yet to emerge, undoubtedly in part thanks to the forceful introductory text written by Gaines.[1] In the meantime, Herzog concluded her letter by writing: "It is reassuring to know there are other feminists interested in the same subject, and who recognize it is an important aspect of film-making and women audiences, etc."[2] Herzog's almost-conspiratorial note speaks volumes of how rare an alliance of kindred spirits this would have felt like. Equally eloquent is her qualifying the mutually shared interest as a feminist one, which suggests at least two things: one, feminist academics interested in problems of fashion, costume and the body were rather an anomaly in 1985; and two, Herzog believed that the subject needed a feminist approach in particular, presumably in order to break the silence on it in mainstream, largely male-dominated film theory.

This anecdotal piece of evidence speaks to the uneasy development of fashion in cinema as a field. Indeed, problems of how cinema interacts with fashion and dress were routinely marginalized in the histories and theories of film – as well as fashion.[3] When the subject was pursued, it was often done so by individuals working alone or in discrete, isolated hubs. Largely considered an "interdisciplinary niche" within film studies,[4] the field evolved unevenly and unprogrammatically, from different disciplinary roots that were sometimes at odds with one another. Dress historian Lou Taylor, for example, observed that the study of fashion in film is "deeply divided" between theoretical and object-based approaches, pointing to a gap – and a sense of antagonism – between humanities scholars (such as Gaines and Herzog, presumably) who pursue nuanced intellectual arguments and museum curators who rely on object-based expertize in collecting and exhibiting costume.[5] Another major hurdle to the development of a *bona fide* field with a cohesive identity has been an underlying dilemma about what exactly constitutes its object of study: is it costume, or is it, rather fashion? – a dilemma that brings with

it question marks about disciplinary positioning (film studies or fashion studies?) and conse-quently, shared theoretical foundations, aims, and methods.[6]

Despite all this, much has changed since 1985. The neglect Herzog alluded to has now been addressed from across numerous humanities disciplines, and even reversed. Recent years in particular have witnessed a surge of interest in examining the intersections between fashion and cinema, evident in numerous publications, conferences, and, in 2012, the foundation of a dedicated academic journal, *Film, Fashion & Consumption*, edited by Pamela Church Gibson. The subject has now been explored in different ways, by scholars who span cinema and fashion studies, visual culture, art history, media studies, literary theory, theater, dance studies, and beyond. And, as I hope to show in this chapter, the inquiry has not been the sole domain of the academy but has also been pursued from within the cultural sphere, with distinctive modes and motivations. It is this broader contemporary perspective – much of it already recognized and covered by *Film, Fashion & Consumption's* wide-ranging remit – that I draw on here in pro-posing that we reframe the specialist "niche" as, instead, a field in its own right, and establish it not within the confines of one discipline or another but, rather, at the interface of several diverse disciplines and practices.

In sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's definition, a field is postulated as "a structured space of positions," constituted by struggles among these positions over power and (all kinds of) capital;[7] struggles "which often take the form of a battle between established producers, institutions and styles, and heretical newcomers."[8] Crucially, as Bourdieu notes, "a fight [within a field] pre-supposes agreement between the antagonists about what it is that is worth fighting about" – thus, a field establishes a common ground, a space of encounters, both conceptual and physical.[9] Its relational dynamic catalyzes interaction, allowing for cross-fertilizations. With this in mind, I want to put forward a delineation of the field of fashion in cinema, in which diverse elements co-exist and ferment together – often productively, sometimes not. I suggest a constellation in which academic scholarship sits alongside different forms of knowledge production, including museum exhibitions, online platforms, film seasons and fashion film festivals (including the one I co-founded in 2006, to declare my own "vested interests"), but also popular writing, jour-nalism, and creative practice. In what follows, I briefly survey these disparate strands of the field. While their separation into sub-chapters reflects the plural positions and approaches taken historically, they are also, crucially, knitted together here into a single fabric. For, it is becoming increasingly problematic to maintain that theoretical reflection and practice exist in isolation: in fact, in many cases, categorizing projects under one category or another seems fraught, since growing numbers of scholars and curators frequently collaborate or otherwise sustain a meaningful dialogue.[10]

Popular publications and film criticism

Current theoretical reflection on fashion and costume in cinema has its roots in popular journalism going back as far as the 1910s. The emergence of this type of writing broadly coincided with the consolidation of two cinematic forms - the narrative feature film and fashion actuality, which was from 1909 presented in regular newsreels. Together, the two forms sti-mulated a sustained interest in what was worn on the big screen, which was reinforced by an absence of a clear separation between costume and fashion that continued throughout the silent era. Early discourses on cinematic dress typically celebrated its aesthetic value, but also com-mented on its effects on audiences. Dress enjoyed frequent – sometimes extended – mentions in film reviews, and had special features devoted to it in popular and trade press, including regular

columns, interviews with fashion and costume designers, and opinion surveys.[11] Yet, anything that can be thought of as a critical paradigm did not develop until much later.

