Women Walking:

The *Flâneuse* and Urban Tourist

in Cinema

Elizabeth Tiller

University of Stirling

MPhil

December 2015

ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at representations of female mobility and the female gaze in films set in Paris and Tuscany. It primarily looks at these representations in terms of female participation in *flânerie*. It looks for the classical example of *flânerie* in early cinema beginning with *Les Vampires* before moving on to mid-century representations and the struggle with the feminine masquerade in *Cléo 5 a 7* and *Funny Face*. The final two chapters look at the female tourist and the window shopper as the *flâneuse* in more recent examples: *A Room with a View, Stealing Beauty,* and *Midnight in Paris*. Ultimately, this thesis looks at women walking and traveling the urban landscapes in their home city and on tour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This thesis developed from an interest in the classic *femme fatale*: a female character who represents the 'fears and anxieties prompted by shifts in the understanding of sexual difference' and emerged 'as a central figure in the nineteenth century, in the texts of writers such as Théophile Gautier and Charles Baudelaire' (Doane 1991, 1-2).   These were women who used their femininity as a defensive mask to hide more masculine desires, such as autonomy and mobility, but whose power is prescribed to her rather owned by her. Her power is 'despite herself' (Doane 1991, 2).

As this thesis developed, it became focused on female mobility, sexuality, and Baudelaire's *flâneur*: the male urban tourist who strolls the city observing people, events and sights. The concept, developed in the nineteenth century, excluded women, except for prostitutes, as respectable women were not allowed to stroll about the city. Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, tourism was restricted to the elite classes, but the rise of the train allowed more people to travel. Shopping and tourism gave respectable women the ability to move about for pleasure and gaze at their surroundings. This thesis also looks at the role of cinema and its connection to tourism as well as the modernization of Paris that created a city designed for tourism.

This thesis begins with a discussion of Musidora's portrayal of Irma Vep in *Les Vampires* (Louis Feuillade 1915). Irma Vep represents the classic 'vamp,' an early iteration of the *femme fatale*, with her name being an anagram of vampire. Irma Vep also represents an early film version of the *flâneuse*, which will be addressed later in this chapter. It is this fascination with female mobility in urban settings which led to research on Agnès Varda's *Cléo 5 a 7* (1962). The character of Cléo (Corrine Marchand) works as a bridge between Irma Vep's dangerously mobile female to a more modern *flâneuse*. Cléo's transformation from doll to autonomous *flâneuse* was reminiscent of Audrey Hepburn's Jo in *Funny Face*

(Stanley Donen 1957). Jo uses her beauty in order to travel to Paris, but ultimately gives up her mobility by the end of the film.

The connection between the *flâneuse*, *flâneur*, and the tourist is further discussed within the context of *Midnight in Paris* (Woody Allen 2011), in which a couple struggle with how they wish to spend their time as tourists. The man prefers the classic form of *flânerie*, whereas his fiancé prefers window shopping—a form of *flânerie* that developed from the power of the female consumer gaze.

It is the time travel in *Midnight in Paris* which led to the inclusion of two film set in Italy: *A Room with a View* (James Ivory 1985) and *Stealing Beauty* (Bernardo Bertolucci 1996). Rather than focusing on the urban tourist, my research of these two films focuses more on the sexuality of the female protagonists and the way the other characters transcribe their own touristic expectations onto these young women. Furthermore, *A Room with a View* is set in Edwardian England and Italy, which overlaps with the *Belle Èpoque,* one of the temporal locations within *Midnight in Paris*. It is also the time period in which *Les Vampires* was filmed[1], creating a circular look at the representations of female tourists and *flâneuse*. Not only does Lucy Honeychurch (Helena Bonham Carter) and Irma Vep share the same time period, but each woman's sexuality is considered dangerous within their respective films. *Stealing Beauty* is included to provide a contrast with *A Room with a View* in a modern setting. The narratives share many similarities, and allow for a comparison between temporal and physical settings. Also, with the inclusion of these two Italian films, the research is given a fuller look at the cinematic *flâneuse* and female tourist throughout the years. The new location also allows for the ability to see how the location affects the female characters.

Ultimately, this thesis is a practice in *flânerie*—strolling through different periods and representations in film to look at how women interact with their locations. It looks at the connection between the tourist gaze, the female gaze,

---

[1] Most scholars consider the outbreak of World War I to be the end of the *Belle Époque*. This would technically place *Les Vampires* within the Great War time period, but considering generations are prescribed after the fact, for this research, *Les Vampires* represents the *Belle Époque* in film. However, the darker subject matter is a result of the beginning of the war.

and the cinematic spectator gaze. It also considers where women fit within these constructs, and how they are represented in these narratives. All the women in these films challenge the roles that their respective films place on them.

The *Flâneur*

The tourist gaze is directly linked to Charles Baudelaire's *flâneur*, which was first written about in the mid-nineteenth century, at the time when travel was becoming more accessible to a wider range of social groups. The word *flâneur* comes from the French word *flâneur* which means 'to stroll' thus *flâneur* literally means 'the stroller.' Baudelaire described the *flâneur* as:

> 'a passionate spectator, [for who] it is an immense joy to set up house in
> the heart of the multitude, amid the ebb and flow of movement, in the
> midst of the fugitive and the infinite. To be away from home and yet to
> feel oneself everywhere at home; to see the world, to be at the centre of
> the world, and yet to remain hidden from the world' (Baudelaire 1964, 9).

Furthermore, the *flâneur* is a 'person who strolls aimlessly in the modern city, observing people and events perhaps (if the *flâneur* happens also to be a writer or an artist) with a view to recording these observations in word or image' (Wolf 2006, 18). While the *flâneur* is an urban tourist, observing the city and recording it, he is also 'an archetypal Parisian, a poet whose language traced the texture and chaos of urban life' (Friedberg 1993, 30).

I have used specific pronouns throughout this chapter, and specifically used 'he' when referring to the *flâneur* in this section for two reasons. First, there is the gendered spaces of 'home' and the 'city.' The urban landscape is a traditionally male coded one, which means the *flâneur* is 'invariably male' (Urry 2002, 138), because 'the privilege of passing unnoted in the city, particularly in the period in which the *flâneur* flourished—that is, the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century—was not accorded to women, whose presence on the streets would certainly be noticed' (Wolf 2006, 19). Second, Baudelaire and Benjamin primarily refer to men as the *flâneur*, and it was only in the mid-20th century when feminist theorist began looking at this exclusion and reworking the theories to find spaces for women in it.

It is not surprising that when travel and tourism grew and expanded beyond the elite, the new modern 'hero,' the *flâneur*, emerged and he was 'able to travel, to arrive, to gaze, to move on, to be anonymous, to be in a liminal zone' (Urry 2002, 138). By Baudelaire's definition, the *flâneur* is an urban tourist.   He wants to be a natural part of his surroundings but at the same time is an outsider, because he is an observer. For the *flâneur* 'the street becomes a dwelling for the *flâneur*; he is as much at home among the facades of houses as a citizen is in his four walls' (Benjamin 1969, 37). Both the tourist and the *flâneur* are able to be away from home and, yet, attempt to make each new place a form of 'home.'

The importance of the *flâneur*'s gender has 'rendered invisible the different ways in which women were both more restricted to the private sphere and at the same time were beginning to colonise other emerging public spheres in the late nineteenth century' (Urry 2002, 138), namely the department store and shopping centres. To this day, shopping is traditionally considered a female practice, with women shopping for pleasure, or 'retail therapy,' in contrast to the male shopper who primarily shops for necessity. The development of the department store and shopping centres made shopping into an event. Today, it is not uncommon to find play structures, merry-go-rounds, cinemas and other activities within the mall, luring the shopper to stay longer.

However, even though shopping has been coded as feminine, it was the development of the Parisian arcades which helped to create the *flâneur*. Walter Benjamin writes, 'strolling could hardly have assumed the importance it did without the arcades' because, prior to Georges-Eugène Haussmann's renovation of Paris, 'wide pavements were rare, and the narrow ones provided little protection from vehicles' (Benjamin 1969, 36). Haussmann's mid-eighteenth century renovation of Paris included the additions of avenues, arcades, and parks within the city. This reconstruction created a 'cross between a street and an *intérieur*' (Benjamin 1969, 37); combining the urban and the domestic spheres in a public place. Haussman's Paris was no longer simply a city, but a place for amusement, relaxation and enjoyment. This new city created the leisure class and the *flâneur*.

Shopping as a Form of *Flânerie*

Where Baudelaire's, and later Benjamin's, *flâneur* is an artist or poet observing the world to create art, the few times a female version is mentioned, she is called a prostitute and clearly labelled as someone who is meant for male objectification—someone who is trying to solicit attention and not blend into the surrounding city life. The *flâneur*'s experience is solitary, a practice of isolation amongst the city masses. This isolation is why many read the *flâneur* as predominantly male, and much of the theorizing has 'accustomed us to assume rather readily that freedom of movement was a male prerogative in the nineteenth century' (Reynolds 2006, 81).

The *flâneur* gaze is a form of consumption: he is observing his surroundings and consuming the sights and experience. Women were objects for consumption, objects for the gaze of the *flâneur*, or the poet who, like Baudelaire, would not notice women as mere passersby (Friedberg 1993, 35). Women are naturally a commodity within the confines of traditional patriarchal society, so they become another sight to be seen and consumed by the *flâneur*. Furthermore, 'if women roamed the street they became "streetwalkers," prostitutes, carnal commodities on sale alongside other items in the arcade' (Friedberg 1993, 35), and it is no coincidence that another name for prostitute is 'street-walker,' as that is one of the forms in which she solicits her wares.[2]

However, as Sîan Reynolds writes, 'women have *always* managed to get about if they really wanted to' (Reynolds 2006, 82). Part of the issue of locating women within traditional *flânerie* is because the examples given are 'the dandy, the rag-picker (the *chiffonier*) and the prostitute as emblematic modern urban types' (Wolf 2006, 19), allowing prostitution to be the only role originally intended for women within *flânerie*. Furthermore, while women are included, 'the gendered French noun designates, the *flâneur* was a male urban subject, endowed with a gaze at an elusive and almost unseen *flâneuse*' (Friedberg 1993, 33).

Not only were women only included if they are walking the streets to sell their body to men, but the feminized version of *flâneur* (*flâneuse*) was created

---

[2] Although there are male prostitutes, I refer to the street-walker form of prostitute as female, as male prostitutes have other names, and are rarely envisioned in the collective societal memory as a 'street-walker.'

later when feminist theorists began to discuss female mobility and *flânerie*—

retrofitting the term. Women could only participate in *flânerie* if they were

commodities to be consumed and enjoyed by the male gaze. Being a commodity

left women primarily to be seen and not to see for themselves.

Baudelaire did not consider the power of women and the female gaze,

specifically 'the power of the woman's gaze *to* the shop window—a gaze imbued

with the power of choice and incorporation through purchase. It was as a

consumer that the *flâneuse* was born (Friedberg 1993, 34). However, Benjamin

did note that it was the arcades and the consumerism which led to the

development of *flânerie*. The new Paris arcades were 'lined with the most

elegant shops, so that such an arcade is a city, even a world, in miniature'

(Benjamin 1969, 37). Though Benjamin does not refer to it as such, window

shopping directly precipitated the rise of the *flâneur*, and allowed for the street to

become like a second home to him. Benjamin further solidifies the arcade and

shops as a pivotal role within *flânerie* when he says to the *flâneur* 'the shiny

enameled signs of businesses are at least as good a wall ornament as an oil

painting is to a bourgeois in his salon' (Benjamin 1969, 37). Consumerism,

window shopping, and strolling are cornerstones of the *flâneur*. However, it still

leaves women excluded from taking a more active role, for when a man does it, it

is *flânerie*, but when a woman does the same it is simply window shopping.

Although women were, and to an extent still are, viewed as a commodity,

the rise of commodity culture also created an increase in female agency and

mobility through the rise of the department store. Erika Rappaport discusses the

increase in the promotion of women's pleasure through shopping with the advent

of Women's Week in London. In 1909, the opening of Selfridges coincided with

the 60th anniversary of Harrods's and the spring sales, and this 'overwhelming

competition among retailers in the years before the war produced a new way of

thinking about consumption, the city, and female pleasure' (Rappaport 1995,

130). This competition resulted in the creation of Women's Week, one of the first

times female consumption and pleasure was addressed by 'journalists, retailers,

advertisers, and consumers' and 'prompted a redefinition of shopping and of

women's place in the urban environment' (Rappaport 1995, 131). This is one of

the first instances of society considering and exploiting female pleasure; with

shop owners and marketers looking to profit by making a public space devoted to

female pleasure and consumption. Although women's week was not an official holiday or nationally recognized day like International Women's Day, it was a promotional advertisement and pushed the focus on the female shopper and the female gaze.

Tourism as Another Form of *Flânerie*

The growth of boulevards and department stores in nineteenth century Europe 'brought enormous numbers of people together in ways that were relatively novel' (Urry 2002, 137). The *flâneur* is an urban tourist, but even though the tourist shares similarities with the *flâneur*, the major difference between the two is that the tourist is not a solitary type, but is more social. For Baudelaire, the *flâneur* was an artist who was observing and experiencing the city for his own enjoyment. It is these 'social relations of gazing [that] enable and constrain' the tourist (Urry and Larsen 2011, 201), whereas the *flâneur* is classified by his solitary nature.

Of course, female mobility is also linked to and dependent upon social class. While women of the upper class may be able to tour different destinations more so than their working class counterparts, upper class women were restricted in other ways. The bourgeois woman of the *belle époque* had more restricted physical mobility because of her own clothing, as 'she was "encased" in corset, tailored clothes, gloves and hat, and liable to be observed by neighbours and servants' (Reynolds 2006, 82). Beyond the physical restrictions that her clothing presented, the bourgeois woman was also constricted socially because 'the unmarried girl had to be chaperoned, and even the married woman was held within a confined space' (Reynolds 2006, 82). Conversely, the working class *belle époque* woman had more freedom of movement as she was not as concerned with wardrobe nor the social faux pas of going out unaccompanied. In fact, the working class woman would be required to travel the city by herself. However, it was still suspicious for a woman to travel by herself, with solo female travellers often being suspected of prostitution but 'a real prostitute would, paradoxically, have had somewhat greater freedom of movement' (Reynolds 2006, 83). This would solidify the urban space coded as 'male' and a place where no respectable woman would be found.

Various guidebooks of the early twentieth century list the public spaces that 'respectable women' would or would not attend. For example, bourgeois women could visit patisseries, teashops, and department stores (but only with a female companion). However, 'ladies' should not attend cafes, cabarets, and dancehalls (Reynolds 2006, 83-84). One guidebook from 1898 even listed the 'right-hand pavement of the boulevard Saint-Michel' as the women's side of the boulevard (Reynolds 2006, 84).

While female mobility was not as restricted as our common preconception of history would let us think, it was still limited for the middle and upper classes. It is important to consider the role gender and class plays in a woman's mobility in order to compare it with that of male mobility in relation to *flâneur* theories, because 'there was obviously still a gendering of space for "respectable society"' (Reynolds 2006, 84). This means that certain places were still socially restricted to 'respectable' women while being completely available to men. Furthermore, certain locations would be more available to the male tourist than the female tourist, although some women broke those barriers.

It is not surprising that the modern tourist is rooted in the *flâneur*. Both the tourist and the *flâneur* have a 'crucially visual nature' and also experience 'kinaesthetic pleasures' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 195). The *flâneur* experiences the city by walking through it, while the tourists experience their destination through walking, shopping, sightseeing, or perhaps doing nothing. Although the tourist and *flâneur* use all their senses, it is the 'visual sense' that 'organizes the place, role and effect of the other senses. The unusualness of the visual sensations places these within a different frame' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 195). It is by looking that both the tourist and *flâneur* are able to organize their experience and transforms 'the most mundane of activities, such as shopping, strolling, having a drink' into extraordinary 'touristic' experiences (Urry and Larsen 2011, 195). John Urry describes tourism as being:

> 'about pleasure, about holidays…about how and why for short periods people leave their normal place of work and residence. It is about consuming goods and services, which are in some sense unnecessary. They are consumed because they supposedly generate pleasurable experiences which are different from those typically encountered in everyday life' (Urry 2002, 1).

For tourists, it is the backdrop of new or 'exotic' locations which allows for these rather basic activities to become something new and exciting. Similarly, it was the creation and expansion of the boulevards and arcades of Paris which created new excitement in the simple act of walking. Furthermore, it was the invention of the department store that provided women with the freedom to participate in *flânerie* beyond the more traditional 'street walker' role. Window shopping allowed women to gaze at commodities rather than be a commodity.

Tourism is a commodity; this is evident by the abundance of travel packages and 'must see' tourist spots that charge entrance fees. However, the tourist also consumes his or her surroundings in a similar fashion to the *flâneur's* consumption of his surroundings. Anne Friedberg argues that 'the *flâneur* becomes an easy prototype for the consumer, whose perceptual style of "just looking" was the pedestrian equivalent of slow motion' (Friedberg 1993, 34). because of the window shopper and her 'just looking.'

Dean MacCannell describes the specific tourist experience of sightseeing as 'a ritual performed to the differentiations of society. Sightseeing is a kind of collective striving for a transcendence of the modern totality, a way of attempting to overcome the discontinuity of modernity, of incorporating its fragments into unified experience' (MacCannell 1999, 13), and for him, sightseeing and tourism, even when traveling alone, is still a social activity, because one's experience is based upon previous and preconceived images of that location's tourism. Rarely in the post-modern world, is one able to completely travel an uncharted path.

Sightseeing and tourism are communal exercises, but at the same time, 'tourists dislike tourists. God is dead, but man's need to appear holier than his fellow's lives' (MacCannell 1999, 10). This is one of the prevailing themes in Woody Allen's *Midnight in Paris* (2011), in which Gil (Owen Wilson) is extremely critical of his fiancée's (Rachel McAdams) choice of sightseeing activities [monument/location]. Gil prefers to wander aimlessly around Paris, absorbing the city as a *flâneur*, which is his preferred form of tourism. Conversely, Inez prefers to participate in a more overtly commoditized form of tourism, in which she visits museums, shopping, and locations where one must pay to experience history. In the chapter on *Midnight in Paris*, I will discuss in further detail the gender issues surrounding these contrasting forms of tourism.

Urry makes a case for the *flâneur* as an early predecessor of the tourist—specifically with his strolling as '*the* activity, which has, in a way, become emblematic of the tourist' (Urry 2002, 138)—but he also, without specifying, creates a connection between the *flâneur* and the modern filmmaker and film spectator. The *flâneur* is also 'in many ways a "consumer of images"' much like the tourist and the shopper, (Bruno 2002, 79) and the film audience as well. Urry relates the link between the *flâneur*, photographer and tourist, by stating that 'to be a photographer in the twentieth century, and that is so much part of travel and tourism, is also to be seen and photographed' (Urry 2002, 138). Tourists participate in their own form of *flânerie* 'by continuing to stroll, to gaze, and to be gazed upon' which creates 'a kind of sensuous consumption that does not create profit,' and for some, tourism is an opportunity to gaze and pay more attention 'to desired others rather than to the passing landscape and narratives of the guides' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 207). This means that the touristic form of *flânerie* is not only about gazing upon the physical place, but gazing upon other people and to have others gaze upon them. The *flâneur*, although being able to pass unnoticed, is also concerned with being looked at as well.

The fact that 'tourists never just gaze upon places and things; they gaze upon them with known and/or unknown others' is apparent, but also 'who we gaze with is as important to the quality of the experience as is the object of the gaze' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 199). Who we travel with affects how we perceive the physical place, and 'the tourist's emotional and affective experiences with a given place depend as much upon the quality of their co-travelling social relations as upon the place itself' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 201).[3] Here is where the tourist and the *flâneur* part ways, as part of what makes the *flâneur* so enigmatic is his solitude; however, it should also be pointed out that his solitude is primarily a bourgeois male construct. It is these men who are permitted and allotted this capability due to their gender and social class, as previously established. Furthermore, not only is the tourist experience dictated by the physical presence of other people, but '*other* tourists also influence and discipline the tourist gaze' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 201). It is important to note the solitary

---

[3] This will become more important in the chapter about *A Room with a View* and *Stealing Beauty*, where the companions of the two young Lucy's write their own fantasies and desires upon the young women, and affect their experience.

mobility of the *flâneur* vs the social mobility of tourism, because, as mentioned earlier, it was improper for women of the middle and upper social classes to walk around unaccompanied.   Walking the city alone is a powerful act and this will be seen in the films discussed in this thesis.

Photography is the precursor to cinema, and like photography, cinema is 'a socially constructed way of seeing and recording' (Urry 2002, 138), which appropriates and tames the object of the gaze, creating a power dynamic between the subjective gaze and the object of this gaze. However, attention should be brought to Urry's seventh characteristic of travel:

> 'photography gives shape to travel. It is the reason for stopping, to take (snap) a photograph, and then to move on. Photography involves obligations. People feel that they must not miss seeing particular scenes since otherwise the photo-opportunities will be missed. Tourist agencies spend much time indicating where photographs should be taken (so-called viewing points). Indeed, much tourism becomes in effect a search for the photogenic; travel is a strategy for the accumulation of photographs' (Urry 2002, 139).

Some people travel to collect the photographs which provide proof that they were there. However, this 'search' for the photographic proof of the tourist experience, means that 'it is *pre*formed rather than *per*formed' because the tourist ritual and experience is 'framed and fixed by commercial images rather than framing and exploring themselves' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 208).   The tourist narrative is already written in one's mind if they are hunting for specific photographic evidence of their trip (a photo in front of the Statue of Liberty, a picture from the top of the Eiffel Tower, a bird's eye view from the London Eye, and so forth.). It now becomes a ritual performance rather than a new experience. *A Room with a View* (James Ivory 1985) demonstrates the early forms of tourism and the importance of photographs in capturing the experience.

Furthermore, photography becomes a social interaction since 'photographing is typified by complex social relations between photographers, posers and present, imagined and future audiences' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 213). It is not simply the camera's gaze or the tourist's gaze, but potential future gazes that will interpret the images within the photograph at a later point—most often in the comfort of one's own home or at least after the tourist returns.

