



THE CORSET AND THE HIJAB: ENUNCIATION, INTERSUBJECTIVITY, AND DRESS

FIRST AUTHOR¹

¹Author Institutional Affiliation, author1@mailserver.com

Abstract: *An important topic within the field of Fashion and Urban Studies today is the problem of dress as a form of communication, and its role in determining intersubjective relations which are the foundations of social interactions between subjects. In the global city, the problem of cultural difference and miscomprehension is added to this relation, especially when it comes to the matter of feminine dress and the forms of feminine identity resulting from it. Looking into the not always peaceful relations created between Western and Islamic feminine bodies in the global cities, this paper examines the corset and the hijab as a starting point to analyse the different layers of communication established between body and cloth, and different clothed-bodies. A mainly theoretical investigation, this work adopts the theory of Greimas on communication, enunciation and its roles; and the works of Marsciani, intersecting Standard Semiotics and Phenomenology, and Ahmed, who blends Phenomenology and Orientalism. Far from providing a finished answer to the problem, we propose an investigation on the possibility of inserting the study of those objects in the presented theoretical framework, with the aim of outlining the approach of dress from an intersubjective point of view.*

Keywords: *Enunciation, Corset, Hijab, Intersubjectivity, Orientalism, Socio-semiotics*

1. Introduction

One of the dominant narratives in our media today relates to the irreconcilability of an opposition, born perhaps back in the day of the colonial expeditions: the one between West and the Orient. The way in which this opposition is presented, reiterated, and scrutinised, is largely connected to the problem of dress: different from other forms of cultural manifestation, which require time to be observed and assessed, what we wear is immediately available to the gaze of others, and is also the first place where an idea of *who we are* starts to be formed.

It is important, thus, to begin by admitting this paper starts from the premise that dress can be understood as a form of communication and, thus, clothes are not mere inanimate objects: the theoretical scope in which this work is written admits that actants are not just humans, but could be anything or anyone acting or suffering action. Dress, thus, has a strong case to be understood as an active subject in human communication, not only because it “speaks,” to a certain extent, but because it works on and with the body, transforming its silhouette, its shapes, colours, textures, and topology, and negotiating, meeting the body half-way to create an appearance.

The delicate exchange established between body and cloth is the first layer of an intricate process of communication, in which the result of the relation between body and dress is the starting point to the interchange between subjects, which forms the broader relations we call “society.” Dress, thus, on the side of being an important form of intersubjective exchange and communication, could be read as the foundation of social intercourse, if we consider its ability to create prescribed forms of interaction. What one wears, to a large extent, determines the manners in which other bodies and subjects should interact

(or not interact) with them, which comprises their gender, their social conditions and roles, their place in the world.

At the global metropolis, another challenge is added to this complex interactive chain, which is the one of cultural miscegenation and contamination, but also cultural miscomprehension. In cities where people from all the corners of the world have to find ways of living together, codes belonging to different cultural systems are freely read and interpreted, and become a fertile ground for both collaborations and polarisations. In this chaotic context, two historical objects, and yet strongly present in our day and age, the corset and the hijab seem to continue to be key techniques of femininity, and, at the same time, strong emblems of the cultural systems in which they were born.

Epitomising an entire set of ideas and ideologies relating to women and social roles, the corset and the hijab are not as opposing or contradicting as we like to believe they are. Sharing more characteristics than we like to admit, both forms of clothings carry the weight of their worlds in their shoulders: forced to mean “everything to everyone” in different moments of their history, both “objects” possess a complex trajectory as techniques of femininity which carry, in their manifestations, prescribed behaviours of both the one who wears and the ones who gazes, and the simultaneous meaning of freedom and oppression. Likewise, both forms of dress encompass moments of “rise and fall” of societies, being associated with both the “golden era” of a certain social configuration, and the backwardness of its institutions – both meaning the ultimate oppression of women, and their struggle for emancipation.