In 1949, the short-lived yet prestigious French journal *La Revue du cinéma* published a double issue dedicated to "the art of costume in film," with theoretical articles by costume designers Jacques Manuel and Claude Autant-Lara (both collaborators of the film director Marcel L'Herbier) and film critics Lotte Eisner, Jean George Auriol and Mario Verdone.[12] A year later, these were reprinted in Verdone's Italian volume *La moda e il costume nel film*, together with new additions (largely compiled from earlier film periodicals) by acclaimed figures such as Adrian, Adolphe Menjou, and Irene Brin, plus an extended homage to the costume designer Gino Carlo Sensani.[13] These two titles seem to be among the first publications expressing an appreciation for costume and fashion as overlooked yet significant aspects of the cinematic image. At the same time, they are important attempts at a theoretical separation of costume from fashion, arguing for a need to understand costume as a distinct form of film craft that must respond to its industry's particular requirements.

Putting aside individual costume designers' biographies and autobiographies (beginning with Edith Head's *The Dress Doctor* published in 1959),[14] a more serious interest in the subject arose again in the mid-1970s, with Diana Vreeland's blockbuster exhibition *Romantic and Glamorous Hollywood Design* at the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Costume Institute (1974–75). While hardly a serious historical project – Vreeland reportedly presented authentic costumes alongside numerous copies made to replace lost historical originals[15] – the exhibition proved very popular and likely had the effect of sparkling further study, especially on Hollywood costume design. It was closely followed by several overviews as well as monographic books dedicated to leading designers. Most notably, these have included publications by Elizabeth Leese, David Chierichetti, Dale McConathy and Diana Vreeland, and Edward Maeder.[16]

More recently, there has been a new proliferation of lavish, photography-led publications on costume design by authors including Regine and Peter W. Engelmeier, Deborah Landis, Christopher Laverty, and Jay Jorgensen and Donald L. Scoggins.[17] And in the past decade, the subject has found a passionate champion in Christopher Laverty, the founder and principal contributor to the website *Clothes on Film*.[18] Though not explicitly reflexive of the theoretical positions within which they are grounded, all these works are valuable attempts at studying costume design as a singular film art and craft. More recently, research into costume design has also begun to receive more scholarly treatment, as, for example, in publications by Annette Vogler, Drake Stutesman, or Adrienne L. McLean.[19]

Film and visual studies

As in these popular accounts, Hollywood cinema also became central to examinations by film studies scholars publishing between the early 1980s and 2000s, although they pursued markedly different agendas. Here, perhaps the most enduring concern was the connection between cinema spectatorship, dress and consumerism.[20] This line of interrogation can be traced to Charles Eckert's seminal text "Carole Lombard in Macy's Window" (1978), which made a case for an "almost incestuous" relation between fashion, cinema and the American economy.[21] In what became a much-repeated trope,[22] Eckert made an analogy between the cinema screen and a "shop window," considering it as an ideal space to display and mediate a broad spectrum of merchandise among which fashion and cosmetics were singled out as especially prone to commodity fetishism. Coupled with the giant luminous screen, fashion produced glamorous and seductive images that stimulated (almost invariably) female desire to possess and consume.[23] In contrast to Eckert's account of women as largely passive and submissive consumers,[24] the

alliance between screen fashions and consumerism has also been interpreted as potentially a liberating force for articulating modern female identities,[25] and in the context of a participatory milieu of today's "transmedia universe."[26]

Related to this inquiry, but distinct in its motivations, has been a body of work on costume and fashion embedded within cultural studies and (third-wave) feminist film theory and their ideological critique of the cinema. First emerging in the mid-1980s, much of this scholarship responded to an earlier feminist debate, which had rejected "artificial" female adornment as a tool of male oppression and passive female spectacle. It was now felt that as a consequence of this, fashion had fallen into an impasse and remained ignored within the academy. Exemplified by Gaines and Herzog's 1990 collection *Fabrications*, this critical shift echoed Carol Ascher's and especially Elizabeth Wilson's earlier texts, which made a point of reclaiming fashion as a subject vital to women's history (as well as men's, in Wilson's case) – as one that is both necessary and intellectually exhilarating.[27] Fashion and film costume, *Fabrications* argued, constituted a rich area of study in dire need of critical re-evaluation, with a new emphasis placed on the positive aspects of fashioning (fabrication), and its potential for female pleasure, subversion, and resistance.

The studies that followed have largely revolved around two major areas of interest that were often interlinked: firstly, the interactions between fashion, costume and cinema in the construction of stardom, celebrity, female types and female spectatorship;[28] and secondly, the role of costume in the politics of representation, in affirming as well as subverting various aspects of identity – gender, national, sexual, social, class, or racial.[29] Among them, the vast majority were focused on Hollywood, and women (characters, actresses) within it.[30] As the dominant cinema and the epitome of commercial entertainment propped up by the star system, the classical Hollywood idiom offered itself as "a key source of idealized images of femininity."[31] Its visual-narrative style combining realism and escapist fantasy has created a particular economy of desire and identification, deemed especially fit for a critical undressing.