Photography is one of the ways in which we create collective memories and tourist narratives for locations, as it blends the public and private spheres, bringing the 'exotic' locations to the comfort of one's living room. Sharing photographs of the popular tourist spots, provides proof of your experience and passes this experience on to others.

Early Cinema and Circulation

The movement of people and goods has been a key factor the development of the modern world and the increase of human circulation created not only more travel opportunities for everyone, but especially for women. In 'Tracing the Individual Body: Photography, Detectives, and Early Cinema,' Tom Gunning writes 'Any number of *topoi* of modernity that cluster around the second half of the nineteenth century can be approached as instances of circulation' (Gunning 1995, 16). For example, Parisian Boulevards, factories and conveyor belts, moving sidewalks—it all comes down to the movement of people and things. For Gunning, two of these markers of modern circulation were the cinema and the railway. The nineteenth-century rail expansions allowed for the greater mobility of people and goods, assisting in the creation of a transnational and global society, and making it easier for people and films to cross borders and engage with other cultures.

Trains not only opened tourism opportunities to the middle and lower social classes, they also influenced the development of film. Christian Hayes writes, 'early cinema held an instant fascination with the train' and with it 'cinema found a technology to rival its own wonders, and early train films are often records of one modern technology marvelling at the other' (Hayes 2012). Although developed 60 years prior to the cinema, 'the optical experience of the train carriage window long prefigured the cinema, providing passengers with a cinematic experience' (Hayes 2009, 185). Hayes continues, 'the experience of train travel and the cinematic experience overlapped in Hale's Tours' or 'phantom carriages' (Hayes 2009, 185). These were cinemas designed to simulate a train journey, with the audience sitting in a "carriage" while a film was projected onto a "window," thus recreating the movement one would experience (Hayes 2009, 185). This "window" 'was the screen at the front of the carriage' and what these window-fronted carriages clearly most resembled, then,

were cinemas and thus these phantom carriages were the predecessor to the modern cinema (Hayes 2009, 189-190).

In England, Hale's Tours 'complemented the variety of activities available on Oxford Street, functioning in this case as an escapist interlude from busy department stores. The brief 10–15-minute shows would have made Hale's Tours a convenient distraction to Oxford Street itself, as well as encouraging repeated viewings from enthusiastic spectators' (Hayes 2009, 192). The Hale's Tours not only capitalized on the increase of public circulation, but also co-opted and expanded the *flâneur*'s gaze. It is the *flâneur*'s experience that 'epitomizes the fragmented and anonymous nature of life in the modern city, observing the fleeting and ephemeral aspects of urban existence (changing fashions, brief encounters)' (Wolf 2006, 18-19). Thus, it is through his physical circulation that the *flâneur* was able to observe modern life, but the Hale's Tour and cinema (theatres are often located near shopping and city centres to this day) added a new dimension to the *flâneur*.

A similar spectacle to the Hale's Tours was the panorama, 'a 360-degree cylindrical painting, viewed by an observed in the centre' (Friedberg 1993, 21), which gained popularity 100 years prior to the phantom carriages. As Anne Friedberg writes, 'the panorama did not physically *mobilize* the body, but provided virtual spatial and temporal mobility, bringing the country to the town dweller, transporting the past to the present' (Friedberg 1993, 22). Much like the Hale's Tours, the panorama created a sense of mobility, for when a person entered the panorama, 'The effect of going from darkness into the naturally lit circular rotunda was meant to heighten the sensation of standing out of doors and viewing a scene as if one had virtually travelled there in the time it took to enter the building' (Roff 2003, 1). Panoramas were billed as 'painted from sketches taken by the artist "on the spot"' with promotion focusing on the 'accuracy and mathematical precision of locations such as Hong Kong, Paris, St. Petersburg and Constantinople (Roff 2003, 1). The original panoramas were static representations of locations and scenes, but soon moving panoramas became popular attractions where canvas 'unfurled from one cylinder to another at the opposite end of the stage created the sensation of travel through simulated journey' (Roff 2003, 1).

It is important to look at these pre- and early cinematic technologies because it increased the mobility of the gaze and as Hayes notes: 'Hale's Tours fits into a tradition of virtual travel experiences which began long before 1905 and which continues today.' (Hayes 2009, 194). However, while the artistic techniques developed into photorealism, the panorama artists were able to create virtual mobility, but this virtual mobility stripped the observer of their physical mobility, as they became 'more immobile, passive, ready to receive the constructions of a virtual reality placed in front of his or her unmoving body' (Friedberg 1993, 28), and although the spectator's gaze became more mobile the spectator became increasingly immobile

In the panoramas and other forms of virtual mobility 'the city dilates to becomes landscape, as it does in as subtler way for the *flâneur*' (Friedberg 1993, 23-24), and cinema is another version of this virtual mobility that helped to bring the world to the masses and to those lacking in mobility, as prior to the late nineteenth-century, travel and tourism were the privileged domain of the upper classes.

Film, Scopophilia and Tourism

Prior to the nineteenth-century, 'there was organized travel in premodern societies, but it was very much the preserve of elites' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 5). It was not until the 1840s, and the development of mass travel by train in Europe, that a '"democratization" of travel' allowed the working class to participate in tourism (Urry and Larsen 2011, 31). Furthermore, Urry and Larsen write that 'this is when the "tourist gaze", that combing together of the means of collective travel, the desire for travel and the techniques of photographic reproduction, becomes a core component of western modernity' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 31). Much like the filmic gaze, the tourist gaze is an example of pleasure gained through visual consumption, and much of the pleasure of travel comes from being able to 'gaze at what we counter' because 'when we "go away" we look at the environment with interest and curiosity' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 1).

Much like the city, the cinema is also a blend of public and private spheres. The evolution of the cinema house has created a place where one can be on his or her own, but in a public space. With an emphasis on silence in the theatre, watching a film becomes a private experience. Yet, in a packed house,

one is easily sitting next to total strangers who are also having their own public-private experience.

Similarly, tourism is a way of bringing the private and the public together. Tourism is an escape from the daily grind, but 'voyage and home work together in spectacular ways: rather than representing separate stances they can be considered intrinsically interrelated' (Bruno 2002, 81). One cannot get the thrill of traveling with knowing what 'normal, everyday' life is.

Visiting landmarks like Versailles or Blenheim Palace allows the average tourist to enter in to the homes of nobility—spaces that were originally closed to the public and a private home. Many of these private spaces have become places of public consumption. The importance of the *flâneur* to this research is his ability to see and be seen, while also moving between the public and private spheres, spheres which are traditionally coded as male (public) and female (private). The tourist and the cinema spectator share similarities with the *flâneur* because of the blending of these two spheres.

A major component of *flânerie*, film and tourism is scopophilia, or the pleasure found in looking. All three of these social practices involve spectators finding pleasure in looking, and thus these spectators have scopophilic desires. However, scopophilia also has erotic connotations. Freud isolated this idea when he 'associated scopophilia with taking other people as objects, subjecting them to a controlling and curious gaze' and developed its natural voyeuristic tendencies (Mulvey 1989, 16), and voyeurism is a basic part of the cinema experience. The film spectator, tourist and *flâneur* all find pleasure in looking and it is their gaze that drives the modern practices of cinema and tourism. However, all three are filtered through a gendered (and primarily white) gaze that naturally excludes women.

The gender and race filters also apply tourists and there is a danger of tourists and foreigners 'exoticising' native populations in the countries they visit. The tourist, the *flâneur* and the film spectator are all preconceived as male, because that is the dominant narrative that has been presented for centuries. Of course, women travelers did exist in the 1800s, and there are tour guides and books dedicated to female tourists, but even now, women experience tourism differently from their male counterparts, and the *flâneur* has a different experience from the *flâneuse*.

There is a connection between *flânerie*, tourism and cinema. As mentioned, the *flâneur* was able to move between the public and private spheres, but at the same time the changing landscape of Paris blended the private and public together. It was also during this time that women began to venture around the city more on their own. Department stores, boulevards, cafes and the bicycle all led to the increased mobility of Parisian women and an increased number of female tourists visiting Paris at this time (McCollough 2011, 10). Not only was the city blending the public and private, women were beginning to leave the private spheres of the home to move around the public city.

Many early films were developed to be a form of travel and tourism, and some of the most important films in early cinema are centered on travel. Guiliana Bruno writes, 'cinema itself developed as an apparatus of travel and was born in the arena of tourism' which is discussed in Charney and Schwartz's *Invention of Modern Life* in relation to modernity and circulation. Bruno adds to this by writing that 'recent work in film studies has shown that a diversity of means contributed to the creation of the "touristic consciousness" that gave birth to the cinema' (Bruno 1993, 76) and that this is evident in 'the transit of modern (glass) architecture and the film screen [which] converged in the design of the movie house itself' (Bruno 1993, 76).

Furthermore, early film theatres were called 'tamâshâkhânah' in Persian which translates as 'that house where one went sight-seeing and "walking together"—that is literally, went site seeing' (Bruno 1993, 77).[4] From the beginning, travel, site-seeing and film are intrinsically linked, and not only because of the similarities between the medium and travel, but because as Bruno points out, 'cinema emerged at the height of historical imperialism' (Bruno 1993, 77). Cinema was able to bring foreign and exotic locations back to the general populations of the colonial nations. Now someone could film these new places and return home giving a more true-to-life experience than a painting could provide, and the motion that a photograph could not supply. The cinema helped to shrink the distance between countries with its transnational nature—especially

---

[4] Note that one of the translations is also 'walking together' which is an important link to *flânerie*.

during silent cinema, which was able to cross borders and cultures with little alteration to the original film.

Like the tourist gaze, cinema has a 'touristic drive—the gaze of exploration', and an 'aggressive desire of "discovery"' (Bruno 1993, 77). Bruno writes, 'the look that sees can also seize. As a form of capturing—that is of appropriation—image-making resembles the "discovery" of foreign lands and the devouring look of window shopping' (Bruno 1993, 79), which needs to be looked at closely for this research. The idea that a 'look that sees can also seize' is reminiscent of much feminist film criticism involving the male gaze, where women are commodities for the male viewer.

Bruno also compares 'the look that sees and seize' with the 'devouring look of window shopping,' which has been linked to the development of the *flâneuse* and female participation in *flânerie*. Anne Friedberg equates window-shopping and the female consumer with *flânerie* because both are developments in observer, and the relationship between gender and subjective power—subjective power being part of Baudelaire's theory of the *flâneur*. Friedberg writes:

> 'it was precisely while these changes in the observer were occurring in the nineteenth century that women were changing their social role and were allowed a new and more public access to mobility through urban space. As consumers, women had a new set of social prerogatives in which their social powerlessness was crossed with new paradoxes of subjective power' (Friedberg 1993, 35).

As already mentioned, shopping and consumerism gave women of the nineteenth century power, and the development of arcades and department stores emphasized this. Bruno is explicitly linking window-shopping, a female gaze, with tourism and the cinema gaze, which is traditionally a male gaze. All three of these activities share the same 'aggressive desire' to discover and explore, because 'like the tourist and the shopper, the film spectator is also in many ways a "consumer" of images' (Bruno 2002, 79). Further connecting travel, shopping and film together, Bruno writes: 'On the brink of private and public, tourism, and film are both leisure activities and mass phenomena, whose devouring gaze is hungry for pleasure and spectacle consumption' (Bruno 2002, 82). These three

ideas all involve this idea of a 'hungry gaze' that 'devours' what it sees, much like the male gaze devours the female image on screen.

The film experience provides, or at least intends to provide, pleasure to the spectator, and a brief escape from one's daily life. Even the most realistic of films will still provide most of the audience with an experience that is 'different from those typically encountered in everyday life.' Les Roberts describes tourism itself as a cinematic experience, 'with its attendant trope of *projection*, the spectacular space of consumption which the tourists inhabit is one that plays host to an urban topography that has been *cinematically* rendered' (Roberts 2010, 183). Despite being an actual experience, tourism is a form of theatrical spectatorship and the tourist whose mobility 'rather than those of the tableau imagery "on screen" create the emotional[5] architectures of urban narrative space' (Roberts 2010, 183). In tourism, it is the tourist who has an actual experience, but that experience is cinematically rendered.

If the tourist experience is like a cinematic experience, then the next question is 'is it possible to imagine the performances of the tourist gaze being entirely based upon "virtual sights" seen upon screens and never corporeally visited? Could the interactions of gazer and gaze be only virtual and never embodied' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 216)?   They ask this as a theoretical question while looking towards the future, but cinema has already provided virtual sights for the tourist gaze. This was happening as early as the Hale's Tours, which recreated the rail journey through a virtual experience. This is still practiced today, and one need only go to Disney World to participate in modern versions of the Hale's Tour. Similarly, travel films are often noted for the beauty of their locations and because it brings the 'faraway places' to the people. What we consume in the media helps to shape our experience of a place and our desire to visit it. This is the basic principle of all the 'Visit ____' adverts on the television, that we will see this advert and want to journey there to experience what we saw on the screen. However, it is not as reflexive as the actual tourist gaze, as there is nothing returning the gaze, the screen can't look back at the audience, for now at

---

[5] This is Roberts paraphrasing Giuliana Bruno in *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film*.

least.[6] It should be noted that a 'a *flâneur* in Paris today will see posters, even in multiplexes, advertising a large number of French films and not just Hollywood blockbusters' (Rollet 2008, 48), and perhaps this reflexive nature of a *flâneur* seeing posters for film which shares a spiritual aspect with *flânerie*, is the beginning of a reflexive gaze. Nonetheless, cinema experience is already providing armchair tourism to those unable or unwilling to travel. By doing this, cinema helps to shape the collective memories of modern society. Bruno was writing about *A Policeman's Tour of the World* (Pathé, 1906) when she wrote 'the interest of this film does not lie in getting the crook but in capturing something else: plot gives way to a set of traveling pleasures as we are transported by a series of tableau shots that take us to different parts of the world' (Bruno 2002, 75). In this film, the locations become characters unto themselves, and with many female travel films, the plot is less important than the locations and visuals that provide the armchair tourist experience.

Paris and Tourism

As established, the growth of rail travel allowed for tourism to grow, and it was the modernizing of Paris that allowed for the *flâneur* to prosper at this time. John Urry writes that we see in 'Paris during the Second Empire in the mid-nineteenth century the construction of the conditions for the quintessentially modern experience' (Urry 2002, 136), and at this time, Paris underwent a 'massive rebuilding'; creating boulevards, arcades, parks and cultural buildings, which 'restructured what could be seen or gazed upon' (Urry 2002, 136). He surmises that these boulevards 'came to structure the gaze, both of Parisians and later of visitors' and 'for the first time in a major city people could see well into the distance and indeed see where they were going and where they came from' (Urry 2002, 137). All of these changes to the Parisian urban landscape also created new spaces, which would combine the public and private spheres. His example of the union of the private and public space is the lovers meeting at a café along the boulevard where they can at once be 'private in public,' or 'intimately together without being physically alone,' and where they could gaze

---

[6] Once again, Disney is spearheading these sorts of interactions so it is only a matter of time.

upon the strangers passing down the boulevard, but these strangers could also gaze upon them, which 'enhanced the lovers' vision of themselves and in turn provided an endlessly fascinating source of curiosity (Urry 2002, 137).

The idea of '*la vie parisienne*' developed in the mid-1800s when the development of 'boulevards and cafes created a new kind of space, especially one where lovers could be "private in public"' and 'to be private in the midst of such dangers and chaos created the perfect romantic setting of modern times' (Urry 2002, 137) which would be recorded and promoted by the steady stream of American tourists traveling to Paris. Often, these Americans traveled with more 'noble dreams' of bettering themselves or their work rather than for purely recreational purposes. For example, David McCullough describes Emma Hart Willard, who despite being a widowed 40-year-old, left for Paris in order 'to see Europe at long last, to expand her knowledge that way… And she was determined to take in all she possibly could in the time allotted' (McCullough 2011, 3). It would be this mass exodus that would lead to the popular, romantic idea of Paris as a destination for artists of all disciplines—allowing the cafes, boulevards, and city of lights to work its magic and every year 'millions of visitors have attempted to re-experience' this romantic ideal (Urry 2002, 137).

Paris is one city which often is its own character in film, and perhaps the only other city which holds a similar mythology would be New York City, both of which have been romanticized and personified. Paris and NYC are alive, but not simply because they are full of living things, but because the romantic view of each city leads them to become living things of their own. Paris is the perfect place to begin this study as there is so much myth wrapped up into the physical city. Take for example the idea that Paris is the city of love, where 'travelling with an affectionate partner makes it easy to fall in love with "romantic Paris"' but at the same time it can 'taunt the single traveler with feelings of loneliness and lost love as well as the troubled couple with realizing that not even *this* place can re-establish their affection for one another' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 201). The tourist's social relations and fellow travelers can affect their experience, an experience that is derived from films, television, books and other social practices. Specifically, I am looking at how female tourists interact with the city in film, but also how these films shape and play into traditional narratives of the city.

Furthermore, these narratives can change with time so I will be looking at films from various time periods. For example, Paris has undergone many different representations through various film movements and genres:

> 'the silent Paris of Feuillade and his vampires [1910s], the Paris of the *réalism poétique* of Carné and Clair in the 1930s, the belle époque Paris of Renoir and Jacqueline Audry in the post-war period, the New Wave Paris of Truffaut, Goddard, and Agnès Varda, the postmodern Paris of Jean-Jacques Beineix, Leos Carax, or the early Luc Besson… In black-and-white or in color, the visual, narrative, symbolic constructions of the city offered in all these films illustrate the multifaceted and fantasized dimensions of modern Paris' (Rollet 2008, 47).

Each of these films has helped to reshape Paris through the years, 'and each director brings a different attitude to the city and discloses something new' while also providing 'economic benefit as well as new perspectives' (Rollet 2008, 47).

The Transformative Feminine Experience and the Feminine Masquerade

Many travel films, regardless of gender, involve a journey of self-discovery. One of the basic characteristics of the female tourist film is that 'travel can be a transformative female experience' (Bruno 2002, 81).   Sometimes the self-discovery is purposeful, à la *Eat Pray Love* (Ryan Murphy 2010), in which Julia Roberts's character ventures to Italy, India and Bali in order to 'find herself' after escaping a failed marriage. Similarly, in *Under the Tuscan Sun* (Audrey Wells 2003), Frances (Diane Lane) is on a vacation funded by her friends in the hope of helping her through her post-divorce depression, when she decides to buy a house and live in Tuscany permanently. Both films feature women who travel to escape their lives, and they are looking for a transformation.

However, the self-discovery is often a by-product of the trip itself. In *Stealing Beauty* (Bernardo Bertolucci 1996) Liv Tyler's character hopes to experience a sort of transformation, specifically a sexual awakening. Similarly, although not looking for a sexual awakening, Lucy (Helena Bonham Carter) in *A Room with a View* (James Ivory 1985) undergoes a romantic/sexual transformation due to her time abroad. These narratives are common in nearly all stories of women traveling. A woman is repressed or hurt and it is through her time in another country that she is able to open herself up and find love. Often

these journeys are an escape from problems in the female protagonist's life, whether it be a divorce (*Eat Pray Love* and *Under the Tuscan Sun*) or death of a family member (*Stealing Beauty*), travel serves as a transformation for these women. In nearly all of these films, the women find love while on their travels and often discover 'themselves' along the way.

In the most basic terms, the feminine masquerade is when women compensate for the theft of masculinity by overdoing femininity. The feminine masquerade is 'a type of representation which carries a threat, disarticulating male systems of viewing' (Doane 1991, 26). It threatens the male world, as the male cannot understand the feminine for two main reasons. First, female reversal is easier than male reversal, as women can transition into male clothing much easier than a man can transition into female clothing. At the same time, when transitioning, she can still be desirable. Second, 'everyone wants to be elsewhere than the feminine position' (Doane 1991, 25) because the female is deemed the weaker sex and this upsets the male world.

Because women are objects of the male gaze, the female journey to self-discovery often involves engaging with fashion. While discussing travel as a transformative female experience, Bruno writes 'along with fashion, itself a transformative mode for Bette [Davis in *Now, Voyager*], it can act as the vehicle of a novel "self-fashioning"' (Bruno 2002, 81). Bruno specifically mentions *Now, Voyager*, and the role of fashion *and* travel in the transformation of Davis's character. Similarly, fashion and mobility play a part in the films *Cleo 5 a 7* (Agnès Varda 1962) and *Funny Face* (Stanley Donen 1957). In each film, fashion plays a part in the female protagonist's travel story.

In *Funny Face*, Audrey Hepburn's character, Jo, travels to Paris to conduct business—which is fashion. In order for Hepburn's Jo to get to France, she must first undergo a 'makeover' to become a high fashion model. Jo is a clerk in a bookstore who thinks fashion is frivolous and below her intellectual pursuits, but when given the opportunity to go to Paris (and thus meet the intellectuals she admires), she chooses to participate in the industry to which she holds much disdain. For Jo, travel creates a transformation that pushes her further into the feminine masquerade. She was not concerned with her physical appearance until reaching Paris, but in order to travel and be loved and fall in love, fashion must prevail. Her discovery includes making herself over into the more traditional

looking woman and finding heterosexual love.   The fashion industry provides her with the physical mobility to get to Paris, but also constricts her physically and socially within a heterosexual romance.

In contrast, in *Cléo de 5 à 7*, *flânerie* allows Cléo, a pop singer who is packaged as a commodity, to leave behind the female masquerade. While she is participating and performing as the hyper-sexualized woman, she is like a bird in a cage, but when she drops this pretense, she is finally able to see the city and herself for what they really are. This transformative experience is the opposite of Jo's experience, where Jo begins her time in Paris as a *flâneuse* and she loses that freedom after her make over into the feminine masquerade.