But even those who looked to other cinemas – British costume drama,[32] post-war European cinema[33] or French cinema[34] – largely limited their scope to narrative fiction film. Among the rare exceptions have been Elizabeth Leese's 1976 book *Costume Design in the Movies*, which for the first time outlined a brief history of costume and fashion in fiction as well as short non-fiction film and Jenny Hammerton's 2001 book *For Ladies Only?,* which focused on fashion as one of the major themes in the British Pathé cinemagazine *Eve's Film Review*. This research has expanded in the last decade, with Eirik Frisvold Hanssen's and Michelle Tolini Finamore's studies of fashion newsreels and color during the silent era, Eugenia Paulicelli's 2016 analysis of Italian newsreels during the late 1920s and 1930s, Natalie Snoyman's doctoral thesis on three-strip Technicolor and fashion, and my own attempt at a typology of historical fashion films.[35] For the most part, however, pre-classical, non-classical, and non-narrative cinemas were left out, presumably because they do not readily invite the kind of ideological analysis applied to fashion in narrative film.

The Fashion in Film Festival, which I co-founded in 2005, sought to respond to these limitations by introducing an array of film forms that had hitherto been sidelined in the debate: early, avant-garde, experimental and underground film, artist film and video, newsreel, documentary, industry/process film, and advertising shorts. The point was not only to show that the wealth of material relevant to the study of fashion in cinema was much greater than had previously been considered, but also, importantly, to capture the new lines of inquiry that this material opened up (and that were by no means exclusive to it): the conceptualization of fashion display in film as a type of "cinema of attractions,"[36] treating dress less as a functional and symbolic device (of characterization and plot), and more as a visual, sensuous, affective, and

performative phenomenon;[37] a need for developing a critical language to address such pro-
blems, particularly because these film forms allow costume to become a significant, sometimes
even dominant, element of the mise-en-scene; and a clearer distinction between the concepts of
cinematic *representation* and *presentation*.[38]

Fashion studies

In contrast to film studies, histories of fashion continued to refer to cinema only sparingly, if at
all. Again, classical Hollywood cinema was almost invariably privileged, treated either as a
means of dissemination with great mass appeal for audiences,[39] or, conversely, as a source of
imagery mined by fashion designers and photographers.[40] Though few and far between, these
accounts have nevertheless recognized cinema's enormous impact on fashion, acknowledging
its capacity to reinforce, if not originate, new trends in dress, styles, cosmetics, and mannerisms.
In her widely read 1975 book *Seeing through Clothes*, the art historian Anne Hollander argued
that the movies and movie stars created a "common cinematic experience" used by audiences as
a reference point for their own sartorial and gestural self-expressions.[41] Referring to the spread
of cinema in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Hollander also suggested something
more radical: film's influence on fashion, according to her, went beyond individual styles,
causing a decisive shift in the perception of the female body. In providing a vocabulary of
movements for imitation, from walking to dancing to moving hands, cinema created a new
feminine beauty ideal in a dynamic body.[42]

The longstanding neglect of cinema in the histories of fashion and dress can be attributed to
at least two factors: Firstly, until the digital age, the world of fashion had always considered
cinema at one remove from its daily business – it simply hadn't played as integral a role in its
communications, marketing and promotion as the static media of photography and printed
magazines. This is certainly reflected by the relative indifference the fashion press historically
showed toward "cinema fashions," which were, meanwhile, robustly covered by the film press.
Secondly, fashion historians have been skeptical towards film as a reliable form of historical
evidence. Film fashions have been deemed notoriously inaccurate due to the liberties with the
truth costume designers tend to take:[43] unable to resist the all-consuming influence of con-
temporaneous fashions, costume designers distort history in representing it.[44] And, much as this
discourse around historical (in)accuracy may be a red herring, it follows that film has been
systematically displaced from fashion history's remit in a broad dismissal. This has, however,
overlooked the fact that besides costume, film also shows *fashion*, not to mention the complex
interrelations between fashion and costume in narrative film, as explored by film scholars such
as Sumiko Higashi, Sarah Berry, and Stella Bruzzi, and later also by fashion and cultural studies
scholars including Mila Ganeva, Karen De Perthuis, Michelle Tolini Finamore, and Eugenia
Paulicelli.[45]

It is only in the last decade or so that fashion scholars have begun to turn more sustained
attention to non-fiction films that record, document and promote fashion, including newsreels,
commercials, and amateur films.[46] Keen as they have been to embed film analysis within
historical narratives of fashion (as opposed to the other way round), fashion scholars have sought
to connect cinema to other modern public presentations of fashion, such as the department
store, theater's fashion play, the fashion show, and advertising.[47] An important factor in this
development has been the opening up of the film archive in the digital age. If film archives
previously tended to "work behind closed doors and only grant access to…holdings on strict
conditions,"[48] the large-scale digitization project of the past two decades has instituted a new

regime of greater access to moving image works, including those previously deemed of little value.[49]

Fashion industry and fashion film

Advancing digital technologies have also profoundly reshaped the fashion industry in the early twenty-first century, with fashion film emerging as a newly prominent form of display and communication. At first explored primarily by independent designers, stylists and photographers, fashion film began to be adopted more widely around 2010 by brands and fashion magazines who were waking up to an ever-growing appetite for time-based creative content online and, consequently, the possibilities of creative expression and promotion in this sphere. Typically produced without the involvement of advertising agencies, and thus having the essence of authorial productions, fashion film was embraced for its capacity to communicate in a less "processed," less "commercial" tone, with an apparent capacity for seamlessly blending branding, creative, and entertainment elements.