Fashion is a form of commodity culture and often is a reason for window-shopping. The connection between shopping and traveling can be found in *Midnight in Paris* (Woody Allen 2011), where Owen Wilson's character, Gil, looks down on Rachel McAdam's character, Inez, for her touristic choices. Inez prefers to participate in the commodity culture of tourism through museums, as well as purchasing furniture and things that can only be purchased in Paris. To Gil, visiting Versailles and participating in the commodity culture is not necessary for the Parisian experience. He would rather walk around the city, but as Friedberg has written, women traditionally have not been able to just wander around. It is consumerism that allowed women the ability to participate in *flânerie* because 'the *flâneuse*, was not possible until she was free to roam the city on her own' (Friedberg 1993, 34). However, 'the *flâneuse*-as-shopper may have had a new mobility in the public sphere and may have been enthralled with the illusion of power in consumer choice, but these freedoms were only possible at a price. Power was obtainable only through a triangulated relation with a commodity- "fetish"' (Friedberg 1993, 58)—power was only available through participating in commodity culture. According to Friedberg's theories on the development of the *flâneuse*, 'the *flâneur* reprivatized public space, turned the street into an interior' (Friedberg 1993, 64).   Bruno also compares the private and the public and discusses how tourism and film have connected the two spheres together. According to her, 'both involve the movement of people to and from places, attraction to sites, and motion through space' (Bruno 2002, 82) and 'the touristic journey is by definition temporary, as is the virtual journey that takes place in the movie "house"' (Bruno 2002, 82).

Although *Midnight in Paris* is primarily about a man's journey, it is also about Gil's relationships with two women in the film. Specifically, it is about his desire to be the *flâneur* and looking for a partner who will participate in it with him. He finds that person in Adriana (Marion Cotillard), but she ultimately leaves him for the *belle époque*, less than a decade after Baudelaire was developed the *flâneur*.

I begin this thesis with a chapter on Irma Vep (Musidora) from *Les Vampires* (Louis Feuillade 1915) as an example of an early twentieth century *flâneuse* at the end of the *belle époque*. I believe it is important to look at the groundwork the character of Irma Vep develops in early cinema. Especially, the dangers a mobile woman represents. Seeing how a French woman interacts with her native city will allow us to compare how visiting women interact with the same city, before jumping to investigate the way female tourists are represented in other countries and finally returning with *Midnight in Paris*, which deals with the present, the 1920s and the *belle époque*.

Flânerie and Dangerous Women

In the era immediately preceding World War I, the role of women in the French workforce (part of the public sphere) was being contested. It was increasingly common for women to be seen outside of the home, especially as prior to the war, in France, the work force was 35-40% female—one of the highest percentages in Europe at this time—with many women working non-traditional jobs, such as transport and manufacturing (Callahan 2005, 81-82) Yet, after World War I, there was 'a push toward more traditional roles for women and an aggressive pro-natalist policy' in France (Callahan 2005, 82) Although speaking of post-WWI Germany, Barbara Hales describes the French (and American) female sentiment when she writes: 'The German woman who worked during World War I would not easily be pushed back into traditional family life' (Hales 1996, 104), meaning women throughout Europe continued to work outside the home even after the war brought the return of much of the male population.

It was at this time that the *nouvelle femme* developed in French social consciousness, as 'a middle class woman seeking independence and education rather than marriage and life at home [and] made her claims in a context where maternity and family were issues fraught with special political and national significance.' (Callahan 2005, 82). Throughout the world, the workingwoman has posed a threat to patriarchy and has been viewed as the breakdown of the family as she produced an 'erotic giddiness [that could send] the world into a tailspin' (Hales 1996, 104). However, it should be noted that even when a woman worked within the home she faced further problems as 'the domestic servant [was] being particularly singled out as someone unreliable at best and more likely, criminal. (Callahan 2005, 82). Even the 'domestic' woman was still suspicious and more

likely to partake in criminal activity, much like the *flâneuse* was more likely to partake in prostitution. As with Europe at the turn of the century, and the *femme fatale* in Hollywood's film noirs, 'the construction of the criminal woman became a signifier for the fear of women's liberation, [and] the new importance of the city,' (Hales 1996, 116) for the criminal woman is representative of the anxiety towards female agency, the urban landscape and modernity.

The *femme fatale* is a term used to describe the dangerous female characters found in film noir. During the 1940s, the Hollywood *femme fatale* served as a physical embodiment of the anxiety men had in Post-War America over the growing number of women entering the work force and leaving the confines of their current domesticated lives. As World War II enlisted so many male soldiers, the women 'left behind' had to not only support themselves, but America's economy as well, resulting in women being considered 'fit for heavy industrial work' (Martin 2000, 203). Not only were women invading the work force, and leaving the domestic, female space, they were also the primary breadwinners for the first time in American history. With many men stationed half way across the world, women became more independent and autonomous. However, after the war, the return of the enlisted men thrust women back into their domesticated lives, and the *femme fatale* became a popular character trope in Hollywood film. She represented the anxieties and crisis that faced the returning male troops, which 'was the discovery that the pliable passive wife or lover was yet another casualty of the war' and the unusually high divorce rate of the immediate post-World War II years are an example of how men disapproved and rejected the new female empowerment that developed during the War.

While the *femme fatale* is traditionally considered a construct of 1940s Hollywood, similar dangerous women appeared in film prior to World War II, such as Theda Bara, who was deemed 'the Vamp,' which is short for 'Vampire,'[7] and Pola Negri. Like their post-war counterparts, these early fatal women were embodiments of male anxiety towards women. As established, France had the highest percentage of women in the work force prior to the war, and yet there was

---

[7] Theda Bara and Musidora were 'creating' their images as 'vamps' and 'vampires' at the same time with their break out roles both occurring in 1915.

a pro-natalist movement attempting to send the women back to their 'proper' roles as mothers and wives—thus reviving the family, which was deemed in crisis by the lack of women performing their designated jobs.

Playing on the anxieties patriarchy had towards women in the post-war era, the *femme fatale* engaged in a feminine masquerade, playing up her sexuality and seducing men in order to mask her wicked ways. She also longed to leave the confines of the domesticated life—developing a hatred for the home—and took to the city streets searching for mobility and her freedom. Considering the strong connection between the defining characteristics of the *femme fatale* and the *flâneur*, it is possible to locate the *flâneuse* in the character of Irma Vep in Louis Feuillade's 1915 crime series, *Les Vampires* (Louis Feuillade 1915).

In *Les Vampires*, the female lead, Irma Vep (played by Musidora), embodies the anxieties that were being projected on French women leading up to the First World War. Irma Vep is a creature of the streets and a member of the titular gang of thieves. The audience is first introduced to her in the third episode: *'Le cryptomagramme rouge'* ('The Red Cypher') while she performs in the 'Hissing Cat'—a cafe described as 'ill-famed.' As Philippe (Édouard Mathé), the investigative reporter following the gang, approaches the club, he notices the poster advertising Irma Vep with an image of her face and name. While the letters of her name cosmetically rearrange to spell 'vampire'—alerting the audience and Philippe that she is a member of the gang—her heavily made up face also conveys that she is a threat for she reclaims the elusive gaze considered out of reach for women and what prevents the *flâneuse* from becoming the true equal to the *flâneur*.

Following Laura Mulvey's theories on scopophilia, the 'pleasure in looking has been split between active/male and passive/female, which mirrors the relationship between the *flâneur* and those around him. The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure… coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote *to-be-looked-at-ness*.' (Mulvey 1996, 19). Thus, women have been given the role of passive object and subjected to the active male gaze. To demonstrate the power of the *flâneur*'s gaze, Baudelaire writes, 'If a fashion or the cut of a garment has been slightly modified… [if] chignons have dropped a fraction towards the nape of the neck, if waists have been raised and skirts have become fuller, be very sure that his eagle

eye will already have spotted it from however great a distance' (Baudelaire 1964, 11). Not only is the *flâneur* looking, but also he is observing and committing to memory every detail.

Further, to the passive female as object, the woman on screen is the erotic spectacle, who signifies male desires that are placed upon her by the patriarchy. She becomes a commodity and fetish for the male gaze, and similarly the *flâneur*'s gaze fetishizes women. Baudelaire uses such words as 'Deity,' 'star' and 'idol' when describing women, their appearance and their performance. He praises the cosmetics and costumes used by women to attract the gaze of men, and the *flâneur*'s approval of such things. Ultimately, while bathing the female form in adoration, Baudelaire is objectifying and fetishizing women as a whole. For him, women are something to be looked at and to give erotic pleasure through their appearance. The inspiration that the female creates in the *flâneur* not only objectifies her, but also makes her a list of body parts and artifices to further render her as the female object to the male subject.

Prior to her actual appearance on screen, the poster outside the café similarly objectifies Irma Vep. Her painted lips and eyes not only exaggerate her features, but also simultaneously objectify her—turning her face into a set of body parts for the male gaze. However, her eyes are angled looking to the left and the poster and set are equally angled, creating the illusion that she is looking through the camera at the audience—endowing her with the subjective gaze for which the *flâneur* is known. Her eyes challenge the viewer and thrust the gaze back upon the audience. Furthermore, when she finally appears on screen, her make up continues to emphasize her ability to look, as well as to playfully acknowledge her objectification. These ideas are mirrored in the promotional posters for the film. In the initial posters, a woman's masked face appears protruding from a question mark above the questions "*Qui? Quoi? Quand? Ou…*" This image is then repeated three times in a row, with the eyes being the only facial feature revealed by the mask. The animated image of Irma Vep reinforces the importance of her gaze.

Once Philippe enters the café, he, and the viewer, are struck by Irma Vep on the stage staring directly into the camera as she delivers her performance straight to the camera. Much like the poster, her appearance on stage is to be objectified, and yet she subverts the male gendered gaze by aggressively

returning it with her own. As she performs, she stares directly into the camera and snarls, barring her teeth, much like a more traditional vampire would do. Furthermore, her dark eye makeup not only emphasizes her features, but also serves to sexualize and code her as sexual predator—like the mythic vampire. The dark eye makeup creates unnatural shadows, and gives her a distinctively villainous look—she is the 'uncontrollable' *femme criminelle*. Similarly, her dark lipstick highlights the eroticism of her lips, and also the snarl that crosses her face as she stares directly into the camera. As she bares her teeth and glares into the camera, she is clearly dangerous and not only because she is a member of the Vampire gang, but because she looks like a vampire.

During the silent film era, the term "vamp" become popular slang for dangerously sexual women, and, in fact, is short for "vampire," and became popular thanks to Musidora and her Hollywood counterpart, Theda Bara. These women were often type cast as sexual predators and were predecessors to the classic *femme fatale*, not only for the danger they posed, but also due to their overt sexuality (Callahan 2005, 23) which was emphasized with dark makeup. Having Irma Vep's name an anagram of 'vampire' not only signals her involvement with the gang, but her sexually predatory nature and the anxiety over female desire. Furthermore, the vampire is 'a characteristic of the "unnatural" and inexplicable criminality, which [is] also found in the crime series of Feuillade' (Callahan 2005, 24).

If Baudelaire 'conceived of the *flâneur* in very strict terms, not just as a man, but as a male poet or artist endowed with a special capacity for metropolitan and sexually charged vision' (Thomas 2006, n.p.), then Irma Vep's first appearance firmly places her into the female category of *flânerie*. Her performance on a stage clearly shows she is an artist; her gaze is sexually charged as it calls upon the sexual images of the vampire, and her appearance in the café marks her as metropolitan.

Although, Irma Vep's sexuality is not explicitly dangerous, it is the threat this sexuality poses to the 'family,' and places her in a similar realm as the prostitutes of the Parisian underworld. Susan Buck-Morss writes: 'prostitution was indeed the female version of the *flânerie*… I mean this: the *flâneur* was simply the name of a man who loitered; but all women who loitered risked being

seen as whores, as the term "street-walker," or "tramp" applied to women makes clear' (Bucks-Morss 1986, 119). While the *flâneur* is described as a man who walks the street or loiters in order to observe the city for his amusement, it does not contain the same menace as the term 'street-walker' which is almost solely used to describe female prostitutes, because the public sphere is unavailable to women as it is to men. As mentioned, the *flâneur* 'had a fluidity of social position, a mutable subjectivity' that women did not have, as he was able to traverse the streets and the home, whereas when women left the home, they were sexualized and criminalized.

However, the connection of women in public and prostitution is not only indicative of Paris or France, as is evident with the correlation of prostitution and Berlin (Hales 1996, 107). While the *flâneur* in turn of the century France embraced the city and 'reprivatized public space' (Friedberg 1993, 64) throughout Europe there was a continued fear of women and the city bringing the fall of the traditional family. Otto Weininger wrote that women sexualized themselves 'since women have no respect in and of themselves, they strive to become the object of appreciation for others through desire and admiration' and would use their sexuality to gain power as 'men are vulnerable victims, subject to women's control' (Hales 1996, 103).

Make no mistake, Irma Vep is not a prostitute—at least not seen in the diegetic narrative—however, overly sexual women were often considered criminals by patriarchal society. Erich Wulffen theorized in the 1920s, that women were 'normally' sexually passive and thus less likely to become criminals, but that a 'woman also has the potential to develop an excess of sexuality. Her innate vanity urges her into acts of lustfulness as she plays with sex, often turning to prostitution, shoplifting, and murder among other crimes,' thus 'female crime is rooted in sex' (Hales 1996, 104). At this time, women who were deemed too sexual were often assumed by society to be criminal. Furthermore, during La Belle Époque, (1890-1914), 'ladies' did not attend cafes, cabarets or dancehalls (Reynolds 2007, 83-84) as these spaces were reserved for women of the lower classes, while middle class women would visit patisseries or tea shops. This is only heightened as Irma Vep is later seen conversing with the Grand Vampire while a couple performs an Apache dance— a dance which shows a violent quarrel either between lovers or a pimp and

prostitute, and was named for a Parisian street gang.   However, Siân Reynolds notes 'a real prostitute would paradoxically have had somewhat greater freedom of movement' (Reynolds 2007, 83) than the average woman on the street during this time. Although not a prostitute, Irma Vep's appearance in The Hissing Cat, places her within the spectre of *flânerie* when she runs the risk of being considered a prostitute.

As investigative reporter Philippe enters the cafe, his gaze unites with the audience's to form one, which takes in the sight of Irma Vep singing on stage. This image is reminiscent of L. Frank Baum's 'The Vanishing Lady' or 'female mannequins posed in static seduction, [and] were women made safe under glass, like animals in the zoo,' because his 'conception of the show window seems to bear a clear analogy to the cinema screen' (Friedberg 1993, 66). As long as women were commodities for the male gaze they were safe, their containment allowed them to be seductive while calming the anxiety around female sexuality. Although she is sexualized and coded as dangerous prior to the audience actually seeing her, *at this moment*, Irma is safe because she is on display for the spectator. She is behind the invisible glass of the stage proscenium and her every movement is on display. In the initial establishing wide shot, she stands stationary in the middle of the screen, with the nightclub's audience distancing her and Philippe—further establishing the connection between Irma and the shop window mannequin. When Irma disappears under the stage, she changes from singer to vampire, like the 'Vanishing Lady' would briefly disappear from Baum's window before reappearing showcasing different merchandise.

Baum's 'Vanishing Lady' reappears throughout the film, as every time Irma Vep appears on the screen, she is in a different disguise. Her ability to disappear and reappear with a new identity emphasizes the danger she poses, as she could become anyone by the next scene. Furthermore, this idea is explicitly revisited in the sixth episode, '*Les yeux qui fascinet'* (The Hypnotic Gaze), when the Vampire gang performs in a film within the film before an audience that includes Philippe and Mazamette (Marcel Lévesque). However, what is even more interesting about this scene is that it is the first time Irma Vep appears dressed as a young man, not only disguising herself, but actually becoming a *flâneur*.

In the series, Irma Vep is the master of disguises. After her stint as a performer in The Hissing Cat, she enters Philippe's home, by posing as a maid. As established, there was an increased anxiety around the workingwoman as a 'threat to the French family.' Furthermore, the domestic servant was seen as even more dangerous and a criminal. Thus, when Irma Vep infiltrates Philippe's home as a maid, she becomes a threat on multiple levels. Firstly, she is a threat because she is a member of the gang, and thus a criminal herself. Secondly, she is a workingwoman and domestic maid, and thirdly, she is re-entering the private space of the home.

Although the *flâneur* is able to move between the public and private spheres, if considering the idea that the prostitute is the female equivalent, she is unable to do the same. At this time, women oscillated between the 'two divergent painterly representations of woman in the nineteenth century—the *fille publique* (woman of the streets) and the *femme honnête* (respectable married woman)' (Friedberg 1993, 36), but never the two could meet, for the 'street-walker' was a dangerous threat to the French family of the early twentieth century. As a member of a street gang, Irma Vep's home is on the street, that is her designated space and although she does not appear as a prostitute within this film, she is coded as a woman who would associate with prostitutes, and her home invasion carries a deeper threat than that of a mere jewel thief, because she moves between public and private spaces.

One of the results of the *flâneur* was that he 'reprivatized public space, [and] turned the street into an interior' (Friedberg 1993, 64). However, by posing as a maid, Irma Vep reverses this idea, and instead of bringing the private to the public, she brings the public to the private. When she enters his home, she brings an element of the street with her, as now nowhere is safe, and the security Philippe had of being in his own private space is no longer there. Like the *femme fatale*, who was transgressive because she left the feminine home for the masculine street, Irma Vep is transgressive because she leaves her designated space of the street for the home. Unfortunately, while the *flâneur*, was notable for his ability to move between private and public locations, women were not allotted a similar quality, making Irma Vep even more dangerous than initially believed.

Not only does Irma Vep play the part of the domestic servant, eliciting the fears directed towards the working woman, but she also embodies the anxiety that women are capable of replacing men—specifically, when she cross dresses as young men.   During the sixth episode, *'Les Yeux qui Fascinent'* ('The Hypnotic Gaze'), Irma Vep poses as the Viscount Kerlur, the son of Count Kerlur—the Grand Vampire in disguise. Performing in drag points to the obvious idea that 'the criminal can use disguise and alias to elude recognition' (Gunning 1995, 23), thus providing Irma Vep with a supposedly perfect disguise. However, this disguise makes the life of the *flâneur* available to her much like it did for the early predecessor to the *flâneuse*, the infamous George Sand. While nearly a century earlier, Sand, dressed in drag, 'made her way through Paris streets taking pleasure in the sights and in her freedom' (Mouton 2001, 7) and performing as a man gives Irma Vep a similar freedom. Although, Philippe and Mazemette instantly recognize the young man as Irma Vep in drag, it still grants her more mobility than she would have had as a woman. Furthermore, her masquerade plays on the anxieties of the pro-natalist movement.

When Irma Vep appears in drag, not only is she accessing the role of the *flâneur*, but she represents the French fears which anticipated the American fears of the 1940s and 1950s, which when put in the most minimalist terms, was the male fear of being replaced in their traditional masculine roles of the dominate sex on upon which women rely. In the plainest of terms, this anxiety steamed from the fear of women gaining too much independence and rendering men obsolete.

While Irma Vep is seen in women's clothing throughout the rest of the episode, her costumes continue to have a masculine influence. After being hypnotized by Moreno, she wears a man's jacket and tie over a full skirt. Although tailored masculine jackets, shirts and ties with skirts was a popular trend for early 20th century women, the costuming goes beyond Musidora-as-fashion-plate and signals her ability to outperform the men around her. Moreno believes that by having Irma Vep shoot-on-sight the Grand Vampire will be proof that his hypnosis has worked and he has control over her. However, what it actually proves is that he needs a woman to get the job done. Although not dressed in explicit drag, her jacket, tie and skirt signal that she, in fact, has more mobility, than the men she works for. She has the capability to move

between the sexes and pull 'power' from each in order to commit
crimes. Furthermore, she is the only woman seen wearing this fashion in the
series, and one cannot deny that she is the most powerful female character in *Les
Vampires*.

This power and mobility is ultimately what distinguishes Irma Vep from
the more traditional *femme fatales*. The 1940s *femme fatales* were women who
used their sexuality to seduce men to kill, steal and cheat for them. These women
threatened patriarchy through their visibility and although 'the image of woman
on the screen achieves a particular spectacular intensity' (Mulvey 1996, 13), she
is ultimately an object and must passively wait for men to place meaning onto
her. Looking at classic 1940s *film noir*, the women in these films never actually
commit the crimes on their own. For example, *Double Indemnity*'s (Wilder
1944) Phyllis (Barbara Stanwyck) talks Walter (Fred MacMuarry) into taking
part in an insurance scheme and killing her husband. The idea is hers, yet she
needs a man to implement it. Similarly, Cora (Lana Turner) in *The Postman
Always Rings Twice* (Garnett 1946) is unable to escape her dismal marriage, and
kill her husband, until Frank (John Garfield) falls for her. Furthermore, in *Gilda*
(Vidor 1946), Rita Hayworth is considered one of the quintessential *femme
fatales*, but in fact does nothing within the diegetic plot to actually earn that
title. However, while Gilda may not actively commit any crimes, or elicit help
from a man to do so, it is the potential threat of her sexuality that causes problems
for the men in her life. Ultimately, these men are portrayed 'as vulnerable
victims, subject to women's [sexual] control' (Hales 1996, 103), giving the only
power to the *femme fatale* as that of sexual power.

While Irma Vep certainly carries her sexuality as a weapon, she is not as
passive as the Hollywood *femme fatale*, for she is actually a woman of
action. Where the Hollywood *fatales* were powerless at committing the crimes
themselves, Irma Vep has no problem doing her own, or someone else's dirty
work. In fact, it is a testament to her capabilities as a true *femme fatale* that she is
the Grand Vampire's right hand 'man' and desired by Moreno—the Grand
Vampire's criminal rival. For example, in episode 4 '*Le spectre*,' (The Spectre)
she poses as the secretary for a bank manager, who, in turn, is the Grand Vampire
in disguise. When the attempt to steal from one of the clients is made, it is Irma
Vep, as the secretary, who will be entrusted with delivering the money. It is

made clear in the first two episodes ('*La Tête Coupée* and *La Bague qui Tue*) that there are many members in the gang, and that it is primarily male dominated, yet, Irma Vep is the one seen doing most of the crimes. This is partially to do with Musidora's star power, but also her capability of participating in the feminine masquerade and utilizing it to empower herself.