SHOWstudio, a website founded in 2000 by Nick Knight and Peter Saville, played a pioneering role in establishing fashion film as a viable means of showing fashion to a global audience. Since mid-2000s, it was joined by other platforms, from DVD-based magazines (such as *FLY*), to online iterations of established fashion magazines (*Dazed Digital, tank.tv, Purple Television*), to major video channels, both curated (*Nowness, M2M Studios*) and sharing (*YouTube, Vimeo*). There has also been a veritable explosion of festivals focused expressly on fashion film, with the aim to foster creative exchange among image-makers, producers, and agencies working in the industry (including Diane Pernet's Paris-based *You Wear it Well* and its newer iteration *A Shaded View on Fashion Film*; Ditte Marie Lund's *Copenhagen Fashion Film*; Niccolò Montanari's *Berlin Fashion Film Festival*, and Constanza Cavalli Etro's *Fashion Film Festival Milano*). This formula has now become ubiquitous, spreading to other large cities globally, including Bucharest, Istanbul, Los Angeles, Madrid, Mexico City, Miami, San Diego, and Santiago.

Besides the creative fashion films, the fashion industry has adopted the moving image in a broader sense, in an even greater variety of contexts. From various behind-the-scenes formats to fashion and beauty demonstrations (think, e.g., *Vogue*'s "Inside the Wardrobe" series) these types of content offer entertaining sneak peeks into aspects of fashion previously more or less hidden from view. With a hybridization of various formats shown online, the fashion moving image is less confined to the handful of clear-cut formats previously accessed in cinemas and on television. It is now a more plural and hybrid form than ever, spanning multiple media and platforms, also including social media, fashion shows, retail and the public space, and often variously overlapping and converging with more traditional print media forms. It is highly likely that the recent rise of the fashion documentary feature (*The September Issue*, 2009; *Dior and I*, 2014; *McQueen*, 2018) and fashion reality television (Channel 4's *The Model Agency*, 2009; Hulu's *The Fashion Fund*, from 2011) owes much to the Internet's consolidation of an audience for backstage fashion's dramas. Importantly, this new pre-eminence of fashion moving image within (and without) the fashion industry has prompted a push beyond the horizons of existing thinking about the interactions of fashion and cinema. As a result, fashion moving imagery has demanded a serious investigation by scholars who are both fashion and film-literate, and indeed, there is now a growing body of literature on the subject.[50]

Exhibitions

Film has also enjoyed a growing presence in the fashion and design museum. There, it has often been deployed in a bid to enliven, animate and spectacularise exhibitions, drawing on the new accessibility of archival footage while also answering to recurrent objections against the static and graveyard-like feel of museum displays, especially of dress.[51] Yet, it has generally been cast in a functional way, seen as supporting material that contextualizes or illustrates the primary object – dress. This is as true for fashion exhibitions as those focusing on film costume, such as Deutsche Kinemathek's exhibition *Filmkostüme! Das Unternehmen Theaterkunst* (29 March– 2 September 2007), or the V&A's major exhibition *Hollywood Costume* (20 October 2012– 27 January 2013). In other words, film in the fashion exhibition has rarely been given the status of an artifact, let alone one with its own materiality. There is no doubt that the entrenched cultural investment in the "original" (dress) versus the "copy" (film), is played out here, but there have certainly also been technical hurdles in displaying archival film in museums.

Such a curatorial hierarchy between dress on the one hand and fashion communications media on the other has recently undergone a shift. Film display, for one, has now become an increasingly prominent aspect of exhibition scenography. Major touring exhibitions such as *McQueen: Savage Beauty* (originating at the MET, 4 May–7 August 2011), *David Bowie Is* (originating at the V&A, 23 March–11 August 2013), and particularly MET's *China: Through the Looking Glass* (7 May–7 September 2015), have done much to shake up the traditional imbalance, with giant screens blatantly dominating some of the exhibition spaces. In the case of *China*, film became central in the curator Andrew Bolton's rationale for the show, with its status further reinforced by the appointment of the celebrated film director Wong Kar-wai as the exhibition's "artistic director." The installation featured some daring confrontations between fashion, art and objects of popular culture, among which cinema enjoyed prominent exposure. Still, it is interesting to note that the curator's justification for film here was as a "filter" through which Western fashion designers have absorbed ideas of Chineseness,[52] something that once again affirmed the fashion exhibition's habitual hierarchical order of the object and its "context."

There has also been a handful of curatorial projects to have focused specifically on the theme of fashion and cinema's crossover. Perhaps the most ambitious among those was the 1998 edition of the *Florence Biennale*, titled *fashion/cinema* (21 September–1 November 1998), which comprised seven thematic exhibitions across the city of Florence.[53] As the first major project of its kind, the biennale brought fashion and cinema together in broad terms, exploring a diverse range of subjects, from costume design (*Costumes from the Oscars*) and shoes (*Cinderella*), to then-contemporary films selected for their strong visual style (*Cine-Moda*), to a retrospective exhibition of fashion and cinema (*The Last Word*). It also featured Terry Jones's prescient exhibition *2001 Minus 3*, featuring newly commissioned films and videos by 22 pairs of avant-garde fashion designers and image-makers, including Raf Simons, Hussein Chalayan, Donald Christie and Sølve Sundsbø (many were established contributors to *i-D* magazine, of which Jones was then editor). These films were showcased in the cavernous space of Florence's disused train station Stazione Leopolda, on monitors or screens, many of which were incorporated in inventive spatial installations.

Elsewhere, in São Paulo, the journalist Alexandra Farah staged several seasons of her fashion film festival *Filme/Fashion* between 2003 and 2007 – making hers the first festival of its kind, despite claims by others. With a repertory scope and a thematic approach, the festival high-lighted "film fashion" as a major expressive feature in cinema, and in some of its seasons introduced a substantial proportion of Brazilian film. Elsewhere, in France, a retrospective season

Le cinéma français des années 20: corps et décors, hosted by Musée d'Orsay (8–24 February 2008), brought to light visually striking examples of set and costume design in French popular cinema of the 1920s. The season explored the intermingling features of exoticism, modernism and fantasy in this period, and, much like the Fashion in Film Festival, threw the spotlight on a body of film that had typically been marginalized in accounts of cinema history and applied art alike. Finally, two major exhibition projects have also focused on fashion film as a rapidly expanding area of creative practice: *SHOWstudio: Fashion Revolution* at Somerset House (17 September–23 December 2009) and British Council–sponsored *Dressing the Screen* at UCCA Gallery in Beijing, China (26 October–11 November 2012).

Conclusion

Taking stock of all these parallel developments – and placing them side by side – urges us to expand earlier conceptualizations of the field of fashion in cinema, and re-frame it as a composite one. This is a field whose strength issues not from one single disciplinary grounding but, rather, from its being located in the overlaps and interstices of a number of different disciplines and fields. Thus, its horizons extend beyond those of cinema studies and fashion studies, to also embrace fashion and film curation, cultural, media and visual studies, and debates around current fashion image-making practice. It is my belief that such a broad definition enables us to better trace relations between these different activities, which already inform and enrich one another by provoking new ideas, revealing new problems, and suggesting new avenues for further research. To be sure, fields are far from static, homogenous entities with universally shared stakes. Indeed, both cinema and fashion studies have recently been faced with their own "identity crises," brought about by a growing diversification in interdisciplinary approaches that went hand in hand with an increasing tendency to specialize in distinct subfields. This has led some to conclude that these fields are in themselves best thought of in terms of their multiple identities.[54] Like them, the study of fashion in cinema is fragmented in nature, with plural and frequently shifting trajectories. As such, it is continuously being redefined from within the academy as well as from without.

Notes

1 Jane Gaines, "Introduction," In *Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body*, eds. Jane Gaines and Charlotte Herzog (London: Routledge, 1990), 1–27. The special issue of *Frauen und Filme* came out in May 1985, under the title "Maskerade." *Fabrications* was eventually published five years later, and with a changed subtitle: Gaines and Herzog (eds.) *Fabrications: as above.*
2 See Herzog's letter to Heide Schlüpmann and her preliminary outline of *Fabrications*, published in *Frauen und Filme* no. 38 (1985), 124–25.
3 Paul Jobling, "Border Crossings: Fashion and Film/Fashion in Film," in *The Handbook of Fashion Studies*, eds. Sandy Black et al. (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 164–80.
4 Rachel Moseley, ed. *Fashioning Film Stars: Dress, Culture, Identity* (London: BFI, 2005), 2. See also Helen Warner, *Fashion on Television: Identity and Celebrity Culture* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).
5 Lou Taylor, *The Study of Dress History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 177.
6 Marketa Uhlirova, "On Fire: When Fashion Meets Cinema," in *The Handbook of Film Theory*, ed. Kyle Stevens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022).
7 Pierre Bourdieu, Sociology in Question (London: Sage, 1993), 72.
8 David Hesmondhalgh, "Bourdieu, the Media and Cultural Production," *Media, Culture & Society* 28, no. 2 (2005), 215–16.
9 Bourdieu, Sociology in Question, 73.
10 Christopher Breward, "Between the Museum and the Academy: Fashion Research and Its Constituencies," *Fashion Theory*, 12, no. 1 (2008).