In the Hollywood version of the *femme fatale*, she performs the feminine masquerade by being excessively feminine. She is sex personified and influences the men around her, because of her objectification—which she plays into. By using her sexuality to seduce a man, she distracts him from her darker, more masculine intensions—thus she performs the feminine masquerade. Irma Vep also plays a form of masquerade albeit a much subtler one. Through her disguises, she utilizes her sexuality in order to achieve her goals during the course of the series. However, she does not play up her sexuality to the same extent as the Hollywood *femme fatales* do, but she does rely on the fact that innocent looking women naturally carry less suspicion. While her make up is still heavily styled to play up her eyes, after her initial appearance, it is toned down to create a more innocent, and less ghastly appearance.

Perhaps the biggest difference between Irma Vep and the 'traditional' *femme fatales* is that she does not rely on men to commit the crimes, but instead, the men rely upon her. Although, in a sense she is used by these powerful men, her own power is evident in '*Le yeux qui fascinent*,' ('The Hypnotic Gaze'). In this episode, Irma Vep is sent by the Grand Vampire to search Moreno's rooms. However, while there, she is kidnapped by Moreno, who hypnotizes her, and orders her to kill the Grand Vampire upon sight. While it may appear that she is powerless to these men, Irma Vep is actually in the reversal of the traditional roles executed by the *femme fatale*. Where the classic *fatale* is the one who must seduce a man to steal and kill for her, Irma Vep already can do this. Furthermore, it is Moreno who seduces her with his eyes, which mirrors when Phyllis seduces Walter in *Double Indemnity*.

Irma Vep's increased power when compared to the more classical representations of *femme fatales* is directly related to her as the *flâneuse*. As discussed, at the turn of the twentieth century France, women were either the *femme honnête* (respectable married woman) or the *fille publique* ('street-walker'). These two distinctions and the discrepancies between the perceived

respectability of the two types of women, emphasized 'the politics of this close connection between the debasement of women sexually and their presence in public space, the fact that it functioned to deny women power, is clear' (Bucks-Morss 1986, 119). However, the *flâneur* was capable of traveling between the public streets and the private home, which was not accorded to women at the same time, thus, 'the female *flâneur*, the *flâneuse*, was not possible until she was free to roam the city on her own' (Friedberg 1993, 34). Similarly, the woman walking the streets of *film noir* was the *femme fatale*, a *fille publique*, who used her sexuality to bring about the destruction of the men around her—the ultimate fear of patriarchy in post-war America. Her sexuality, although initially used to deny power, was reclaimed through the feminine masquerade and empowered her, as it masked her more masculine tendencies; distracting the men around her from her true purpose. Although Irma Vep is definitely sexualized, she does not use her sexuality against men like the *femme fatale*. In fact, it is the men, like Moreno, who use their own sexuality to seduce her, and reverse the traditional relationship between the *femme fatale* and men.

The *femme fatale* and the *flâneuse* desired, struggled for and relied upon mobility. Many theorists have struggled with locating a *flâneuse*, because women in the nineteenth and early twentieth century were not accorded the same potential for mobility as men. Even in contemporary times, women are still more at risk when wandering the streets, and thus limited in their mobility. Fortunately, modern women are no longer seen to be as dangerous as earlier women on the street were considered. However, nearly 100 years after Baudelaire first wrote 'The Painter of Modern Life' and first began theorizing about the *flâneur*, women still struggled with their own mobility.

This mobility was not merely physical, but also social, because this woman, the *femme fatale*, could not exist in both the public and private spheres of the street and the home—nor did she necessarily want to belong to both. The *femme fatale* represented both the longing to escape the home that many women in the post-war America felt, but also the fear and anxiety men experienced that the threat of potential female mobility posed towards patriarchy. In the binary coding of spheres, with the street being male and the home, female, women who crossed this line represented the potential for women to render men obsolete. Thus, she became dangerous because her sexuality masked her

potential to play into the castration fears experience by her contemporary male counterparts.

Although not a *femme fatale* in the traditional sense, it is Irma Vep's transgressions that connect her to the film character. The Hollywood *fatale* is dangerous for her desires to break free of traditional female roles and to leave the domestic space. The stereotypical *fatale* was a wife, who grew weary of her status with in the house and home, and would use her overt femininity to seduce a man in order to gain her freedom. However, Irma Vep becomes a danger when she re-enters the domestic space, roughly performing the same transgression as the femme fatale only in reverse. Irma Vep represents the struggles the modern pre-war French woman faced—being urged back into the home after being such a major part of the French work force—but she also hints at the future struggles of the American post-war woman. While not a 'classic' *femme fatale*, her influence can be felt in the future characters as she, too, threatens her contemporary society.

Irma Vep's mobility, created through her own various masquerades helps to locate the *flâneuse* within her character, due to her mobility and ability to 'look' and watch her surroundings. The emphasis of Musidora's eyes through the film and promotional material, emphasize the power of her gaze, and it is her gaze that rivals that of the *flâneur*, for it is a sexually charged, subjective form of looking.

However, whereas the *femme fatale* became a danger when she left the home and took to the street, Irma Vep's threat comes from the reversal. She is a woman of the streets, and when she poses as a maid to enter Philippe's home, she poses a similar danger as when the *femme fatale* left the home, walked down the street, and into the leading male's life.

Feminine Masquerade and Mobility

The gaze is a powerful feature of the Baudelaire's *flâneur*, for not only is he a traveller of the city, but he is a spectator of urban life. Similarly, a *flâneuse* would require the power of looking if she were to exist as the female counterpart to the *flâneur*. However, the feminine gaze is problematic, because it is hard to locate amongst the inherent objectification of women throughout history. Locating a female gaze within film proves even more difficult when looking through the classic Mulvey-ian analysis of film. For Laura Mulvey, women in film are passive objects, who bear meaning for the active, male subjects—who inevitably are the only ones able to create meaning (Mulvey 1989, 18). However, Mulvey's analysis is based on classic Hollywood cinema of the 1940s-1960s, which is dominated by male directors, who naturally create films with a male gaze. This does not account for European directors nor female directors.

Cléo de 5 à 7 is Agnès Varda's 1962 French new-wave film about a young female pop singer, Cléo (Corinne Marchand), wandering through the city of Paris while waiting for medical test results that may confirm cancer. It is divided into chapters which mark the passage of time during the two diegetic hours. These chapters are named after Cléo and the other characters interacting with her. In the first half of the film, the chapters primarily alternate between Cléo and Angèle, her housekeeper.

Cléo de 5 à 7 is celebrated as one of the appearances of a *flâneuse* within cinema, particularly in the second half of the film when she sheds her feminine masquerade and re-enters the street as an active subject to gaze upon the city, rather than the object fetish she plays in the first half of the film. As Janice Mouton writes: her 'transformation from feminine masquerade to *flâneuse* occurs

as a result of her involvement with a city, specifically Paris' (Mouton 2001, 3).
However, while Cléo undergoes a 'a profound transformation of [her] entire
being' (Flitterman-Lewis 1996, 275), she is not the only woman in this film who
travels the city or is empowered with the gaze. While most analysis focuses on
Cléo's ability to overcome her status as object, her transformation is mirrored in
her interaction with the other women around her. For as Cléo becomes a
flâneuse, she is surrounded by women who are already *flâneuses*.

In 1957, Paramount Pictures released the musical *Funny Face* (Stanley
Donen) about a bookish young woman, Jo (Audrey Hepburn), who is recruited to
be a fashion model by Dick Avery (Fred Astaire) and Maggie Prescott (Kay
Thompson). Hepburn's character, Jo, has no interest in the 'frivolous' fashion
industry as she prefers more intellectual pursuits, but is convinced to become the
Quality woman of the year because it means a free trip to Paris--home of her
favourite philosophers. While Cléo undergoes a transformation into the *flâneuse*
by letting go of her feminine masquerade, Jo becomes caught in her own
feminine masquerade and is unable to experience Paris the way she had originally
planned. Jo is the quintessential tourist upon her initial arrival in Paris, but is
slowly pulled deeper into the feminine masquerade until she is stripped of her
own agency.

This chapter will focus primarily on the pre-transformation Cléo-as-
object-of-the-gaze, the capability of other women in the film to 'look,' and Cléo's
own gaze prior to her 'epiphany' and how it hints at her future *flânerie*. It will
also compare the similarities between Cléo and Jo, while also looking at the
opposite directions their narratives take them.

From the beginning of the film, Cléo is presented as an object. As Sandy
Flitterman-Lewis writes, 'the first half of the film [*Cléo 5 a 7*] installs and
reinforces a conventional, fetishized image of female beauty in ways that
objectify Cléo as a spectacle for erotic contemplation' (Flitterman-Lewis 1996,
274). The opening credit scene is shot from above a table where deck of tarot
cards is being dealt while two disembodied female voices discuss the outcome,
and from this angle the two women exist only as hands and voices, or objects
rather than fully formed human beings. However, as the fortune-teller begins to
read Cléo's cards, her ability to 'see' Cléo's past, present, and future, places her
in the role of subject over Cléo-as-object. This is exemplified when she remarks,

'You haven't appeared yet. The cards speak better if you appear. Ah, here you are. That's better' and turns over the final card with the image of a woman on it. As the card turns over, Varda cuts to a close-up of the image on the card and Corinne Marchand's name appears next to it, further creating a connection between the card and Cléo. In this scene, and in the fortune-teller's 'gaze,' the character Cléo is a literal object—a card—and for the spectator, she is no more than a disembodied voice, a hand, and the card. It is important to note that as a pop singer, Cléo's voice makes her commodity, and her image is part of the packaged deal, making her an object to be consumed both aurally and visually.

As the fortune-teller's predictions turn negative, Varda cuts to the first shot of Cléo's face, in a series of mirrored shot-reverse-shots between the fortune-teller and Cléo. Where the fortune-teller is an older woman, wrinkled, grey and without make up, Cléo is in stark contrast, as she is younger and heavily made up with her hair piled high on her head in an elaborate style. Later in the film, the viewer realizes the hairstyle is a fall, or hair extension, when Cléo removes it to shed the feminine masquerade, and reinforces the idea that her image is not authentic.

As the audience quickly learns, Cléo's fears are not entirely about possible negative medical test results, but also a fear of losing her good looks either through illness or aging. In this series of shots, her image is juxtaposed with that of the fortune-teller's face as they seemingly look upon each other. But where the fortune-teller can see and observe Cléo, Cléo only sees her own dismal future, and as the cards begin to look bad for Cléo, she rushes from the room and down the stairs, only pausing briefly to look in a mirror before leaving behind her dreaded 'future.'

This first moment where Cléo studies herself in the mirror is of great importance, because the use of mirrors throughout the film signifies her own journey of self-reflection, which allows her to become a *flâneuse*. In the beginning of the film, mirrors serve as 'a reassurance of identity' (Flitterman-Lewis 1996, 275), an identity which is entirely based on image, beauty and what others see, rather than on her actual being. This is evident through the words she speaks to herself: 'Hold on, pretty butterfly. Ugliness is a kind of death. As long as I'm beautiful, I'm more alive than others.' While she gazes into the mirror, the camera moves in tight on her reflection in the mirror, emphasizing that it is the

physical image that is important, not the person that is being reflected—and what a striking image she is! From the fall on top of her head to the shoes she wears, Cléo is dressed not only according to the current trends, but her 'appearance [is] coded for strong visual and erotic impact' in order to provide visual pleasure for those looking at her (Mulvey 1989, 19).

As a pop singer, she is a commodity. Cléo's idea of identity at the beginning of the film is that she is not alive unless she is being looked at, and much like Tinkerbelle's need for applause to resuscitate her, Cléo needs the male gaze and attention to reaffirm herself—which is what she accomplishes when she visits the café with her housekeeper, Angèle (Dominique Devay).

As Cléo walks to the café, the audience finally sees Cléo's entire body, and the way she is dressed to attract attention, specifically male attention. This behaviour is part of Cléo's feminine masquerade, which she performs throughout the first half of the film. Elizabeth Ezra emphasizes this by describing Cléo's performance as 'a woman embracing the trappings of femininity, complete with blonde wig, make up, spike heels and a dress with swishing skirt and tightly-cinched waist that emphasizes her hourglass figure, making her look like nothing so much as a drag queen' (Ezra). While Mulvey argues that women on screen are made into a spectacle by the male subjective gaze, Cléo actively plays into it, as evident by her slight smile as she orders her coffee through tears. Upon entering the café, Cléo makes a spectacle of herself through her wardrobe and her sobbing, and she easily attracts the attention of multiple men who are quick to attempt to appease her, much like an adult would tend to a crying child. As Jill Forbes notes: 'the character Cléo is described by Angèle in the café in the rue de Rivoli, as 'a child' and in her apartment she is visually compared to the kitten she plays with' (Forbes 1996, 85). Cléo's participation in the feminine masquerade not only maintains her image as a fetishized doll, but as a child that needs to be coddled.

Part of Cléo's ability to become a *flâneuse* comes from her shedding of the feminine masquerade which allows her to blend in and no longer attract as much attention. Cléo, throughout the first half of the film, creates herself as fetish. Particularly when she enters the shop after her first café visit and uses consumerism and commodities to participate in a form of social/consumerist prostitution. Later, however, she gives up the feminine masquerade and when

she steps back onto the street in much understated clothing, she is no longer a fetish and has become a *flâneuse*.

Although she successfully becomes a *flâneuse* after the deconstruction of her identity half-way through the film, there is a hint of it when she enters the first café with Angèle. Before sitting down at the booth, Cléo removes her belt. Although a minor moment within the scene, it is extremely important as it is closely followed by a reaffirmation as an object and her willingness to participate in the subjective gaze, when she powders her nose and the neighbouring table's conversation comes to the foreground. While looking in her hand mirror and adjusting her image, the background conversations dominate the scene and random people walk between the camera and Cléo, drawing the audience's attention to what is occurring around her and pushing her to the side momentarily. This scene is designed to show Cléo's self-absorption, especially as it is paralleled in the second half of the film after her transformation when she enters another café and listens and watches those around her rather than drawing attention to herself.

However, it also helps to make the film spectator a *flâneur*/*flâneuse* as well. Film has always been connected to *flânerie*, where 'the freedom to wander is no longer about the literal movement of bodies in space, but rather about the mobility of the gaze confronted by the moving image' (Wolf 2006, 20). It can be argued that a film spectator is already a *flâneuse*, but this scene allows those watching it to be drawn away from the image of Cléo and observe the city and the urban population for herself—further making a connection between the *flâneuse* and the film spectator.

The removal of a belt may seem insignificant, it is the first time she is seen removing any piece of her feminine masquerade, and as Mulvey writes: 'the high heel on high-heeled shoes, a classic fetishist image, is both a phallic extension and a means of discomfort and constriction. Belts and necklaces, with buckles and pendants, are both phallic symbols and suggest bondage and punishment' (Mulvey 1989, 8). Therefore, by removing the belt to help her sit and breath unrestricted through her hysterics, it signifies her first attempt at removing her feminine masquerade, because she sheds her metaphorical bondage to 'woman as object.' It is after the removal of her belt that she can begin to

become the *flâneuse*.   However, this moment only lasts a few minutes at this stage of the film, because Cléo is unable to look beyond herself.

While Cléo is first presented to us as a woman participating in the feminine masquerade, Jo (Audrey Hepburn) is presented as a woman avoiding and disgusted with the display of female bodies in *Funny Face*. The staff of *Quality* magazine (the fictional magazine in the film) storm in for an impromptu photo shoot at the bookstore where she works. The women immediately begin rearranging the books to create a more photogenic display, ruining the organization. Jo's objections to the photo shoot cause her to be removed from the bookstore, and she is forced to wait outside. When the shoot concludes, the shop is a mess and Dick (Fred Astaire) is the only person who has any sort of remorse for the work that Jo will now have to do. He stays behind to help her clean up.

During this introduction, Jo wears a shapeless ensemble consisting of a black turtleneck and a tweed skirt with a tweed jumper over it. Her clothing is in stark contrast to the very form fitted clothing that the model is wearing and the very vibrant pink feminine clothing that the female staff of the magazine wear. The viewer learns that Jo has no interest in fashion and thinks it is frivolous. She prefers philosophy and other intellectual pursuits.

Back at the magazine, Dick sees her in the background of the photographs and decides he would like to use her for their 'Quality Woman of the Year' model spokesperson. They invite Jo to the magazine office under the pretence of asking her to deliver some books.   When she arrives, the women of the magazine surround her in an attempt to get her to participate in the feminine masquerade by giving her a makeover. Horrified, she runs out. Ultimately, it is Dick who convinces her to do it because he knows she would love to go to Paris to experience it and the only way for her to get there is if she travels with the magazine.

Is important to look at what Jo wears and compare it to how Cléo was dressed. Where Cléo wears a full skirt that helps emphasise her hourglass shape, Jo, who does not have the same hourglass shape, wears an outfit that resembles a sack and takes away any feminine shape she has. Another stark contrast to Jo is with the model in the bookshop who is wearing a very form fitted dress. The dress does not have the full skirt that Cléo has, but it still shows off the model's hourglass figure. This is important to note because later, when Cléo undergoes

her transformation and removes the feminine masquerade to gain mobility, Jo puts on hers and loses her mobility.

It is also important to note, as mentioned in Cléo, the use of the mirror as a way to provide self-reflection. However, in Jo's mirror experience, the reflection she sees is a funny face. Jo undergoes her own transformation, her own soul-searching, but her soul-searching involves romance, fulfilling obligations and becoming the 'Quality' woman--the epitome femininity and womanliness, and not an independent, mobile woman. The photographs are the visual theme in *Funny Face*, particularly with the way Dick lays out a story with all the pictures that he is taking culminating in Jo being in front of a chapel in a wedding dress.

Although Cléo has a moment early in the film where she 'plays' at being a *flâneuse*, this only lasts a moment, because she is unable to lose herself in her surroundings.   As Janice Mouton writes, Cléo 'initially is so self-involved and preoccupied with her fetishized image that she is blind to her city surroundings' (Mouton 2001, 3) for Cléo, in the first half of the film, is only interested in herself, and this is echoed through her interactions with the city, her location within the film frame, and the way the other women in the film interact with their surroundings.

Upon leaving the fortune-teller's building, the camera follows Cléo as she strolls down the street, keeping her in the centre of the frame. She finally meets with her housekeeper, Angèle, in the café, still remaining in the centre of the frame. Once again, when she asks if her illness (and death) are written on her face, the camera pulls in for a close up, continuing to position her in the centre of the screen.   Finally, she turns to the mirror behind her and sobs: 'If it is, I'll kill myself.' The use of mirrors and close ups in the film emphasize Cléo's view of herself—that it is her physical appearance that is of most importance. She performs as both child needing to be cared for and a doll needing to objectified, for as she sees it, being beautiful and objectified is what makes her 'more alive than others.'

` Due to her self-positioning as spectacle, Cléo is unable to participate in *flânerie*, as she is unable to look at the world beyond her. As she travels the streets before reaching her home, the prevalent use of mirrors and the camera work emphasize her narcissism and her blindness to the world around her. Every time she looks into the mirror, she is not only admiring her own physical

appearance, but multiplying her appearance for the cinema spectator. Even when the camera pulls away and attempts to show what is going on around her, she is still the centre of the frame. At one point in the café, when the camera moves away, allowing the people in the foreground move between the camera and her, she is still centred. Not only is she in the centre, but she is looking to a hand mirror and adjusting her appearance. While the world moves around her, she remains oblivious to it, and focuses on herself. This is contrary to the Baudelairean theory of the *flâneur*, who looks out on the world and observes it. At this point in the film, and until her 'epiphany' in her flat, Cléo is an impossible *flâneuse*.

However, this does not mean there are no other *flâneuses* in the film, as many women in the film are able to look and observe. In fact, most anyone who looks upon Cléo is empowered with the omnipotent 'gaze,' which is requisite for a woman to become a *flâneuse*. One such woman is the aforementioned fortune-teller, but due to her lack of mobility, she is never seen outsider of her flat, the two more plausible *flâneuses* are Angèle and the female taxi driver. These two women actually participate in an afternoon of *flânerie*; traveling and taking in the city during their short ride together.

When Angèle and Cléo first get into the taxi, the film is in one of the 'Cléo' chapters, and in this chapter, like most the other chapter's named for her, the camera is focused directly on her. She is the centre of the screen as we watch her stick her head out the window but fail to actually see anything. The taxi passes by buildings and a few people, but too quickly for her, or the audience, to actually take in the scenery. However, when the taxi briefly pauses in front of a shop window full of African masks, Cléo returns her gaze to what is in front of her—ignoring the shop window, its contents and the sites around her. She is no longer looking out the window, and in doing so, she loses her capability of being a *flâneuse*. Instead, she looks in front of her and ignores the world around her. While the taxi moves too fast for her to look at anything around her, she also refuses to look at it when she is actually capable of seeing what is around her.

Similarly, when the students rush the car, she becomes agitated and refuses to look at them—going so far as to throw her head back and ignore them—pushing herself out of the frame. In contrast, Angèle looks at the students and laughs, acknowledging that they are only having fun, and in a sense, silently

remarking on Cléo's inability to look around and enjoy the scenery. We see her laughing and enjoying the pranks the students are playing, even saying that she was the same back in the day.

It is at this moment that the next chapter, titled Angèle, begins. We see things through her perspective and hear her voice over. Furthermore, as this chapter is from her perspective, unlike in Cléo's chapter, the camera does not focus on Angèle, but instead on the surroundings. The camera sits behind the taxi driver, looking out past her and onto the street, letting the audience 'see' what Angèle (and the taxi driver) see, further emphasizing Cléo's inability to be a *flâneuse* because she refuses to look outside of herself. This scene presents Angèle as a *flâneuse*, because even though she is devoted to Cléo and her attention is primarily on her, she is still able to observe the city and its surroundings.

Eventually, the camera looks back towards Cléo, but instead of being the centre of the screen as earlier in the title scene, she is out of focus and barely in the frame. Once again, this technique combines the audience's gaze with the camera. It is as if Angèle is looking in Cléo's direction, but instead of focusing on her, she is fascinated by the city and its inhabitants. From here, Angèle, and in turn the audience, watches as a woman and two men cross the street as the taxi bends the curve. Unlike Cléo, who appeared stressed and anxious to be out of the taxi, Angèle is relaxed—she does not avoid looking at her surroundings. She might not be walking, but she is still a *flâneuse* as she 'wanders' through the city.

By the end of the taxi ride, a new 'Cléo' chapter begins, and the camera returns to focusing on her. During this chapter, the film spectator loses the point-of-view shots, and we do not see anything from Cléo's perspective. In previous chapters, Cléo's perspective was only shown through the use of mirrors, which only involved her own image, which emphasizes her inability to look beyond herself. However, that does not mean she was not capable of 'looking,' but that unlike the traditional *flâneuse*, her gaze was stunted.

Whereas Cléo has herself as a centre in the narrative of the film, the film shows her rethinking beyond herself and having a connection with another man, a more real connection than ever before. Jo also begins to think beyond herself. When the group first arrives in Paris, Maggie, Dick, and Jo all claim to be tired, but they all go sightseeing separately in Paris in a musical number:

'Bonjour, Paris,' and accidently meet each other at the Eiffel Tower. Jo is seen wandering by herself in a shapeless rain coat. Before her makeover, Jo is a *flâneuse*, she wanders and explores the city--she sits in a cafe and just experiences things.

The philosophy she so admires, Empathicalism, emphasizes projecting yourself in order to feel what other people are feeling. She explains it is a way of experiencing life and interactions with people without language or other pretences. When she is at the cafe talking to the philosophers, Dick becomes jealous and comes for her. He is very upset because she has missed a fitting appointment and she has obligations. She doesn't realise it, or she says she don't realise it because she was out exploring. She was participating in *flânerie* and being private. Although her motives were innocent, she is punished because she is in Paris for a job and she has upset the schedule and the crew. This is the turning point in the film. She now begins looking beyond herself and fully participating in the fashion world and in the photographs.

In the shift from more masculine to feminine clothing after her arrival and through her makeover, she loses her mobility. She travels all around the city being photographed, but she is not fully present. She is stressed. The backdrop of the photographs are merely pretty visuals. She will have the photographs to prove that she was in Paris, but she is not having an authentic tourist experience. This leads her to rebel and fight with Dick. She came to Paris to talk to the philosophers and Dick pulls her away from them.

During this rebellion, Jo goes back to her masculine or asexual style of dress: black trousers and a black turtleneck sweater. This is mirrored in the philosopher who is wearing the identical outfit of black trousers and black turtleneck. This shows that they are presumably on the same philosophical wavelength. It is also her uniform and her way of ditching the frivolity of fashion. When Dick finds her with the philosopher, he is angry and vows to return to New York without her. When the philosopher attempts to seduce her, Jo realizes he was not interested in her mind, but only her body. She smashes a vase over his head and rushes out to appear in the final fashion show and is transformed into the fashionable woman once more.

Although Cléo might not be a *flâneuse* in the first half of the film, there are hints of her ability to be one throughout the film. As previously mentioned,

when Cléo removes her belt, a symbol of her feminine masquerade, the audience is treated to life outside of Cléo. She might not be a *flâneuse*, but she helps the audience have their moment of *flânerie*. Shortly following that scene, Cléo drags Angèle into a hat shop, where she proceeds to parade around the shop trying on various hats. While flouncing around the hat shop for Angèle, Cléo is playing at one theoretical version of the *flâneuse*—the female consumer. Ann Friedberg writes that the *flâneuse* 'becomes an easy prototype for the consumer, whose perceptual style of "just looking" was the pedestrian equivalent of slow motion. But Baudelaire did not consider the power of the woman's gaze *to* the shop window—a gaze imbued with the power of choice and incorporation through purchase. It was as a consumer that the *flâneuse* was born' (Friedberg 1993, 34).

Considering Friedberg's analysis of the female consumer as *flâneuse*, we can see the beginnings of Cléo's transformation in the hat shop. It can be said that Cléo's time as a *flâneuse*, later in the film, develops partially due to her window shopping habits.

While in the shop, Cléo continues to perform for her housekeeper and the shop assistant by trying on various hats in her own personal fashion show. During this fashion show, Cléo is once again placing herself back on stage, and, as Janice Mouton describes, she becomes 'a fantasy, a fetishized object, someone to be looked at, reassuring rather than dangerous' (Mouton 2001, 3), Cléo's performance in the hat shop places her directly in the discussion of the possibility of a female *flâneur*. If using Friedberg's analysis, Cléo's consumer gaze positions her as a *flâneuse*, but when she actively places herself on a figurative stage as a commodity herself, she challenges that position. She challenges this idea, because she is consuming her own image. Friedberg's work focuses on the female shopper looking at things while strolling and not on the woman as both object and subject. As mentioned, mirrors are used to help create Cléo as an object, and in this scene in the hat shop she is both the object and the subject. She is placing meaning upon herself, but that meaning is that she is a commodity for others to look at. At the same time, she is playing into the feminine masquerade and objectifying herself for the other women in the shop; she is still the 'doll' on display, and, in a sense, waiting to be bought. While she is looking for a hat for herself, her gaze is not 'gaze imbued with the power of

choice,' because her choice is met with resistance when Angèle points out that the hat is inappropriate. This upsets Cléo and in a child-like strop, she purchases the hat in rebellion. This mini tantrum carries on during their taxi ride, as she refuses to enjoy her surroundings, instead stewing in her own fear and anger.

As previously discussed, during the Angèle chapter, we are treated to the images of the city, but upon the start of the next Cléo chapter when they return home, it is Cléo who once again dominates the screen. While Angèle was the focus of the previous chapter, it was her gaze that dominated it, rather than her own body. Conversely, when the narrative returns to Cléo, we do not see things from Cléo's perspective; we only see her-as-object and limited shots of others looking at her. Even Angèle, who is constantly by Cléo's side, is absent from most the shots, only seen when she is gazing upon the Cléo helping her to dress for her visitors. During this scene, Cléo's performance of the feminine masquerade is even larger as she changes into an over the top, albeit fashionable by contemporary standards, robe with feathers around the collar and sleeve. This imagery shows her as a bird in a gilded cage and how she plays on her femininity and fetishizes herself. She changes into the feathered dressing gown because she will be entertaining male guests and it demonstrates that she is a willing participant in her role as an object and commodity for the male gaze. Interestingly, while helping to do her hair, Angèle is limited to only her hands within the frame. This echoes the beginning credits when Cléo and the fortune-teller are reduced to disembodied voices and hands. In Cléo's current frame of mind, and thus the frame of the shot, women are reduced to body parts or commodities to be fetishized.

As her evening progresses, and her lyricist and composer visit, Cléo begins to tire of her feminine masquerade, which is evident through her tiring of singing for the men, playing on the image of her being trapped like a bird in a cage. Though she is fickle with her song choices, she eventually sings two very different songs, and although it is during the more sorrowful song about beauty wasted that she has her transformation, her performance of 'I Play' prior to it is also important. In 'I Play,' the female sings of all the things that her man can play (instruments, cards, etc.), and in turn she plays at being woman by batting her eyelashes and swaying her hips. It was written with her in mind, showing how the men simply see her as a woman who uses her womanliness to lure

men—in essence it is a song about the feminine masquerade. This is exemplified when she puts her cheek to Bob's cheek and he plays at being terribly distracted and falls over because her feminine lures have driven him crazy. However, the lyricist continues the song, but now with verses about how shrewd she is and how she cheats. It appears he is making these lyrics up as he goes, but it still shows the falseness of the feminine masquerade, and that he can 'see' through it. Although this does not seem to impact Cléo at the time, she then sings the more haunting song in which she finally drops her own masquerade. Placing a song directly before it that emphasizes this masquerade is not coincidence, and it is the combination of the two songs that aid in her transformation into the *flâneuse*.

Although Cléo is originally 'blind to her city surroundings, [she] gradually learns to open her eyes and look and allows what she sees to transform her' (Mouton 2001, 3), and it is during her performance of [*Sans Toi*-Without You], where she literally opens her eyes, returns the spectator's gaze, and begins her transformation into a *flâneuse*. As Cléo stares directly at the camera, she begins to claim her own gaze, and becomes the subject actively returning the audience's gaze. Unlike earlier scenes, where she looked directly at the camera, this time she is not 'looking' at the fortune-teller, but at us as we watch her. As the song finishes and 'the camera returns to the room, it focuses on a different Cléo. She signals this difference visually by tearing off her wig and feathered robe and donning a simple black dress' (Mouton 2001, 7) and, by removing her feminine trappings, she also quits her feminine masquerade. It is with this newly found power that she escapes from her flat and hits the pavement, this time as *flâneuse* 'taking on a new role of participant-observer in the city' (Mouton 2001, 7). Although she drops her feminine masquerade, Forbes points out that we do not learn Cléo's real name until the end of the film where she reveals it to the soldier, Antoine, 'thus throughout the time we had thought she was Cléo's, including after she removed her wig, she is in fact acting a part' (Forbes 1996, 85).

Cléo returns to the street a new woman, no longer a woman to be looked at, but instead a person who looks. She returns to a café, but is not greeted with the same fanfare as previously granted her by her housekeeper and men waiting for her. She moves on to watch a street performer, as she could not do before

when she was constantly performing herself. However, it is upon her visit to Dorothee where Cléo is confronted with the new power of the gaze, when she watches Dorothee work as a nude model for artists. Dorothee is a literal object for the artists' gaze, and even Cléo joins with the men to objectify her friend. This scene mirrors Cléo's earlier performance in the hat shop when she is trying on hats and in her flat performing for the men, but while she creates herself a fetish, objectifying herself for those around her, Dorothee's nudity is not fetishized. Flitterman-Lewis writes: 'In the film she [Dorothee] introduces the idea of nudity (as opposed to sexual exploitation)' (Flitterman- Lewis 1996, 276), but she also represents Cléo's shedding of the feminine masquerade. As Dorothee stands naked in the centre of the room, she is completely stripped of the masquerade, as she cannot hide behind exaggerated forms of femininity as Cléo did earlier in the film. There is no dress, wig or belt, simply only her own body. This is in contrast to Cléo in the earlier half of the film, and symbolizes the transformation of her psyche, as when she stripped herself of her masquerade, she was able to finally see others. Dorothee represents Cléo coming to terms with her own image, and that she does not need the clothes, hair, and makeup to hide behind. As Flitterman-Lewis points out, when Cléo handles the broken mirror with Dorothee, 'this is the last image of a mirror to appear in the entire film; significantly, it announces that this image has ceased to function for Cléo as a reassurance of identity as it confirms the priority of her own vision of the world' (Flitterman-Lewis 1996, 273).   It is her visit with Dorothee, and seeing her stripped of all feminine trappings that helps cement Cléo as a *flâneuse*.

Whereas Cléo is able to separate herself from the object and instead have a moment where she is able to objectify Dorothee, Jo in *Funny Face* has a reverse experience. Jo begins the film by watching the magazine staff during a photo shoot and is forced into the photo as a counter to the highly stylized and feminized model that occupies the centre of attention. The photo that sparks *Quality* magazine's interest in Jo is very different from the photos that are taken of her later. The original photo is a shoot of a face of an intelligent young woman.   Her later fashion photographs are about the dresses and her intelligence is lost. At the beginning of the film, she wears all black clothing and able to roam around the city without anonymously.   Her clothing is an expression of who she is. She is her most mobile when she is wearing black trousers and a

turtleneck while dancing in a night club with Dick (Fred Astaire). Later, Jo loses her mobility when Dick uses guilt to force her into conforming into what the magazine wants her to be. Her freedom is stripped away when she is put into a form fitting dress that emphasises her tiny waist. She still does not have the curves that Cléo has, but it is a more feminine shape than her 'street uniform' from earlier. This more feminine tight gown restricts her movement. She is no longer free to dance: she is limited to walking down a runway.

In *Funny Face*, Jo puts on the feminine masquerade and fit into society's expectations, in contrast to what Cléo does. In order to visit the Paris and blend in to be a part of it, Cléo must take off her feminine masquerade. In order for Jo to visit Paris, she must put on the feminine masquerade and become the 'Quality Woman' in a fashion production. She is taken to all the major tourist locations in the city to be photographed in the latest fashion. She is basically in the same location that Cléo is inhabiting for the most part including this counterculture.

Cléo is very conscious of image when she wants to be looked at, but when she wants to blend in and wants to have a more natural connection with a man, she takes off the pretences and drops the masquerade.   She also finds the strength to face the possible cancer diagnosis. Dick wants Jo to put on the feminine masquerade and conform to the image he has created for her. When Jo she takes off all her pretences and drops the feminine masquerade when she's with the philosopher, she does not get the relationship she wanted. The philosopher tries to seduce her because she is pretty and idolizes him.

Cléo is visited by her lover and then her pianist and songwriter who visit her and they add to this idea that she is just a bird in a cage. They do not take her possible illness seriously. She also has her housekeeper who helps her in a manner that is the reverse of the situation in Funny Face. The housekeeper helps Cléo takes off the feminine masquerade while photographer helps Jo put it on. Jo wants to see the sights of Paris, and she does, but she's too busy posing to actually experience it. Dick is a photographer and sees Jo as an image, the funny face.

These two films show how differently these two women see the city and participate in the feminine masquerade. Cléo is not a tourist and yet she does not fully experience Paris until she goes back out without an entourage and without all the special accoutrements, but she is still wears a dress. Still, she is

experiencing it as a native Parisian, and for the first time as a *flâneuse*. In comparison, Jo is an American tourist and wears trousers, a turtleneck, and a trench coat to visit Paris. She wants to have an authentic experience and wears the uniform she hopes will help her fit in with the philosopher she admires. This 'uniform' is much simpler and 'frees' her from the feminine masquerade that *Quality* is forcing her to participate in, while also providing her more personal mobility as evident by the dance she does in the café.

Cléo begins the film as a woman playing into the feminine masquerade; a commodity for the consumption of the male gaze. She is compared to a child that needs coddling or a beautiful doll that needs to be handled delicately, and this is exemplified through her appearance. Her full skirt, high heels, and tight belt cinching in her waist are all pieces of fashion, which according to Mulvey, are 'phallic extension[s] and a means of discomfort and constriction' (Mulvey 1989, 98). Her clothing not only constricts her movement, but also constricts her as the *flâneuse* because she is objectifying herself. She only sees herself as an object for the male gaze, and as many theorists have suggested, it is when she strips herself of her hyper-feminine clothing that she is able to participate in an afternoon of *flânerie*.

However, this isn't to say that Cléo in the second half of the film is the only *flâneuse* to appear in it. Although Angèle is tied to Cléo and follows her for the film, she is a *flâneuse*, as she is able to observe the city as she wanders it. When in the taxi, they might not be actually walking, as the name *flâneuse* would suggest is necessary, but they are still 'strolling' the city. The leisurely taxi ride is for both for Angèle and the audience's benefit, and the idle way they move through the city is exemplified when Angèle must remind the taxi driver where they are going. While Cléo may be in a rush to get home, Angèle and the female taxi driver are not, and Angèle even remarks that it is a shame Cléo cannot appreciate the people or the city as she does.

While performing her song of sorrow, Cléo begins to realize that beauty is not the end all be all of existence, and in a fit she strips off her wig, simplifies her clothing and storms out of the flat. Although that is the moment when she sheds her feminine masquerade, it is not until she meets up with Dorothee that this idea is cemented. When Dorothee stands before the room naked, even more stripped of any masquerade, she symbolizes Cléo's transformation completely. Cléo may

be a *flâneuse* but she is not completely stripped of her feminine masquerade as Dorothee is, and it is after this moment that she is able to completely drop her guard and reveal her actual name to Antoine, a young soldier heading for Afghanistan.

Ultimately, where Cléo is able to strip her feminine masquerade and claim her own gaze, Jo goes in reverse. In Funny Face, Maggie helps to subjugate Jo to become a figure for the male gaze. Initially she isn't interested in Jo and complains about how she thinks and talks too much. However, Dick convinces her that with a makeover she would be the perfect *Quality* woman, especially as the shoot they were working on prior to going to the bookstore was 'clothes for the woman who doesn't care about clothes.' The joke is that the model they are using isn't an 'intellectual' so they go to the book shop where Jo works for a more 'intellectual-looking' location.

When Jo first arrives in Paris with Maggie and Dick, they all sing 'I'm strictly tourist, but I couldn't care less' in the musical number, 'Bon Jour, Paris' as they wander the Parisian streets and sing about all the sites they see and wish to see, until they all accidentally meet up at the Eiffel Tower. The next day Jo does not attend her fittings and meetings for the magazine, and Dick hunts her down in a cafe. Here, Jo does a 'modern' dance as a way to express how she feels (leaving language which many feminist theorists would argue is the realm of men) for a physical language. If her body is to be on display she might as well use it. However, after her dance, Dick tells Jo how she wasted the magazine staff's day when she failed to show up and if she is so concerned with Emphaticalism, then she should feel empathy for them. She promises to fulfil her duties and the next time we see Jo, she has been transformed into the quality woman--in a white and pink dress that would make it impossible for her to repeat the dance she performed the night before.

The next few scenes involve a modelling montage, where Dick takes her around the city to photograph her at famous sites, and each vignette ends with the final photograph for the magazine. What should be noted is that she is at these locations, but they are merely backdrops for her image. For the most part she's incredibly stationary, and there is only one moment where she dictates the image and movement descending a long staircase in a form fitting long red gown. Dick orders her to stop and she replies that she doesn't want to stop. Still, she has lost

her mobility. Although she enjoyed all the locations she saw in the "Bonjour, Paris" song, she does not notice them now.

These two films show that it is difficult for a woman to be a *flâneuse* while also participating in the feminine masquerade. While part of the *flâne*ur is to see and be seen, it's also much about blending in with the landscape. This is why when Cléo walks out into the street in the simpler black dress, she is finally able to look at her surroundings, with less attention being paid to her. She is able to be the *flâneuse*, because she drops the feminine masquerade. In *Funny Face*, Jo is only able to explore the city when she is in her black turtle neck and trousers costume. When she visits the famous French locations again as a fashion model, she is unable to fully appreciate them. It's also interesting to note that from then on, when she is in her high fashion dresses, she has no more solo dances.

During the song 'On How to Be Lovely,' Maggie explains that the secret to being the perfect woman is to be low maintenance and simply be lovely. Prior to the number, the two women are wearing black trousers and white button down shirts, specifically it appears that Jo is wearing a man's shirt. Before the song, Maggie advises 'first we should look like ladies' and passes a fringed table cloth to Jo to wrap around her waist and a matching cloth to cover their heads like a scarf. This acts like a 'cover' for their more masculine clothing and underlines the idea that the 'quality woman' is a performance. While most of the lyrics express the idea that you don't need make up, 'you just have to wake up' happy and cheerful in order to be lovely, there is one line that specifically mentions that doing this can 'weave a spell,' underlining that the feminine masquerade is all performative.

Two Lucys in Italy

The previous chapters have focused on *flânerie* and tourism in France. However, these subjects are not limited to Paris and France solely. In this chapter, I move to Italy and specifically Tuscany to consider how gender, tourism and *flânerie* play into two films about young female tourists as well as the power of looking and being looked at.

Early in James Ivory's *A Room with a View* (1985), Miss Lavish (Judi Dench) states plainly to (Charlotte Maggie Smith) that she is watching young Lucy Honeychurch (Helena Bonham Carter) with anticipation to see how Italy will transform her. When she states her interest in 'A young girl, transfigured by Italy!' she is expressing the Anglo-American's romanticism of the 'idea' of Italy as not only the 'cradle of the renaissance' (Pidduck 2004, 84), but as a 'zone of illicit sexuality' (Pidduck 2004, 89). In the female travel film, Italy often represents a location for a personal, romantic and sexual renaissance, that ultimately ends with the woman entering into a heterosexual relationship with 'Mr Right.' This is evident through such films as *Under the Tuscan Sun* (Wells 2003) and *Eat Pray Love* (Murphy 2010), where trips to Italy for two divorcees signal their rebirth, because 'travel is associated both with risk and with self-transformation through experiences distinct from the modern and the familiar' (Pidduck 2004, 89). Many travel films feature a metaphorical 'journey' along with the physical one, but the personal journey in Italian based travel films is often based around a woman's sexual journey, because of the 'idea' of Italy that non-Italians have of the country.

This idea, which Julianne Pidduck identifies as a common 'set of discourses,' was 'part of the successful formula established in Merchant Ivory's 1985 *A Room with a View* [which] was to situate the sensual awakening of

Forster's leisured English protagonists within the settings of Florence and Tuscany' (Pidduck 2004, n.p.). *Room* is the standard Edwardian travel story of a young English woman who experiences a sexual awakening while in Florence, and must come to terms with this change she experienced while being confronted with the expectations of polite English society.

A Room with a View is set in a world that is ever concerned with blossoming female sexuality and with what is believed to be the proper forms of sexual expression for the time period. It offers a romanticized view of Tuscany as a place that provides freedom and a vivid backdrop for one's sexual expression, in contrast to the constrained lifestyles of the female protagonist's home country.   Lucy is not only vacationing from her everyday life; she is on vacation from the usual societal norms. Thus, Tuscany is not simply a location, but a catalyst for change, and the preoccupation with scenic shots in the films emphasizes the importance of the location to the narrative.

A Room with a View provides a progressive take on the female coming-of-age story, allowing Lucy to assert herself against Edwardian culture. As a young female tourist in a foreign land, she is transformed by her surroundings—and her transformation is created and exposed through the Italian location and the power of the gaze.

A Room with a View shows a preoccupation with its surroundings, as Andrew Higson notes:

> 'the camera is characteristically fluid, but camera movement often seems dictated less by a desire to follow the movement of characters than by a desire to offer the spectator a more aesthetic angle on the period setting and the objects which fill it. Self-conscious crane shots and high-angle shots divorced from characters' point of view, for instance, are often used to display ostentatiously the seductive *mis-en-scene* of the films' (Higson 2003, 39).