11 For more on this see Michelle Tolini Finamore, *Hollywood before Glamour: Fashion in American Silent Film* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

12 *La Revue du cinéma:* "L'Art du costume dans le film," nos. 19–20 (Autumn 1949).

13 Mario Verdone, (ed.) *La moda e il costume nel film* (Rome: Bianco e nero editore, 1950. For more on this publication, see Eugenia Paulicelli, *Italian Style: Fashion & Film from Early Cinema to the Digital Age* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

14 Edith Head and Jane Kesner Ardmore. *The Dress Doctor* (Kingswood: The World's Work, 1959).

15 Richard Martin and Harold Koda, *Diana Vreeland: Immoderate Style* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1993), 18–20.

16 Elizabeth Leese, *Costume Design in the Movies* (New York: Benbridge, 1976); David Chierichetti, *Hollywood Costume Design* (New York: Crown Publishing Group, 1976) and *Edith Head: The Life and Times of Hollywood's Celebrated Costume Designer* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003); Dale McConathy and Diana Vreeland, *Hollywood Costume: Glamour, Glitter, Romance* (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1976); Edward Maeder, *Hollywood and History: Costume Design in Film* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1987).

17 Peter Regine Engelmeier, *Fashion in Film* (London: Prestel, 1997); Deborah Nadoolman Landis, *Dressed: A Century of Hollywood Costume Design* (New York: Collins Design, 2007), *Costume Design* (Amsterdam: Focal, 2012) and (ed.) *Hollywood Costume* (London: V&A Publishing, 2012); Christopher Laverty, *Fashion in Film* (London: Laurence King Publishing, 2016); Jay Jorgensen and Donald L. Scoggins, *Creating the Illusion: A Fashionable History of Hollywood Costume Designers* (Philadelphia, PA: Running Press, 2015).

18 http://clothesonfilm.com

19 Annette Vogler, *Filmkostüme! Das Unternehmen Theaterkunst* (Berlin: Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, 2007); Drake Stutesman, "Costume Design, or, What is Fashion in Film?" in *Fashion in Film: Essays in Honor of E. Ann Kaplan*, ed. Adrienne Munich (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011), 17–39; Adrienne L. McLean (ed.), *Costume, Makeup, and Hair* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016).

20 Jean Thomas Allen, "The Film Viewer as Consumer," *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 5, no. 4 (1980): 481–99; Maureen Turim, "Fashion Shapes: Hollywood, the Fashion Industry and the Image of Women," *Socialist Review* 13, no. 5 (1983): 78–97; Maria LaPlace, "Producing and Consuming the Woman's Film: Discursive Struggle in *Now, Voyager*," in *Home Is Where the Heart Is: Studies in Melodrama and the Woman's Film*, ed. Christine Gledhill (London: BFI, 1987), 138–66; Jane Gaines and Renov Michael, "Preface," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 11, no. 1 (1989): 7–8; David Desser and Garth Jowett, eds., *Hollywood Goes Shopping* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

21 Charles Eckert, "Carole Lombard in Macy's Window," *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 3, no. 1 (1978), 4.

22 See for example Mary Ann Doane, "The Economy of Desire: The Commodity Form in/of the Cinema," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 11 (1989), 23–33; Jane Gaines, "The Queen Christina Tie-Ups: Convergence of Show Window and Screen," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 11, no. 1 (1989), 35–60; Anne Friedberg, *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

23 On this point see also Robert Gustafson, "The Power of the Screen: The Influence of Edith Head's Film Designs on the Retail Fashion Market," *The Velvet Light Trap: Review of Cinema* 19 (1982): 8–15.

24 For a critique of this line of enquiry, see Pam Cook, *Fashioning the Nation: Costume & Identity in British Cinema* (London: BFI Publishing, 1996), 46–47.

25 Sarah Berry, *Screen Style: Fashion and Femininity in 1930s Hollywood* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000); Desser and Jowett, *Hollywood Goes Shopping*.

26 Sarah Gilligan quoted in Adam Geczy and Vicki Karaminas, *Fashion's Double: Representations of Fashion in Painting, Photography and Film* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 52–53.

27 Carol Ascher, "Narcissism and Women's Clothing," *Socialist Review* 11, no. 3 (1981): 75–86; Elizabeth Wilson, *Adorned in Dreams: Fashion and Modernity* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2003/1985).