Excessive emphasis on the scenery is a common attribute of the heritage film, with these moments 'existing only as adornments' to be admired by the film's audience rather than to exist for narrative purposes (Higson 2003, 39). Moments, such as when Lucy is playing the piano and the camera tracks slowly over the room, drawing attention to the paintings and props within the frame, *Room* creates a spectacle of this excess, which Higson compares to Tom Gunning's

'cinema of attractions,' where 'the gaze, therefore, is organized around props and settings—that look of the observer at the tableau image—as much as it is around character point of view' (Higson 2003, 39). Thus, *Room* creates a cinema of heritage attractions and creates its own form of museum-culture, where the film creates a form of authenticity much like that of a museum. These tourist images are for the film audience as much as it for the diegetic tourists, and 'the shots of Florence are always offered direct to the spectator, unmediated by shots of characters within the diegesis looking at the view. Such shots, in fact, follow the views, rather than preceding and thus motivating them' (Higson 2003, 38). The film serves as a form of scenic tourism for the audience; allowing them to see as if they were physically there themselves.

Narratively speaking, *A Room with a View* opens with Charlotte Bartlett (Maggie Smith) and Lucy Honeychurch (Helena Bonham Carter) looking out the window of their hotel room at the Pension Bertolini and complaining about a lack of a view, which they were promised when planning their stay, but the first image the audience sees is that of the buildings blocking their view of Florence— reaffirming Higson's statement that the shots of the exotic location are presented for the film spectator's pleasure. A spectator who, as many critics assert, is more likely than not female, which creates a unique viewing experience for heritage films as when 'viewed against a cinematic apparatus that traditionally structures the gaze as male, the foregrounded diegetic gaze here is often female' (Pidduck 2004, n.p.). Not only are most of the film's audience female, but the film is explicitly about women looking.

In the second scene in *Room*, Charlotte and Lucy enter the dining room and are seated at the dinner table with a diverse array of characters. Upon their immediate arrival in the room, an unnamed elderly woman looks up and stares at Charlotte and Lucy as they enter. With the camera behind Lucy and Charlotte, we see the two women acknowledge the older woman looking at them and return her gaze as they walk past her and towards their table. As they are seated, the film provides a quick succession of shots alternating between Lucy and her fellow female dining companions. First, the camera focuses on Lucy as she looks up only to find Miss Lavish (Judi Dench) looking at her through an eyeglass which both disguises and doubles her gaze (Monk 1997, n.p.)—both shots featuring the women looking towards the direction of the camera; though not at

it, but maintaining a presence of an objective camera. The film cuts back to Lucy, as she looks over at the two Miss Alans (Fabia Drake and Joan Henley), who look sidelong, and slightly suspiciously at Lucy. At the same time, Charlotte is staring at the eccentric Miss Lavish.

This sharing of looks between the women establishes that 'female voyeurism—female looking of the most covert and yet overt kind—is a recurring theme in *A Room*, and is rapidly established… primarily via the persona of 'the lady novelist, Miss Eleanor Lavish'—a character whose very profession sanctions voyeurism' (Monk 1997, n.p.).   Furthermore, the film creates agency and 'advocates the right to look/right to pleasure of those groups of women patriarchy most despise, namely spinsters (Miss Lavish, Charlotte Bartlett) and the elderly spinsters (the Miss Allans)' (Monk 1997, n.p.). The two elderly spinster sisters represent Edwardian England; sexually repressed to the point of being asexual—as spinsters are not considered to be romantic or sexual beings, and definitely a group of women that have lost their right to pleasure. They abided by the repressive English culture, and only because they are considered asexual, can now travel because they are not at risk of ruining their reputations.

On the other hand, Miss Lavish represents the English tourist's fantasies of Italy.   As she later says to Charlotte, she expects that Italy will be a transformative experience for Lucy. Thus, these three women are mapping their expectations on to Lucy with their looks. However, Miss Lavish, though a writer looking for an authentic Italian experience to write about, does not expect to experience it herself. She is looking to capture Lucy's experience, in order to vicarious live through her, much like the film's audience is looking to also observe Lucy's experience; allowing Miss Lavish to become the audience's representative on screen. While the women are mapping their own expectations onto Lucy and Lucy's experience, they are also wary of each other.

This looking between the women at the table is in stark contrast to the behaviour of the men at the table, for when we first see Mr Emerson (Denholm Elliot) and George Emerson (Julian Sands), Mr Emerson is briefly looking at Miss Lavish as she speaks, then looking away and shaking his head, whereas George is looking down at his plate, playing with his food. The next immediate shot is of Lucy looking over at George, who is caught looking at her, and then back down at his plate where he has formed a question mark with his food, which

he lifts towards the camera and Lucy. Then, when Mr Emerson turns to speak to a woman at the neighbouring table, Lucy and Charlotte are seen, out of focus, looking at him as he tells the woman not to drink lemonade. These series of shots are important because of what Mr Emerson says moments later when offering to trade rooms with Lucy and Charlotte. He explains that he is happy to trade rooms with the women because 'women like looking at a view, men don't.'   This statement is 'in contravention of the usual rules of mainstream cinema, looking is presented as a specifically female pleasure' (Monk 1997, n.p.); however, it also is in line with Gil's (Owen Wilson) idea of tourism and *flânerie* in *Midnight in Paris* (Woody Allen 2011). Both Mr Emerson and Gil see men as wanting to experience and not merely look at their surroundings, and take issue with the way in which they perceive female tourism. I will discuss this further in the next chapter.

While the Emersons attract suspicion due to their behaviour, the women behave 'properly' and yet, the fact these women travel on their own causes them to be suspicious. The idea of women travelling alone, while not completely unheard of, is still problematic at this time. As previously mentioned, women traveling alone were considered at risk and, in fact, a risk themselves. This is why Charlotte is always preoccupied with what is proper and improper behaviour, beyond simply her job as Lucy's chaperone.

Traditional theories on women and the gaze is that women are not allotted the same power of looking as men, because women are objects of the gaze and men project the gaze onto women. As Laura Mulvey discusses, women are inscribed with meaning, which is assigned to them through men. Scopophilia was created for men, and yet, here is Mr Emerson saying that women like looking. This is reaffirmed through the repeated images of women looking at one another and at their surroundings. In these opening scenes, it is the women who take pleasure from looking, and also are displeased when the view they were promised is not delivered. While they look, the men, in stark contrast, do not look, and are not as interested in looking as the women. However, Mr Emerson asserts that men experience things rather than looking—and these experiences are allowed due to the mobility men are given over women. It is his privilege as a male to be able to move around the city and the world with little problem. Furthermore, in this scene, while the women are looking at each other;

passively questioning and passing judgement and suspicions on each other, it is the Emersons who are interacting with everyone, be it a man or woman, at their table or another one. While Miss Lavish speaks about her expectations of the trip and her writing and Charlotte complains about the lack of a view, it is only Mr Emerson who is taking action at dinner and offering her their room.

To further emphasize the difference between how *A Room with a View* articulates a distinction between the way men and women travel, while out on a walk, Miss Lavish takes away Charlotte's map and says 'two women adrift in a city, now that is what I call an adventure.' In this moment she is demonstrating the rarity that is two women alone walking in a city. Furthermore, she is creating a situation where Charlotte and herself will 'experience' the city, like Mr Emerson says men do, rather than look at the pre-prescribed sights, which was clearly Charlotte's plan. At the same time, Lucy raises a few eyebrows when she decides to wander the city completely on her own; something, which The Reverend Mr Eager (Patrick Godfrey) reminds her, is improper and possibly dangerous. In both instances, the women are participating in *flânerie* in the 'traditional' sense, with no map, guidebook, or itinerary. Although the women seem to establish themselves as *flâneuses* with the power to the gaze in these opening scenes, Mr Emerson implies the male gaze is different and superior. After offering his room with a view to Lucy and Charlotte, saying, 'women like looking at a view, men don't,' he continues, 'I don't care what I see outside, my vision is within.' Mr Emerson establishes himself as an active participant in his tourism. He does not care if he sees all the locations he 'should' see but that he walks away with a lived experience.

He implies that, as a man, he experiences life differently; that he does not simply look, but lives. Therefore, while these women may have a subjective gaze, they are not active participants in their surroundings, but merely passively looking instead, according to Mr Emerson and the men in the film. As Pidduck writes, 'the view from the window, this gendered gaze not only connotes mastery, but also stasis and powerlessness' (Pidduck 2004, n.p.) and these women may be able to look, but they are still not expected to participate. However, this idea is challenged and mirrored in Lucy's character arc as her time in Italy changes her outlook on life and challenges the social mores of Edwardian England. As we

come to see, Lucy's sexuality threatens the established social structures of her time.

Being roughly 19, Lucy is growing into herself as a woman and attempting to claim, or accept, her place within society. Unlike Charlotte, who is a product of the earlier Victorian era who was taught to obey strict social norms, it is established that Lucy has urges, or at least the ability, to challenge what is expected of an English woman of her age. While playing the piano, The Reverend Mr Beebe (Simon Callow) comments on the passion with which Lucy plays the piano, and although not explicitly mentioned, this 'passion' is implicitly tied to her sexuality. When Lucy says her mother does not like her to play Beethoven because she is 'always peevish afterwards,' Beebe responds that 'naturally one would be… stirred up;' referencing the passionate way she plays the piano and how this is at odds with Edwardian society. Lucy represents the next generation of people, those coming out of the Edwardian period and into 1920s and the twentieth century.

On Lucy's playing, Mr Beebe says: 'if Miss Honeychurch ever takes to live as she plays, it will be very exciting, both for us and for her,' and this statement emphasizes the invested interest those around her have for her 'blossoming' sexuality. This comment is akin to Miss Lavish's interest in Lucy, not only as a character for her novel, but because of the expectations she has on a young woman in Italy. While discussing why she has chosen Lucy as the model for her heroine, she mentions the trope of 'the young English girl transfigured by Italy,' because Italy's cultural masquerade is that of a country of romance and transformative powers, and much like a religious baptism, Italy can transform a young woman like Lucy.

While 'drifting' around the city with Charlotte, Miss Lavish explains that 'one must always be open—wide open,' clearly a phrase which makes Charlotte uneasy with its sexual undertones. When Charlotte asks what one is to be open to, Miss Lavish sharply stops and turns her head to a flustered Charlotte and says 'to physical sensation,' which elicits a gasp from Charlotte, who in contrast to the more assured Miss Lavish, is obviously uncomfortable with such ideas, let alone to being open to any physical sensations herself. As the 'spinster chaperone,' it is clear that Charlotte is not 'open' too much, and it is this fear of physical sensation that allows her to shame Lucy into silence and to ignore her feelings for

George. Unlike Lucy, Italy will not change Charlotte, as she is too consumed with proper Edwardian etiquette.

While Italy presents an escape for Lucy, when others place their tourist fantasies onto her, she provides an escape for them, which is out of their reach rather due to age or their place within society. Although Miss Lavish represents a more modern and unconventional woman who writes, speaks her mind, and travels alone, she still conforms to Edwardian conventions. Instead of writing on her own experiences, she needs Lucy to experience things for her; thus placing her expectations onto Lucy.

When Lucy plays the piano, Mr Beebe obviously feels the passion with which Lucy plays, and he too is 'stirred up.' Similarly, the scene where the Emersons decorate the Miss Alans' room is during Lucy's solo. Although the previous evening the Miss Alans were in agreement with Charlotte that trading rooms with two men would be most improper, the next day they are happy to find these men alone in their room. However, as they climb the stairs, listening to Lucy's playing, they are touched by the passion in the music, as they pause and slow down on the stairwell, their steps mimic the music as it washes over them; providing their own transformation. After Lucy finishes playing, she tells Mr Beebe she is going to wander the city on her own. He reminds her that would be most improper for a woman of her social standing to go out alone, but, as she says, if she was going to sit around the pension, she should have stayed in England.

The audience can see that Lucy is already pushing the boundaries of traditional society. Her transformation has already begun, not only due to Italy, but to her own nature, although Italy does allow her the freedom to express this side of her. At the same time, her Italian transformation allows the others smaller transformations. When Miss Catharine Alan (Fabia Drake) comes downstairs, Mr Beebe comments on the flowers in her hair and around her neck, something a young girl would do while playing outside; she seems unconcerned with her unconventional image. Certainly, a woman of her age would never do such a thing back in England, but it is allowed here in Italy, not because they are in Italy, but because Lucy is in Italy.

However, this potential for transfiguration is at odds with acceptable Edwardian English society and is what creates the tension within Lucy and much

of the narrative. After sharing a passionate kiss with George in the Italian countryside, Lucy is shamed by Charlotte (representing England) into ignoring and forgetting her feelings for George in order to save her (and Charlotte's) reputation. It is then that the narrative moves back to England, but the power and freedom of Italy is represented by the presence of George in Lucy's home life and Miss Lavish's book—continuing the conflict of freedom and sexual expression of Italy and the sexual repression of England.

In *A Room with a View,* Lucy is a sight to be seen by the other characters. Lucy Honeychurch is transformed by her surroundings and in doing so, Edwardian England loses its hold on her. This transformation is related to the way in which the film deals with the idea of the idea of women looking. In the first few scenes she is presented as a young woman who looks, and it is through her looking and observing that she grows.

Miss Lavish sees the potential for Lucy's transformation as a product of her location and is interested to see the transformation Tuscany will have on Lucy, and what she will do with it—placing the power in Lucy's control.

In *Stealing Beauty* (Bernardo Bertolucci 1996), Lucy Harmon (Liv Tyler) experiences her own sexual awakening while she is in Tuscany; but, rather than being pressured by conservative Edwardian society, she is pressured to conform to the mid-1990s sexually open expectations of a group of Anglo-American expatriates in Sienna. Like *A Room with a View,* this film also offers a romanticized view of Tuscany as a place for freedom and transformation in contrast with the constrained lifestyle at home.

Also, like *A Room with a View, Stealing Beauty* emphasizes the scenery. Bertolucci is often preoccupied with long shots and scenes focusing on the countryside of Siena; helping to establish Tuscany as a land of passion. When Lucy first arrives at the Graysons' hilltop villa, the camera

> 'does what Lucy cannot (unless in spirit) and embarks on a circular aerial tour. It meanders above emerald grass and glides over the recumbent bodies of both sleeping diners and life-size terracotta figures. Then it rises to open the vista across garden, outbuildings and distant hills, continuing a marvellous sweep above the landscape before turning back to the house's front to descend beneath the pergola. There it rejoins Lucy as she wakens her hostess Diana Grayson (Sinead Cusack)' (Izod 2006).

Stealing Beauty features shots saturated with colour—specifically with warm reds, orange, browns and gold. This warmth is present throughout the film, through locations and costumes, and these colours not only represent the hot weather, but also echo the idea that this is a passionate and sexual place. For the viewer, the atmosphere of the Tuscan locations makes the sexual tension palpable--we know that this land holds a sexual magic because we can feel it through the presentation of the Tuscan landscape.

While the two films have many similarities, unlike Lucy Honeychurch, Lucy Harmon is an object throughout the film. She is a site to be seen. This is demonstrated from the opening sequence where the audience is treated to recording from a hand held video camera, from an unseen videographer's perspective. As John Izod writes:

> 'we only know that the camera is in the hands of a middle-aged man; but his identity cannot be made out until later in the film. The disconcerting nature of the footage recorded by this clandestine observer arises from the invasion of Lucy's private space by extreme close-ups, an intrusion of which, since she is asleep, she remains unaware' (Izod 2006, 84).

A little later, we see that the videographer's seat is a few rows back and that he is obsessively recording Lucy, going out of his way to capture these images of her. These sort of images, with the camera stalking a static Lucy as she travels carries on, with only one brief moment where Lucy glances over her shoulder and nearly sees the man recording her. However, Lucy remains oblivious to the camera following her even as the images become increasingly obsessive and sexualized. As she sleeps on the train bound towards Siena, the camera lingers on her foot, before traveling up her body, focusing in on her lips, hands, and ultimately her crotch where her hand rests as she sleeps. These images sexualize Lucy and establishes her as an object, because she is disembodied and reduced to a series of body parts for 'the naked voyeurism' by a man who '"takes" Lucy's' sexuality as if by right, with an artless and repugnant aggression which tells us more about the camera operator than the girl' (Izod 2006, 84).

While Lucy Harmon also influences her companions in Italy, her influence is a false one because it is based on what the others assume are and will be her experiences and not her actual experience. For example, when returning from a party with a man, she fakes that they are engaging in sexual activity, while

instead she puts him to bed and sleeps on a couch on the other side of her room. However, prior to that, she makes a performance out of her situation, knowing that her friends will be spying on her; she encourages him to make it look like they will have sexual intercourse. Although she does not engage in sex, her performance for the others does prompt the two couples, Miranda (Rachel Weisz) and Richard (D.W. Moffett) and Diana (Sinéad Cusack) and Ian (Donal McCann), to have sex. This scene echoes the influence that Lucy Honeychurch has on the others in the pension, specifically with the two older women, and to an extent Mr Eager, but it also echoes Miss Lavish's interest in her respective Lucy as well.   However, Lucy Harmon's influence is inauthentic, thus the touristic expectations her companions place on her are not realized like Lucy Honeychurch's is at this point within the film, and she remains an object throughout the film.

The biggest difference between these two films and the experiences of the two female protagonists, is the importance of the female gaze in the films. As established, *A Room with a View* places an importance on women looking and the pleasure that can be derived from it. However, where Lucy Honeychurch is concerned with looking, Lucy Harmon is completely unaware of her surroundings. Lucy Honeychurch is seen throughout the Italian half of *A Room* looking at things, from the opening shot, to her solo journey through the city of Florence, and to the field to see 'a view'—and where George passionately kisses her—much is done about her looking and being a tourist in Italy. In contrast, Lucy Harmon rarely leaves the Graysons' villa, and when she does, it is to visit the neighbours for a party. She is never seen participating in the traditional tourist activities like Lucy Honeychurch, and in fact she is perhaps even 'blind' to what is occurring around her. As she walks through a field with Osvaldo (Ignazio Oliva), she comments on how beautiful the land is, and as she leaves the frame, the camera remains focused on where they were, and the viewer sees prostitutes soliciting customers on the street. This contrast of the image and her comment show how out of touch she and her companions are with the outside world. At the villa, they have created their own little world, 'with few native Tuscans in their number,' (Izod 2006, 85), that they are unaware of what is occurring in the rest of the country.

In *A Room with a View,* before the picnic, Mr. Eager discusses his interest in how people travel and he asks Lucy whether she's there for education, or if she's writing a novel like Miss Lavish. Lucy says she's just here is a tourist and he replies, 'oh I feel bad for you tourists shuffled around this place to this place. And they rely completely on their guidebooks.' Lucy's trip to Italy is about more than just seeing the sights, she wants to have a more authentic experience.

There are also similar parallels between Miss Lavish and Charlotte Bartlett, because Charlotte is very proper British woman. She wants to see the sights that she supposed to see, not necessarily experience them. She wants to visit these popular sites, take the photos or purchase a souvenir, and then go back home and with proof that she has been there. On the other hand, Miss Lavish wants to see more. She explains that she wants to get lost in the city so that she literally can just wander aimlessly around the city. When the two of them are out together, Charlotte gets very upset or very concerned that they're going to get lost and Miss Lavish doesn't care.

A recurring theme in this film is the idea of like living fully. At home, Lucy is constrained by the British lifestyle of the time and is not living fully. In Italy, Lucy is able to let go of the British constraints because she's on vacation in this beautiful foreign country.

After Lucy and George witness a man getting murdered, Lucy faints and George rushes her back to her room. Lucy's pictures get dropped in the mud and blood. George tries to salvage them, but they are ruined and he throws them away. This forces Lucy's interactions with the city to change. She cannot rely on the photos as evidence she was there. Now the souvenir is Lucy herself. It's more authentic.

When they are having the picnic in a field, Charlotte relaxes her guard and George kisses Lucy. Lucy wanted the experience, but Charlotte is worried about the danger because this is a romantic place, a place of transformation, a place that inspires passion. Charlotte feels she must take Lucy away, but Miss Lavish is very excited because the incident is great for her novel. She wanted Lucy to have this romantic moment and.   They take their carriages back to the pension except for Emerson, who decides to run back in the rain.

Charlotte and Lucy travel Rome and Lucy encounters Cecil Vyse (Daniel Day Lewis). Cecil is always inside and admits he cannot imagine himself out of

the room.   Lucy says she's never seen him in nature, but only in a room. As they look out the window, he admires her and compares her to a gorgeous statue or painting, but there is a physical barrier between them. When they go out into the garden, he asks to kiss her. It's something that he normally wouldn't do, as it is not proper. It is so very awkward because he does not have that natural passion that she apparently does.

Conclusion

In *A Room With a View* and *Stealing Beauty*, the two young women are tourists but only one participates in *flânerie*. In *Room*, Honeychurch is a *flâneuse*, imbued with the visual power to look, observe and wander the city alone. In contrast, Harmon in *Stealing Beauty* rarely leaves the villa after she arrives. Others come and go, and she visits neighbours, but only with the other expats and her guardians. Despite the fact that she is on a mission to discover her biological father, Harmon is extremely sedentary, and lacks any urgency to actually uncover the truth. Instead of actively looking for her father, Harmon becomes an object and plaything for those around her. This is evident when Christopher (Joseph Fiennes) pretends to be her in an internet chatroom, because Lucy is no longer a person, but an object for others to write their fantasies on to, and they do write their fantasies on to her. Miranda (Rachel Weisz) and Richard (D. W. Moffett) use the 'fantasy' of Lucy to enhance their strained relationship and sex life, and the rest of the group push her towards taking a lover so they can write their own fantasies on to her as well.

As mentioned in the introduction, one's traveling companions can have as much of an effect on the tourist as the actual location does. The expectations of Italy and the two Lucys have profound effects on these women. It is despite the expectations of her sex driven companions that Harmon does eventually lose her virginity. In contrast, Honeychurch suffers an internal conflict to behave as a good Edwardian English woman, as Charlotte expects, or to give into the carnal landscape of Italy as Miss Lavish hopes. Furthermore, for Honeychurch to give into her desires would be to take on a more masculine approach to the situation, 'living' as Mr Emerson would describe it, rather than keeping a distance like the other women. Ultimately, both women stop filtering life through the expectations of those around them and 'live' in the moment, but it is in despite of their

traveling companions who have tried to map their own adventures and experience on to them.