28 Maureen Turim, "Seduction and Elegance: The New Woman of Fashion in Silent Cinema," in *On Fashion*, eds. Shari Benstock and Suzanne Ferriss (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994); Jane Gainesa and Charlotte Herzog, "'Puffed Sleeves before Tea-Time': Joan Crawford, Adrian and Women Audiences," *Wide Angle* 6, no. 4 (1985): 24–33; Jane Gaines, "Costume and Narrative: How Dress Tells the Woman's Story," in *Fabrications,* eds. Gaines and Herzog, 180–211; Jackie Stacey, "Feminine Fascinations: Forms of Identification in Star-Audience Relations," in *Stardom: Industry of*

Desire, ed. Christine Gledhill (London: Routledge, 1991), 141–63 and *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship* (London: Routledge, 1994); Sumiko Higashi, *Cecil B. DeMille and American Culture: The Silent Era* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Berry, *Screen Style*; Ginette Vincendeau, *Stars and Stardom in French Cinema* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000); Moseley (ed.). *Fashioning Film Stars* and *Growing Up With Audrey Hepburn: Text, Audience, Resonance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

29 Gaylyn Studlar, "Masochism, Masquerade, and the Erotic Metamorphoses of Marlene Dietrich," in *Fabrications*, eds. Gaines and Herzog, 229–49; Sybil DelGaudio, *Dressing the Part: Sternberg, Dietrich, and Costume* (Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1993); Sue Harper, *Picturing the Past: The Rise and Fall of British Costume Film* (London: BFI Publishing, 1994); Cook, *Fashioning the Nation*; Stella Bruzzi, *Undressing Cinema: Clothing and Identity in the Movies* (London: Routledge, 1997); Sarah Street, *Costume and Cinema: Dress Codes in Popular Film* (London: Wallflower Press, 2001); Moseley, ed., *Fashioning Film Stars*. For a study of costume in television, see Warner, *Fashion on Television*.

30 For accounts of male screen styles, however, see for example Miriam Hansen, "Pleasure, Ambivalence, Identification: Valentino and Female Spectatorship," *Cinema Journal* 25, no. 4 (1986): 6–32; Bruzzi, *Undressing Cinema*; Street, *Costume and Cinema*; Nick Rees-Roberts, "Men of Mode: Alain Delon, Christian Dior and Brand Heritage," *Film, Fashion & Consumption* 1, no. 1 (2012): 81–99 or Jan Olsson, "Shooting and shopping: Suiting Grant and dressing Saint," *Film, Fashion & Consumption* 8, no. 1 (2019): 49–69.

31 Jackie Stacey, *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship* (London: Routledge, 1994), 9.

32 Harper, *Picturing the Past;* Cook, *Fashioning the Nation*.

33 Bruzzi, *Undressing Cinema*; Street, *Costume and Cinema*; Eugenia Paulicelli, Drake Stutesman and Louise Wallenberg, eds. *Film, Fashion, and the 1960s* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017).

34 Ginette Vincendeau, *Stars and Stardom in French Cinema* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000).

35 See Leese, *Costume Design in the Movies*, 9–17; Jenny Hammerton, *For Ladies Only? Eve's Film Review: Pathé Cinemagazine, 1921–33* (Hastings: The Projection Box, 2001); Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, "Symptoms of Desire: Colour, Costume, and Commodities in Fashion Newsreels of the 1910s and 1920s." *Film History: An International Journal* 21, no. 2 (2009), Tolini Finamore, *Hollywood before Glamour* and "Color before Technicolor: Colorized Fashion Films of the Silent Era," in *Colors in Fashion*, eds. Faiers, Jonathan and Bulgarella, Mary Westerman (London: Bloomsbury, 2018); Paulicelli, *Italian Style*, see esp. chapter 4; Natalie Snoyman,"In to Stay": Selling Three-Strip Technicolor and Fashion in the 1930s and 1940s* (Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2017) and Marketa Uhlirova, "Excavating Fashion Film: A Media Archaeological Perspective," *Journal of Visual Culture* 19, no. 3 (2020).

36 The term "cinema of attractions" was first coined by film theorist Tom Gunning who popularised it through his much-reprinted article "The Cinema of Attraction[s]: Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant- Garde." *Wide Angle* 8, nos. 3–4 (1986): 63–70. For the concept's application to fashion in film, see for example Mila Ganeva, *Women in Weimar Fashion: Discourses and Displays in German Culture* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2008); Hanssen, "Symptoms of Desire"; Caroline Evans, "The Walkies: Early Fashion Shows and Silent Cinema," in *Fashion in Film: Essays in Honor of E. Ann Kaplan*, ed. Munich, 110–34.

37 Also see Bruzzi, *Undressing Cinema* and Pamela Church Gibson, "Fashion, Fetish and Spectacle. *The Matrix* Dresses Up – and Down," in *The "Matrix" Trilogy: Cyberpunk Reloaded*, ed. Stacy Gillis (London: Wallflower Press, 2005), 114–25.

38 For more on this issue, see Noël Burch, *To the Distant Observer: Form and Meaning in the Japanese Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979); Gunning, "The Cinema of Attraction[s]"; André Gaudreault, "Film, Narrative, Narration: The Cinema of the Lumière Brothers," in *Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative*, eds. Adam Barke and Thomas Elsaesser (London: BFI, 1997), 68–75 or Paul Willemen. "Fantasy in Action," in *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, eds. Nataša Durovicová and Kathleen E. Newman (New York: Routledge, 2010), 247–86.