Flânerie **for Him and Her… and Her?**

The previous chapters have discussed more traditional forms of *flânerie* and the examples of the *flâneuse* found in the characters of Irma Vep and Cléo, with a brief discussion of tourism as a form of *flânerie*. This chapter specifically looks at the role of tourism and the gender in relation to Woody Allen's film *Midnight in Paris* (2011). It tells the story of Gil (Owen Wilson), a Hollywood screenwriter, who, while wandering the streets of Paris, meets people driving about in a vintage car and is transported back to the 1920s every night at midnight. Gil is the textbook Baudelairian *flâneur*. Although he writes scripts for Hollywood films, he longs to be a novelist like his idols Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald, whom he meets during his time travels. However, Gil is not the only character to participate in *flânerie*. While time traveling around 1920s Paris, he is introduced to Adrianna (Marion Cotillard), a fashion student of Coco Chanel and an 'art groupie'. As will be established, Adrianna is a *flâneuse* close to the definition provided by Baudelaire, and because of this, Gil values her perspective on the city over his fiancé's, Inez (Rachel McAdam) preferred form of tourism, because it matches his own. While Gil is a traditional *flâneur*, Inez prefers to go window shopping, which Gil believes is not as valuable as meandering around the city. However, the window shopper was an early form of female mobility, providing, an early version of the *flâneuse*, particularly in the *belle époque*, which is ultimately where Adrianna visits and stays.

It is established in the first scene that Gil is a writer in Hollywood, but that he wishes to absorb, and be absorbed by, Paris. This is partially due to his love for the 'ideal' Paris he has in his mind, and also for the inspiration he thinks it will bestow on him. In order to gain this inspiration, Gil wants to wander around Paris to experience the hustle and bustle of the city through walking and

looking. Indeed, Gil observes the city as he strolls through it, mentally banking this experience for future writing.

Gill's method of experiencing Paris is something that his fiancé and her family and friends do not understand, as they would rather experience Paris through sight-seeing and window shopping rather than simply 'being' in the city. This juxtaposes Gil and the others, and alienates him from the other modern day characters in the film. It also establishes Gil as having a 'hate of the home and the passion for roaming,' which was part of Baudelaire's conception of the *flâneur* (Friedberg 1993, 30). Although he is traveling with Inez and her family, he attempts to spend as little time with them, because they represent what he dislikes about himself—the Hollywood hack, who failed to become a novelist (artist) and stuck in this consumerist lifestyle.

This is particularly evident in the scene where Inez, her mother, Helen (Mimi Kennedy), and Gil are looking at furniture. This occurs after his first night traveling back in time, and he is struck with inspiration after meeting his idols F. Scott Fitzgerald (Tom Hiddleston) and Ernest Hemingway (Corey Stoll). That morning he attempts to tell Inez about his experience, but she tells him he sounds crazy and that they need to hurry to go shopping with her mother. When Gil says he plans to stay in the hotel and work on his novel, Inez rushes him out and forces him to go furniture shopping for their home. In the immediately following scene, a set of $20,000 chairs catch Inez and Helen's eyes, which Helen says is a steal. Nonetheless, the price tag shocks Gil, and he reminds Inez that they are attempting to keep costs down so he does not have to take any more Hollywood rewrite jobs. In return, Helen circuitously calls Gil cheap, which upsets him. As they leave the store, Gil asks if they would like to walk back with him in the rain, which he thinks is beautiful (he continuously refers to how beautiful Paris is in the rain), but the women object and the three of them pile into a taxi to head back to the hotel.

Although a small scene that primarily serves to show how ill-suited Gil and Inez are, and to justify his feelings for Adrianna later in the film. It also establishes two very different ideas of *flânerie*. On one side, there is Gil as the archetypal *flâneur*, who demonstrates his 'hate for the home' and 'passion for roaming' in this scene. There is no obvious hatred towards the women in the scene, but Gil is uncomfortable in their world of shopping, consumerism and

commodities. He would much prefer to experience Paris the way he thinks his Jazz Age idols experienced it, via simply living and being there. He wants an 'artistic' experience that is a fantasy. In contrast, Inez and the chairs represent his unhappy home life and his failure to lead the 'artistic lifestyle' he so longs for. Unlike his heroes he encounters during the film, he is 'a hack,' who is forced to do rewrites to sustain his and his fiancé's lifestyle, and he states that he would have to do more of this work, which he does not like, in order to afford the chairs. Gil would rather live modestly in order to afford more time for his writing, something that Inez does not understand nor seems to want him to do.

In *Midnight in Paris*, Allen places Inez as an 'antagonist' of sorts, who would cause Gil to give up his artistic integrity in exchange for her preferred lifestyle. In a film peppered with fictional portrayals of artists such as Pablo Picasso, Salvador Dali, Luis Bunuel, and the aforementioned Hemmingway and Fitzgerald, --giving up one's artistic integrity to be a 'Hollywood hack' is the biggest crime that a writer could commit. Inez and the chairs represent a lack of mobility; a sedentary lifestyle that is suffocating for Gil. However, that is because he is looking at mobility through a traditional male privilege that ignores female mobility and window shopping as a form of *flânerie*. Ultimately, this is the problem with Gil as the *flâneur*, he idolizes the male participation in *flânerie* and ignores the more 'non-traditional' forms in which women participate.

Based on his conversations with her family at the beginning of the film, Inez and her family do not believe that being a novelist is a worthy career choice and thus do not support what they believe to be a folly. For them, it is important do things to serve a purpose. They believe Gill should write screenplays to earn money, and although they are vacationing in Paris, Gil and Inez are there courtesy of Inez's father's business trip. Their beliefs are in opposition to Gil's longing to be a *flâneur*, who does not serve a particular purpose. As Baudelaire wrote, *flânerie* is about the experience first and foremost; if the *flâneur* is an artist and later commits this experience to paint or pen and paper, then so be it, but 'to Baudelaire, the *flâneur* was an archetypal Parisian, a poet whose language traded the texture and chaos of urban life' (Friedberg 1993, 30). Ultimately, this is what Gil would rather do instead of window shopping with his fiancé and future mother-in-law. This confounds Inez's family and is why her father (Kurt Fuller) hires a private investigator to follow Gil on his late night walks, as he cannot

understand why someone would want to simply wander the streets--for him there must be a reason. By the time the private investigator is hired, Gil is purposely wandering the streets in order to visit Adrianna, but initially it was because he simply wanted to observe and absorb Paris.

In many ways, Inez and her family represent Gil's fear of domestic life, but also a fear of losing one's masculinity. Despite being played by Owen Wilson, Gil is a fictional representation of the film's writer and director, Woody Allen, and masculinity, or lack of it, is something that is often found in Allen's work. Gil is the embodiment of Allen in this film, and the typical 'passionate, self-deprecating schlemiel' (Scott 2011, n.p.), not a bastion of masculinity. In contrast, there is Inez's father. It is his work that has brought the family to Paris. His presence on screen is that of a demanding and overbearing father-in-law. He is the traditional hard-working 'provider' of the family, which reads as more masculine and dominant than Gil.

To Inez's family, money and financial comfort are a priority, and Inez herself struggles to encourage Gil's creative (read more feminine) side, while still wanting him to provide his share of the finances in the future. When Inez insists he goes shopping with her and her mother, she is pulling him into the feminine world of consumerism, which is something he has no interest in as he would much rather be working on his novel or walking through the city. Gil already struggles with his masculinity, as evident in the way his future father-in-law bulldozes him and with the power imbalance in his own relationship—shopping is another way to de-masculinize Gil. This is further reinforced by the fact that shopping is the form of consumerism, and Gil dislikes consumerism as he finds it a distraction from his artistic interests. When he takes one of his Hollywood 'hack' jobs, he is doing so to earn money, but it distracts him from his true passion--writing his novel.

Part of Gil's interest in Paris, more specifically Paris of the 1920s, is that he feels it was a time of great artistic strides. He is not wrong; with an influx of American and European artists to Paris when 'thousands of expatriates from America and every corner of Europe flocked to the city on the Seine, eager to experiment with new artistic forms and share new ideas' (Brody 2012, 7), this meant that Paris during the interwar years produced many classic novels, paintings, and films. The increase of Americans in Paris after the war was

partially the result of the disillusionment the returning servicemen felt, coupled with Prohibition which 'felt like a slap in the face for those returning from the trauma of trench warfare' (Brody 2012, 7). Also, Paris was 'close enough to feel threatened, even shelled on occasion but never overrun by German forces' (Brody 2012, 19) which gave it a sense of immediacy as well as nostalgia for the non-natives. *Midnight in Paris* is an ode to the artists that flocked to Paris during this period, with dozens of characters and cameos to demonstrate that during this magical time, all these artists were in this one city and producing art. It is no wonder Gil would like to be in 1920s Paris, for him it represents artistic freedom, something that he is lacking in his present life. Gil, in a way, is a member of his own lost generation, disillusioned with his life and nostalgic for a time he actually has never personally experienced. Similarly, the actual 'lost generation' of artists and intellectuals felt a similar nostalgic feeling for Paris.

While Inez represents the 'hate for the home,' the lifestyle that Gil has found himself living while also despising it, she also represents another form of *flânerie*. Woody Allen positions Inez as the opposite of Adrianna, who represents the idealized Paris for which Gil longs. Although Adrianna is a traditional representation of a *flâneuse*, Inez is also a *flâneuse*, but in the vein of Anne Friedberg's theory on window shopping. She does not understand Gil's need to wander the city and just 'be' in it; however, part of what makes the *flâneur* the *flâneur* is the power of his look, and Inez does a lot of looking.

From window shopping, to visiting the traditional tourist locations, Inez participates in a different from of *flânerie* from Gil, one he does not accept, but it is an equally valid one. She visits famous tourist locations, such as the Louvre and Versailles with her friends, and both of these are locations where one is encouraged to look and observe, to wander, albeit within prescribed areas. Versailles is also both a public and private location, combining the two spheres that a *flâneur* originally had access to travel between. Instead, the private becomes public when the visitor pays an entry fee. Although this is a form of *flânerie*, it is not fully acceptable to Gil, partially because it is still about consumerism, as you need to pay, and he believes that the predetermined looking of guided tours to be inauthentic compared to his personal preference. Inez is the consumer side of the *flâneuse*, whereas Adrianna is the 'artistic' side.

In the scene when Paul (Michael Sheen) and Carol (Nina Arianda) invite Gil and Inez to Versailles with them the next day, Inez is very keen to see it, but Gil wavers and complains that it is two hours from the city—where he would prefer to be spending his time. Their choice of tourist locations speaks to the divide between Inez and Gil. It also represents the male/female division of public space. The *Chateau de Versailles* is representative of absolute monarchy and extravagance. When it was a royal palace, it was home to the notorious Marie Antoinette. Life at Versailles featured strict social rules which served to stratify the people living within it, thus creating its own social classes amongst the extended royal family. The people, and especially women, of this time would have been restricted in the places they could go, thus constraining the mobility of the chateau's inhabitants. Marie Antoinette and her posse would hardly have been allowed to wander Paris on their own and, since Versailles served as the centre of political power, there would be little need for them to visit Paris to as everyone in their social group flocked to them. Due to this distance, Versailles is associated with the nobility's frivolity and ignorance to the rest of the country.

Inez's choice to visit Versailles draws a comparison between herself and the excess with which Versailles is associated, which is far from the *flâneur's* Paris that Gil longs to experience. After their invitation, Inez confronts Gil because he does not want to go to Versailles with her and asks if he really wants to give up all his success in Hollywood just to 'struggle' to further emphasize the difference between Inez and Gil.   To Gil, visiting the typical and popular tourist destination, is not what he wants from his time in France, and he looks down upon Inez's choice in mass tourism.

Mass tourism has helped to create the 'tourist gaze' and as there was more 'democratised geographical movement' there developed 'extensive distinctions of taste' and one's choice in tourist destination became 'markers of social "distinction"' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 30). While Versailles is a symbol of wealth and class, it is also a location of mass tourism. For the tourist, like Gil, looking for an 'authentic experience,' mass tourist locations are something to be avoided. This in part leads to Gil's interest in Adrianna, as she helps him achieve his ideal of the 'authentic Parisian experience,' but I would argue that Gil does not have the tourist gaze but the 'romantic gaze,' which is much more obviously auratic, concerned with the more elitist--and solitary--appreciation of magnificent

scenery, an appreciation which requires considerable cultural capital, especially if particular objects also signify literary text' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 100). As Urry and Larsen write, for a 'cultural phenomenon' to have aura 'was to say that it was radically separated from the social, it proclaimed its own originality, uniqueness and singularity, and it was based in a discourse of formal organic unity and artistic creativity' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 98). Gil's interest in being a *flâneur* is a study in modernism whereas Inez-as-*flâneuse* is a study in postmodern culture which is 'anti-auratic' because it is not based on the singularity or creativity but a prescribed way of looking and experiencing the sights. Such forms do not proclaim their uniqueness, but are 'mechanically, electronically and digitally reproduced and distributed' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 98).

Inez's tourist experience of Versailles, is one that can be, and is daily, reproduced by the hundreds, making it part of mass tourism. While this could be an argument to separate Inez and Gil's experience as simply post-modern and modern, one that features the tourist gaze and the other a romantic gaze. However, 'capitalist societies are characterised by a strong emphasis upon consumption based upon the romantic ethic' (Urry and Larsen 2011, 98) and Gil is actually attempting to reproduce his Parisian fantasies. In fact, one could say the whole film is actually Allen's way of using the 'romantic ethic' for monetary consumption.

In the first scene of the film, Gil expresses his love for the city, while Inez counters his praise for it with criticism and tells him "you're in love with a fantasy." This references the film's form, as it is a fantasy with its time traveling. It also references Gil falling in love with a fantasy twice over. The first fantasy is that of Paris; more specifically Paris in the 1920s. For him, it's a magical time and place and utterly perfect, a place where he will be inspired and write his 'great novel.' The second fantasy is Adrianna, a woman who does not exist in his time.

While Gil is presented as a 'romantic' protagonist, who only wants to be a *flâneur* in the romantic and traditional way, it does not discredit Inez as a *flâneuse* herself. As Friedberg writes, 'shopping, like other itinerancies of the late nineteenth century—museum-and exhibition-going, packaged tourism and, of course, the cinema—relied on the visual register and helped to ensure the predominance of the gaze in capitalist society' (Friedberg 1993, 37). Thus,

shopping is packaged tourism, and Versailles and museums are forms of packaged tourism, reiterating the point that Inez is a *flâneuse* with the tourist gaze. Inez is seen at museums and tourist exhibitions and she looks. She wants to experience Paris through these activities, in contrast to how Gil wishes to experience Paris. Her choice of activity does not mean she is not a *flâneuse*.

Although she is pitted against Adrianna in Gil's affection, this rivalry comes from the difference in their *flânerie*. Inez is a *flâneuse* in the Friedberg School of window shopping, where capitalism helped to create the *flâneuse*, by giving women a public space to meander in the arcades of Paris. Friedberg writes 'the female *flâneuse*, was not possible until she was free to roam the city on her own. And this was equated with the privilege of shopping on her own' (1993, 36), because the development of shopping centres, department stores, and arcades, gave women an excuse to be out in public. She continues looking specifically at the department store for the nineteenth century and adds:

> 'endowed with purchase power, she was the target of consumer address. New desires were created *for her* by advertising and consumer culture; desires elaborated in a system of selling and consumption which depended on the relation between *looking* and *buying*, and the indirect desire to possess and incorporate through the eye' (Friedberg 1993, 37).

Friedberg believes that consumerism empowered women and created a female gaze that was both recognized and utilized by society, thus shopping and commodity culture helped create a viable *flâneuse*, as previously women did not have the mobility for the gaze required to create a female version of the *flâneur*. Inez is a part of consumerism and a participant in commodity culture. As previously stated, she wants to experience Paris through museums and sightseeing and the film shows her visiting the Louvre, Versailles, and the Rodin Museum. In between wandering Versailles and the Rodin Museum, Inez admires large diamond rings in a shop window. In this moment, she is literally window shopping, and Inez-as-shopper bears a striking resemblance to Inez-as-tourist. As Friedberg mentioned, packaged tourism and shopping helped to establish the gaze in capitalist society, and touring a palace or museum is very similar to shopping in a mall, as it combines the gaze and consumerism. For example, Inez visiting Versailles would involve an entrance fee, establishing the consumerist aspects of tourism, and while there she would be looking at the

historical grounds—creating a gaze. Tourist locations such as Versailles and the Louvre are meant to be looked at, they are objects waiting for a subjective gaze, which is ultimately one of the problems with locating a *flâneuse* throughout history. Tourism is a way for a woman to participate in *flânerie*, because it combines public and private locations (by opening up private homes and collections to the public view), as well as gives women the ability to wander and look.

Gil's struggles between his life as a self-described 'Hollywood hack' and the artistic novelist he wants to be and this is represented in his relationships with Adrianna and Inez. At one point, Inez says to Gil 'if you want to wander the streets of Paris at night and take it in fine, but I'm in the middle of a good book Carol lent me' as she jumps into a taxi leaving him before the second time slip begins. By day, Gil wanders with Inez as she shops or goes through museums and other tourist spots, but at night he wanders the city for what he claims to be artistic inspiration, which no one else seems to understand. Inez's parents scoff at his claim that he is inspired by walking, probably something original *flâneurs* faced, as they would be considered loitering. To Inez, her parents and her friends, one does not simply wander around the city, they may wander around museums, palaces, and shops, but not just along the city streets. Instead, Gil would rather spend his time with Adrianna, who represents for him the archetypal Parisian, much like Baudelaire's description of the *flâneur*, despite the fact that Baudelaire primarily ignored female participation in *flânerie*. Adrianna shares Gil's nostalgia for the past as well as his interest in the artists and intellectuals of the Lost Generation (which obviously, would not have been considered by that name during the 1920s).   Later, he develops an interest in Gabrielle (Léa Seudoux), who works in a stall at the flea market, selling antiques. She is a contemporary version of Adrianna and his idea of the 'archetypal Parisian' as she participates in café culture, listens to old French records and shares his nostalgia for the past.

One of the things that draws Gil to Adrianna is that she is the perfect example of 1920s France to him. Until then, the colourful cast of real life characters he meets are all definitively non-French. Between interacting with the Fitzgeralds, Hemingway, Stein, Dalí, Picasso, and Man Ray, almost everyone he meets is either American or Spanish. This leaves Adrianna as not only the only

French person the audience sees him interacting with at length during the 1920s time period, but it exaggerates her 'French-ness' and why she is seen as the 'archetypal Parisian' to Gil and the others. Adrianna becomes a romantic symbol of Paris, something that they are all trying to capture; it is what has brought them to this spatiotemporal moment.

There is a reason that all these creative people migrated to Paris, for the romanticized pre-war nostalgia that Paris represented (Brody 2012), and ultimately their time in Paris would influence their work, much like the *flâneur* would observe and use the urban landscape to influence his own work. It is interesting to note that besides Adrianna, Henri Matisse is the only famous French person Gil meets during the 1920s. When he and Adrianna travel further back to the *Belle Époque*, he meets with Toulouse-Lautrec and Edgar Degas. Meeting Degas is of extreme importance because he 'could be counted among the *flâneurs*, but the other impressionists adopted the characteristic features of this modern Parisian: objectivity and a devotion to contemporary life' (Pace 2015), meaning that Gil finally meets a contemporary of Baudelaire and one of 'his' *flâneurs*.

While Adrianna shares the romantic view of Paris that Gil has, and she is content to walk along the boulevards, she is more like the streetwalker that Baudelaire includes in his initial description of the *flâneur*. Adrianna is prized amongst all the 1920s characters by the men around her. She stands out from the contemporary female characters because of her nationality, her youth, and beauty. Although Josephine Baker and Alice B. Toklas are seen, Gil only interacts with Gertrude Stein (Kathy Bates), Zelda Fitzgerald (Alison Pill), and Adrianna. Stein and Zelda are both American, like Gil, and thus less exotic (although he is enraptured by both at first because they are historical icons), and furthermore, Stein, being older and gay, is coded as asexual in this film. She can be a mentor, but not a muse, unlike Zelda and Adrianna.

When Adrianna is first introduced to Gil, it is during a discussion between Stein and Picasso over a painting that she inspired. They argue over whether or not Picasso has accurately captured her energy in the portrait. Greg M. Thomas writes:

> 'Baudelaire conceived of the *flâneur* in very strict terms, not just as a
> man, but as a male poet or artist endowed with a special capacity of

metropolitan and sexually charged vision. Viewed this way, a *flâneuse* would have to be a female poet or artist with a sexually cognizant gaze, and Elizabeth Wilson has consequently suggested prostitutes as the closest approximation in Paris. Yet equating the prostitute with a Baudelaire or Manet would contradict the fundamental relation of power and visual domination that is really the heart of the idea of the *flâneur*' (Thomas 2006, 34).

It is quickly established that Adrianna came to Paris to work with Coco Chanel, which serves to provide her with an artistic background, to mirror Gil's own artistic work. Furthermore, she enjoys Paris for its ability to inspire; spending her time with other artists and recording her observations of the city in her journal, so she is a *flâneuse* in that sense of the term.

However, Adrianna also walks the line between the *flâneuse* and the 'street-walking prostitute' that is often referred to when discussing women and *flânerie*. When we first meet Adrianna, she is at Stein's house because of her sexual relationship with Picasso. Picasso has painted Adrianna, but he and Stein have disagreed on whether or not it captures the real Adrianna and Stein asks Gil for his first impression of Adrianna. As the camera cuts to her for the first time, she is standing in the corner smoking a cigarette. Hemingway and Gil are caught by her beauty, the former being the one to approach her, much like a hunter would approach prey. Adrianna is not only a muse, but a romantic and sexual partner to these artists. When Gil asks what brought her to Paris and her 'sad story,' she lists her previous lovers, including Amedeo Modigliani and now Picasso. She even mentions how attractive Hemingway is, foreshadowing that she will run off to Africa with him for a short while. Gil calls her an 'art groupie' to her face, but as a 1920s woman, she doesn't understand. This serves to establish her interest, much like Gil's own interest, in the arts and love for Paris. At the same time, it shows that she partakes in a form of prostitution with these men. This is not to say that she sells her body to these men, but she knows how to utilize her sexuality to get what she wants from them. Later, Gil reads Adrianna's diary. She writes that she has fallen in love with him, and that they had sexual intercourse when he gifts her a pair of earrings.

It is the idea of the *flâneur* having a 'sexually charged vision' or 'sexually cognizant gaze' that is where it becomes tricky. Adrianna certainly has a

sexually charged vision and writes about it in her journal, which is read by the character played by Carla Bruni, who is a former model and was at the time of filming, married to the French President Nicolas Sarkozy. She writes that she is attracted to Gil, rather than to Pablo Picasso or Ernest Hemmingway and that she has a dream where he brings her earrings and then they make love. Clearly, based on her journal entry and her affairs with Pablo Picasso and Ernest Hemingway, Adrianna is meant to be a sexual being, but her sexuality is never actually demonstrated. The audience does not see her speak of her affairs (beyond listing her lovers), and the only time her thoughts are voiced are when being read by another woman, a woman whose own image was objectified during her time as a model. It is established that Adrianna has a 'sexually charged vision,' but only through her relationships and her diary being read nearly 100 years later. Furthermore, Adrianna is viewed as an object by the men around her. This is evident by her first scene, when Picasso has literally used her to create an object of art. Neither Picasso, Hemingway nor Gertrude Stein have an actual conversation with her, and yet both the men are spurred on to seduce her. It is only Gil who has a true dialogue with her and only Stein is able to identify the relationship between object and subject between these men and Adrianna.

On their second meeting, Adrianna and Gil go for a walk. On the walk, they pass a line of prostitutes and she asks if he sees anything he likes. In this moment, she is acknowledging the other women on the street, and actually participates in objectifying the other women. The *flâneuse* and prostitutes have a strong connection, because prostitutes were originally included in Baudelaire's *flânerie*, because they are literal street walkers. While Adrianna is not a prostitute, she is a sexual object to the men around her and uses her sexuality to gain things from these men—for example, being whisked off to Africa with Hemingway. How much of a difference is there between the two? However, although Baudelaire included prostitutes in his description of the *flâneur*, the street-walker does not hold the same power of looking as the *flâneur* because she is there to be looked at.

While Gil believes the 1920s is the best time, Adrianna would prefer to travel further back to the *Belle Époque* and stay there. When she chooses to stay there, she ultimately choses something that Gil cannot bring himself to do. As

much as he loves her, she is a fantasy, much like the Parisian 1920s. Interestingly, Adrianna stays in a time that would further restrict her mobility. In the 1920s, she is never shown walking about on her own, she only walks the city with Gil, and she travels, but only with Hemingway and Picasso. She has an implied mobility much like an implied sexually charged vision, as the audience never sees any of this.

Ultimately, Gil ends up with Gabrielle, the French girl he meets when accompanying Inez on a shopping trip, when he runs into her at midnight walking around the city. He is walking around Paris, much like he has been throughout the film, and meets her as she is walking home from dinner with friends. It begins to rain and they walk as she says she thinking Paris is most beautiful in the rain, mirroring what he said at the beginning. She is actively participating in *flânerie* on her own when she meets him, perhaps becoming more of what he wants from a woman.

Conclusion

Much like the *flâneur* was not intentionally, but ultimately gendered, tourism and shopping have been gendered as well. *Midnight in Paris* features the male gaze and the male idealized form of tourism and *flânerie*. Gil questions and ultimately denies the authenticity of Inez's experience of Paris because it does not fit his idealized fantasy of what Paris means and how it should be experienced. He is drawn to the women who conform to his preferred mode, and ignores Inez as a *flâneuse* and 'authentic' tourist herself.

Ultimately, Gil represents the struggle to locate a woman within Baudelaire's idea of *flânerie*. Much like Baudelaire, Gil's idea of a *flâneuse* is one that aligns closer to a prostitute. Adrianna can participate in *flânerie* but she must also be objectified and serve as a commodity for the male artists with whom she surrounds herself, just like the inclusion of the prostitute in the Baudelaire's definition allows women to participate but only if they are commodities for men themselves.

In contrast, Inez represents a postmodern *flâneuse*. One can argue that her affair with Paul could be seen as a form of prostitution; however, the affair happens off screen leaving it out of the cinematic gaze, unlike with Adrianna. Instead, the audience only sees her subjective gaze when she is shopping and at

the tourist locations. Although the film is not told through Gil's 'eyes' as the camera, it is from his view and as the film continues, and Adrianna catches his gaze, Inez becomes less of an object of desire but one who desires. Inez is not there for the visual consumption of Gil or anyone else, but to look at the sights and window shop, making her more of a *flâneuse* than Adrianna.

Conclusion

Two of the components that make up *flânerie* is mobility and the power of looking. For many theorists, it has been difficult to locate a female participant or *flâneuse* because female mobility and the female gaze is so often restricted. However, as established throughout the thesis, there are examples of the *flâneuse* throughout cinematic history.

In 1915, Irma Vep in *Les Vampires* is a dangerous *flâneuse*. Her mobility allows her to move throughout the city to commit crimes and help the Grand Vampire with his nefarious plans. However, it is not only her mobility that makes her dangerous, but the power of her gaze, which was emphasized throughout the films and the marketing. She returns the look of the *flâneur* and that of the cinema audience.

Moving forward, the mid-century *flâneuse* had to struggle with her own feminine identity as the post-World War II era, much like the interwar years, saw a push to move women back into the more traditional roles upon the return of the servicemen. At the same time, fashion became about heightened femininity with cinched waists and clothes that emphasized the feminine physique. It is no wonder then that the *flâneuse* had to shed her feminine masquerade in order to gain mobility and to escape her role as object. In *Funny Face* and *Cléo 5 à 7*, Jo and Cléo battle with the feminine masquerade, which prevents them from fully exploring the city.

Although most of this thesis has focused on Paris, the inclusion of *A Room With a View* and *Stealing Beauty* was to create a discussion on tourism as a form of *flânerie*. There is a natural connection between tourism and *flânerie*, but the tourist experience is defined by the experience of others. The tourist is either

looking for the most 'authentic' experience (as in *Midnight in Paris*) or based on pre-prescribed locations (as in *A Room with a View*), but either way, the experience is still defined in comparison to other tourists. This sets tourism apart from *flânerie*, and not all tourists are a *flâneur or flâneuse*, much like Lucy Harmon in *Stealing Beauty*. However, all *flâneurs* perform tourism in their experiences.

This distinction is more apparent in *Midnight in Paris*, when Gil struggles with what he believes are 'inauthentic' experiences. Rather than going to Versailles, museums or shopping, he would rather stroll about the city, taking it in like a classic *flâneur*. Unfortunately, that means he discredits his fiancé, Inez's, experience and her participation in *flânerie*. Inez might not be a *flâneuse* in the classic sense like Adrianna, but window shopping is one way that women were able to become the *flâneuse*. Gil's dismissal of Inez as the *flâneuse* is representative of Baudelaire's dismissal of women from *flânerie* in the beginning. This is not to say that Baudelaire purposefully ignored women, but that he could not see a female equivalent other than the prostitute. This is partially because he was writing about the *flâneur* before department stores really captured global attention, but also because shopping is so gendered as feminine. However, Benjamin explicitly points to the invention of the modern Parisian arcades and shops as to allowing the creation of the *flâneur*; meaning shopping and specifically window shopping has always been a part of *flânerie*. Even if the *flâneur* has no intention of buying anything, strolling the arcades helped to develop the gaze which is so intrinsic to *flânerie*.

Much like Cléo and Jo, who are so linked to fashion and consumerism in their respective films, Inez's flânerie is also linked to shopping. This becomes a core issue in the narrative because the audience is supposed to pity Gil as he is dragged to the shops with his fiancé and future mother-in-law. The audience is expected to feel sympathetic to Gil not only because of the clichéd trope that men do not like shopping, but because he, and director Woody Allen, believe shopping is below the more noble *flânerie*. However, that negates the power of the female gaze to the shop window and ignores the social, mobile and monetary power shopping provided women throughout history.

For most of the women to fully participate in *flânerie*, they must stop obeying the social expectations of their time. Cléo and Jo must give up their

feminine masquerades to truly experience the city. The Lucy's must ignore their traveling companions and have their own authentic experiences rather than those of the guidebooks or their predecessors. For example, Harmon is constantly being compared to her mother and her mother's time in Italy. Ultimately, it's Inez and Irma who are the uninhibited *flâneuses*. Neither care about what the men or their fellow women think about them and both have been imbued with the power of the gaze. Irma participates in a more traditional form of *flânerie* while Inez participates in a touristic form of *flânerie* which also includes consumerism and commodity culture. Both are valid forms though, despite being very different. The concept of the shopper-*flâneuse*, however, still excludes women taking a more active role in *flânerie*. When men walk about and look it is *flânerie*, but women are simply window shopping.

These films also serve as their own form of *flânerie*; allowing their audience to be static *flâneurs*. The film selection may not seem random, but each film provides its own version of the *flâneuse*, while allowing the audience to also participate in *flânerie*. From the beginning of film spectatorship, the cinema has been linked with shopping, as evident by the Hales World Tours which populated busy shopping centers, or that most film theatres today still inhabit space near or at the local mall. The cinematic gaze has always been a part of *flânerie*; Baudelaire would have included it in his theorizing if the science had been invented earlier. Ultimately, this dissertation is a *flâneur*istic look at the *flâneuse* in cinema.

FILMOGRAPHY

Cléo 5 a 7. (1962) Film. Directed by Agnès Varda. [DVD] France: Ciné Tamaris.

Double Indemnity. (1944) Film. Directed by Billy Wilder. [DVD] UK: Universal

        Pictures.

Eat Pray Love. (2010) Film. Directed by Ryan Murphy. [DVD] USA: Columbia

        Pictures.

Funny Face. (1957). Film. Directed by Stanley Donen. [DVD] USA: Paramount

        Pictures.

Gilda. (2000) Film. Directed by Charlies Vidor. [DVD] USA: Sony Pictures

        Home Entertainment.

Les Vampires. (1915) Film. Directed by Louis Feuillade. [DVD] France: Société des

        Etablissements L. Gaumont.

Midnight in Paris. (2011) Film. Directed by Woody Allen. [DVD] Gravier

        Productions, Mediapro, Pontchartrain Productions, Televisió de Catalunya

        (TV3), Versátil Cinema.

The Postman Always Rings Twice. (2006). Film. Directed by Tay Garnett. [DVD] USA:

        Warner Home Video.

A Room with a View. (2007) Film. Directed by James Ivory. [DVD] UK: Merchant

        Ivory.

Stealing Beauty. (1996) Film. Directed by Bernardo Bertolucci. [itunes MPEG3] USA:

        Fox Searchlight Pictures.

Under the Tuscan Sun (2003). Film. Directed by Audrey Wells. [DVD] USA:

        Touchstone Pictures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABRAM, S. (1997) *Tourists and Tourism: Identifying with People and Places.* Oxford:

Bloomsbury Academic.

BENJAMIN, W. (1969) *Charles Baudelaire*. UK: Verso.

BAUDELAIRE, C. (1964) *The painter of modern life and other essays*. UK:

Phaidon Press.

BEAN, J.M. and NEGRA, D. (eds.) (2002) *A Feminist Reader in Early Cinema.*

Durham: Duke University Press.

BEHDAD, A. (2001) Women Travellers in Colonial India: The Power of the Female

Gaze. *Victorian Studies.* 43 (3), pp. 522-524.

BORDO, S. (1993) *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the

Body*. Berkley: University of California Press.

BRODY, P. (2012) *The Real Midnight in Paris: A History of the Expatriate

Writers in Paris That Made Up the Lost Generation*. Anaheim, CA:

Bookcaps Study Guides.

BRUNO, G. (1997) "Site-seeing: Architecture and the Moving Image." *Wide Angle: A

Film Quarterly of Theory, Criticism, and Practice,* 19 (4), pp. 9-24.

BRUNO, G. (1993) *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map.* Oxford: Princeton University Press.

BRUNO, G. (2002) *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. London:

Verso.

BUCK-MORSS, S. (Autumn 1986) The Flâneur, the Sandwichman and the

Whore: The Politics of Loitering. *New German Critique, Second Special

Issue on Walter Benjamin* (39), pp. 99-140.

BUNDTZEN, L. (1990) Bertolucci Erotic Politics and the Auteur-Theory - from 'Last

Tango in Paris' to the 'Last Emperor'. *Western Humanities Review,* 44 (2), pp.

198-215.

CALLAHAN, V. (2005) *Zones of Anxiety: Music, Musidora, and the Crime Serials of

Louis Feuillade.* Detroit, Michigan: Wayane State University Press.

CAMPBELL, J. (2005) *Film & Cinema Spectatorship.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

CHARNEY, L. and SCHWARTZ, V.R. (eds.) (1995) *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life.* Berkeley, London: University of California Press.

CLAPP, J.A. (2008) The Romantic Travel Movie, Italian-Style. *Visual Anthropology,* 22 (1), pp. 52-63.

CRAIG, C. (2001) Rooms without a View. In VINCENDEAU, G. (ed.) *Film/literature/heritage.* London: BFI, pp. 3-7.

DESMOND, Jane C. (1999) *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DIMENDBERG, E. (1997) From Berlin to Bunker Hill: Urban Space, Late Modernity, and Film Noir in Fritz Lang's and Josephen Losey's *M. Wide Angle: A Film Quarterly of Theory, Criticism, and Practice.* 19 (4), pp. 62-93.

DOANE, M.A. (1991) *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis.* Oxon, UK: Routledge.

D'SOUZA, A. and MCDONOUGH, T. (eds.) (2006) *The Invisible Flâneuse?: Gender, Public Space, and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-century Paris.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

EZRA, E. (2010) Cléo's Masks: Regimes of Objectification in the French New Wave. In: ROTHEBERG, M. SANYAL, D. SILVERMAN, M (eds.) Noeuds de mémoire: Multidirectional Memory in Postwar French and Francophone Culture. Yale French Studies, 118/119, Yale University Press. pp. 177-190.

FISHER, J., 2005. Wandering in/to the Rubble-Film: Filmic Flânerie and the Exploded Panorama after 1945. *The German Quarterly,* 78 (4), pp. 461-480.

FLITTERMAN-LEWIS, S. (1996) From Déesse to Idée: Cleo from 5 to 7. *To Desire Differently: Feminism and the French Cinema.* New York: Columbia University Press.

FORBES, J. (2000) *European Cinema: An Introduction.* Hampshire, England: Palgrave.

FORBES, J. (1995) *French Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford
    Press.

FORBES, J. (2002) Gender and Space in Cléo de 5 a 7. *Studies in French
    Cinema*. Vol 2. pp. 83-89.

FRIEDBERG, A. (1993) *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern.* London:
    University of California Press.

FRIEDBERG, A. (1991) Les Flâneurs du Mal(l): Cinema and the Postmodern
    Condition. *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of
    America,* 106 (3), pp. 419-431.

GAUTHIER, P. (2009) The Movie Theatre as an Institutional Space and
    Framework of Signification: Hale's Tours and Film Historiography. *Film
    History: An International Journal,* 21 (4), pp. 326-335.

GIBSON, S. (2006) A seat with a View: Tourism, (Im)mobility and the
    Cinematic-Travel Glance. *Tourist Studies,* 6 (2), pp. 157-178.

GUNNING, T. (1995) Tracing the Individual Body: Photography, Detectives,
    and Early Cinema. In: CHARNEY, L. and V.R. SCHWARTZ, V.R. (eds)
    Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life. Berkeley, London: University of
    California Press, pp. 15-45.

HALES, B. (1996) Women as Sexual Criminal: Weimar Constructions of the
    Criminal Femme Fatale. *Women in German Yearbook*. 12.

HANSEN, M.B. (1995) America, Paris, the Alps: Kracauer (and Benjamin) on Cinema
    and Modernity. In: CHARNEY, L. and SCHWARTZ, V.R. (eds.) *Cinema and
    the Invention of Modern Life.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of
    California Press, pp. 362-402.

HAYES, C. (2012) Phantom Rides. [Online]. Available from:
    http://www.screenonline.org.uk/film/id/1193042/index.html [Accessed: 5 January
    2013].

HAYES, C. (2009) Phantom carriages: Reconstructing Hale's Tours and the Virtual
    Travel Experience. *Early Popular Visual Culture,* 7 (2), pp. 185-198.

HIGSON, A. (2003) *English Heritage, English Cinema: Costume Drama Since 1980.*

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOLMES, D. and TARR, C. (eds.) (2006) *A "Belle Époque"?: Women in French Society and Culture, 1890-1914.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

IVERSEN, G. (2001) Norway in Moving Images: Hale's Tours in Norway in 1907. *Film History: An International Journal,* 13 (1), pp. 71-75.

IZOD, J. (2006) *Screen, culture, psyche: A Post-Jungian Approach to Working with the Audience.* London: Routledge.

KIRSHENBLATT-GIMBLETT, B. (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

KOECK, R. and ROBERTS, L. (eds.) (2011) *The City and the Moving Image.* [E-Book] Surrey: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

MACCANNELL, D. (1999) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class.* Berkeley, CA: University of California.

MARTIN, A. (2000) Gilda Didn't Do Any of Those Things You've Been Losing Sleep Over!: The Central Woman in 40s Film Noirs. In: KAPLAN, E. A. (ed.) *Women in Film Noir.* London: British Film Institute.

MCCULLOUGH, D. (2011) *The Greater Journey: Americans in Paris.* [Kindle Reprint] Simon & Schuster.

MONK, C. (2001) Sexuality and Heritage. In: VINCENDEAU, G. (ed.) *Film/Literature/Heritage.* London: BFI, pp. 7-9.

MONK, C. (1997) *The Heritage Film and Gendered Spectatorship.* Sheffield: Hallam University. Close Up. The Electronic Journal of British Cinema. [Online] Available from: http://www.shu.ac.uk/services/lc/closeup/monk.htm

MOORE, C. (2007) Having It All Ways: The tourist, the Traveler, and the Local in "The L Word." *Cinema Journal,* 46 (4), pp. 3-23.

MOUTON, J. (2001) From Feminine Masquerade to *Flâneuse:* Agnès Varda's Cléo in the

City. *Cinema Journal,* 40 (2).

MULVEY, L. (1996) *Fetishism and Curiosity.* London: British Film Institute.

MULVEY, L. (1989) *Visual and other pleasures.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

PACE, D. (2005) The Golden Age of Paris: 1850-1900. Indiana University
    Bloomington [Online] Available from:
    http://www.iub.edu/~paris10/ParisOSS/D9_Seeing_and_Being_Seen/Publ
    ic_Life/d9_flaneur.html (Accessed 5 December 2015).

PIDDUCK, J. (2004) *Contemporary Costume film: Space, Place and the Past.* London:
    BFI.

RAPPAPORT, E.D. (1995) A New Era of Shopping: The Promotion of Women's
    Pleasure in London's West End, 1909-1914. In CHARNEY, L. and
    SCHWARTZ, V. R. (eds) *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life.* Berkeley,
    London: University of California Press, pp. 130-155.

REYNOLDS, S. (2007) Women's Mobility in Belle Époque Paris. *A 'Belle Époque'?:*
    Women in French Society and Culture 1890-1914. New York, Oxford: Berghan
    Books.

REYNOLDS, S. (2006) Vélo-Métro-Auto: Women's Mobility in Belle Epoque Paris. In
HOLMES, D. and TARR, C. (eds.) *A "Belle Epoque"?: women in French Society and*
    Culture, 1890-1914. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

ROBERTS, L. (2012) *Film, Mobility and Urban Space: A Cinematic Geography of*
    Liverpool. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

ROBERTS, L. (2010) Projecting Place: Location Mapping, Consumption, and
    Cinematographic Tourism. In KOECK, R. and ROBERTS, L. (eds.) *The City and*
    the Moving Image. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, pp. 183-204.

ROESCH, S. (2010) *The Experiences of Film Location Tourists.* Bristol: Channel View
    Publications.

ROFF, S. (2003) *The Panorama Effect: A Mass Medium is Born*. Homepage of Newman
    Library. [Online] Available from:
    http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/library/alumni/online_exhibits/digital/2003/panoram
    a/new_001.htm [Accessed: 2 December 2013]

ROLLET, B. (2008) Paris nous appartient: Flânerie in Paris and Film. *Film Quarterly,* 61 (3), pp. 46-51.

SAMPAIO, S. (2012) 'I wish something would happen to you, my friend!' Tourism and liberalism in E. M. Forster's Italian novels. *Textual Practice,* 26 (5), pp. 895-920.

SCHWARTZ, V. R. 2007. *It's So French!: Hollywood, Paris and the Making of Cosmopolitan Film Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

SCOTT, A.O. (2011) The Old Ennui and the Lost Generation. In *The New York Times*. May 19 2011. [Online] Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/20/movies/midnight-in-paris-by-woody-allen-with-owen-wilson-review.html [Accessed: 15 May 2014].

STEWARD, J. (1998) The 'Travel Romance' and the Emergence of the Female Tourist. *Studies in Travel Writing,* 2 (1), pp. 85-105.

STRAIN, E. (1998) E.M. Forster's Anti-Touristic Tourism and the Sightseeing Gaze of Cinema. In DEGLI-ESPOSTI, C. (ed.) *Postmodernism in the Cinema.* First edn. Providence, R.I.; Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 147-166.

STRONG, R.J. (1999) *Six English Novels Adapted for the Cinema*. University of Stirling.

THOMAS, G.M. (2006) Women in public: The Display of Femininity in the Parks of Paris. In D'SOUZA, A. and MCDONOUGH, T. (eds.) *The invisible flâneuse?: Gender, Public Space, and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-century Paris.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 32-48.

URRY, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze.* 2nd ed. London: SAGE.

URRY, J. and LARSEN, J (2011) *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

VINCENDEAU, G. (ed.) (2001) *Film/literature/heritage: A Sight and Sound Reader.* London: BFI.

WAGSTAFF, C. (1996) 'Stealing Beauty' - Bertolucci, B. *Sight and Sound,* 6 (9), pp. 54-55.

WOLF, J. (2006) Gender and the Haunting of Cities (or, the Retirement of the *Flâneur*).

In D'SOUZA, A. and MCDONOUGH, T. (eds) *The Invisible Flâneuse?: Gender, Public Space, and Visual Culture in Nineteenth-century Paris.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 18-31.