39 James Laver, *Modesty in Dress* (London: William Heinemann, 1969); Anne Hollander, *Seeing through Clothes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975/1993); Wilson, *Adorned in Dreams*; Christopher Breward, *The Culture of Fashion: A New History of Fashionable Dress* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995).

40 Rebecca Arnold, *Fashion, Desire and Anxiety: Image and Morality in the Twentieth Century* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001); More recently see also Alistair O'Neill, "The Shining and Chic,*" in *Alexander McQueen*,

ed. Claire Wilcox (London: V&A Publishing, 2015), 261–80; Amber Jane Butchart, *The Fashion of Film: How Cinema Has Inspired Fashion* (London: Octopus Books, 2016).

41 Hollander, *Seeing through Clothes*, 344.

42 Ibid., 154

43 Ibid., 295, 342. See also Gaines, "Costume and Narrative."

44 See for example James Laver, "Dates and Dresses," *Sight and Sound* 8, no. 30 (Summer 1939), 50; and Maeder, *Hollywood and History*. As Sue Harper and Pam Cook show, historical inaccuracies and distortions in dress and décor were also seen negatively among film critics as well as historians, and were generally perceived as expressions of poor taste. For more see Harper, *Picturing the Past;* Cook, *Fashioning the Nation*.

45 For works not yet cited above, see for example Mila Ganeva, *Film and Fashion amidst the Ruins of Berlin: From Nazism to the Cold War* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2018); Karen De Perthuis, "I Am Style: Tilda Swinton as Emma in Luca Guadagnino's *I Am Love*," *Film, Fashion & Consumption* 1, no. 3 (2012), 269–88.

46 I refer here to research projects and events such as The Fashion in Film Festival's 2006 season *Between Stigma and Enigma*, and a 2008 V&A Friday Late event "Beyond Espionage: Fashion under Socialism, which I co-curated with Christel Tsilibaris and Renate Stauss respectively; The "Screen Search Fashion" online resource (http://screenarchive.brighton.ac.uk/search/Fashion/Keywords::keyword/) and the V&A's "Fashion on Screen Study Day" 2009, both collaborative projects led by Rebecca Arnold; or Archaeology of Fashion Film 2017–19 (http://archfashfilm.arts.ac.uk), a two-year research collaboration between the University of the Arts London and the University of Southampton, led by Caroline Evans, Jussi Parikka and myself. See also Evans, "The Walkies" and *The Mechanical Smile: Modernism and the First Fashion Shows in France and America, 1900–1929* (London: Yale University Press, 2013); Marketa Uhlirova, "100 Years of the Fashion Film: Frameworks and Histories," *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body and Culture* 17, no. 2 (2013), 137–57; Tolini Finamore, *Hollywood before Glamour*; and Paulicelli, *Italian Style*.

47 For more on this, see especially the work of Mila Ganeva and Caroline Evans.

48 Adelheid Heftberger, "Film Archives and Digital Humanities – An Impossible Match? New Job Descriptions and the Challenges of the Digital Era," *MedieKultur: Journal of Media and Communication Research* 57 (2014): 136.

49 Ian Christie, "Who Needs Film Archives? Notes Towards a User-Centred Future," *Czech and Slovak Journal of Humanities* 1 (2015), 36–44.

50 For some of the earliest publications on fashion film, see Nick Rees-Roberts, "Fashion Film: mode, cinéma et numérique," *Poli: Politique de l'image* 5 (2011): 99–112; Nathalie Khan, "Cutting the Fashion Body," *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body and Culture* 16, no. 2 (2012): 235–50; Gary Needham, "The Digital Fashion Film," in *Fashion Cultures Revisited*, eds. Stella Bruzzi and Pamela Church Gibson (London: Routledge, 2013); Nikola Mijovic, "Narrative Form and the Rhetoric of Fashion in the Promotional Fashion Film," *Film, Fashion & Consumption* 2, no. 2 (2013): 175–86; Marketa Uhlirova, "The Fashion Film Effect," in *Fashion Media: Past and Present*, eds. Djurdja Bartlett, Cole Shaun and Rocamora, Agnes (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 118–29 and "100 Years of Fashion Film"; and Nick Rees-Roberts, *Fashion Film: Art and Advertising in the Digital Age* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018).

51 Flavia Loscialpo, "From the Physical to the Digital and Back: Fashion Exhibitions in the Digital Age," *International Journal of Fashion Studies* 3, no. 2 (2016): 228–9.

52 Bolton cited in *The First Monday in May,* dir. Andrew Rossi, 2016.

53 Leonardo Mondadori (ed.). *Fashion/cinema. Biennale di Firenze* (Milan: Electa, 1998).

54 Lou Taylor, "Fashion and Dress History: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches," in *The Handbook of Fashion Studies*, eds. Black et al. (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Jo Entwistle, *The Fashioned Body: Fashion, Dress and Social Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2015); Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson, "The Academy and Motion Pictures," in *Inventing Film Studies*, eds. Grieveson and Wasson (Durham: Duke, 2008), xxix.