The complexity of the bold parallel we aim at establishing in this paper demands methodological and theoretical flexibility and, following the singularity of the global city and the identities it produces, we propose an intersection between intersected theories: Francesco Marsciani's overlapping between Husserl's intersubjectivity and Greimas' enunciation; and Sarah Ahmed's crisscrossing of Merlau-Ponty's phenomenology with Said's Orientalism. Admitting that Greimas' semiotics is the foundation of my theoretical approach, that is still the strongest foundation of this work, especially his statements about the Actants, Actors and Figures, and, naturally, the *Dictionnaire*. Instead of the analysis of this or that specific object, this paper aims at reflecting on the method instead, which could be read as a first attempt at outlining a theoretical approach. Far from being the result of finished research, the work presented here contains more questions than answers, as is the nature of any work-in-progress. The following items, thus, attempt at laying the first stones on two problems, which relate first to the approximation, rather than opposition, between Western and Islamic techniques of dress (and, consequently, of femininity); and the possibility of an intersection between Semiotics, Phenomenology, and Orientalism in the study of communication, intersubjectivity, and dress.

2. Enunciation, Intersubjectivity, and Dress

In the *Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage, communication* is defined as a form of intersubjective exchange in which meaning and signification are produced (Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 45-8). Therefore, the concept doesn't relate to the mere transmission of knowledge, but to an act performed between subjects. One of the structures through which communication happens is defined, in the *Dictionnaire, enunciation*, which is addressed as a “situation of communication” (Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 126), or a “mediating instance” through which the virtualities of language are put in discourse (Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 126).

Although concerned mainly with verbal communication, it doesn't require effort to understand the possibility of employing the same concepts in the study of dress: the apprehension of the clothed body is, likewise, an act of *enunciation*, as much as the communication established between dress and body can be understood in the same fashion: the entire relationship determined by dress is pervaded by acts of communication, in which dress and body signify, in act, through their interaction with each other, and the interaction between clothed body and the body which apprehends.

One important aspect of that theory and concept of communication, it is important to remark, is the recognition of the roles interchangeability. As noted by Francesco Marsciani in *Soggettività e Intersoggettività tra Semiotica e Fenomenologia*, Greimas' notion of the *enunciation subject* is not the

enunciator alone, or the one who speaks, but the presupposed pair, enunciator-enunciatee, and the established solidarity between them (Marsciani, 2013; Greimas & Courtés, 1993). Marsciani moves forward, by overlapping this notion with Husserl's concept of intersubjectivity, in which the roles of subject, object, and other are also interchangeable: one individual can be simultaneously the "I" in his own narrative, but the "you" in an enunciation act, or the "he" of someone else's world (Marsciani, 2013), a similar notion to the conclusions I reached in my work about the corset, when stating body and dress can also interchange the roles of subject and object, depending on the point of view adopted in the analysis (Jardim, 2014).

Thus, there are grounds for expanding the concept of communication to acts of intersubjective exchange other than verbal language, and also to address clothing not as an *object*, but as an *actant* – the one who performs or suffers the act (Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 3), and which can assume, in the interaction, the role of enunciator as well as the one of enunciatee. It is important to repeat, however, that the roles of the presupposed pair enunciator-enunciatee are in constant interchange throughout the act of enunciation, and the same is true when it comes to understanding dress as an enunciation act: body and dress take turns, the body at times shaping dress, and being shaped by dress at others, and vice versa.

Such relation, however, is not limited to the dynamics between body and dress: the clothed-body, formed through the union of body and dress, is also a term which can assume both of the roles in the enunciation act, or to exist within the interchangeable role of subject and object in a broader social logic. It is in the different layers of this complex interaction between body and dress, and clothed-body and other subjects, that the social role of dress is denounced. In other words, dress can *act* both as the enunciator end of communication – the one more commonly identified with the expression in communication – and as the enunciatee, which "receives" the messages from the body. And so can the body be both expression, the one who speaks to dress, and call, the one who "receives" dress; and, finally, clothed-body, as one actant subject, exists likewise at both ends in its intersubjective exchange with other actants in society.

Ana Claudia de Oliveira addresses the issue of the clothed body when analysing the visual process of appearances. For the semiotician, the body is not an "empty support" to dress: it is, on the contrary, an instance which interacts with the clothing formants, and acts through its different configurations, which include the gesture, the posing, and the movements (Oliveira, 2011). This composed syntagma, the clothed-body, is what permits dress to complete its meaning (Oliveira, 2011), and I add that is also what permits the body to complete its meaning. Together, body and dress manifest the modes of being in the world, which takes place in the interchange – or, perhaps, the negotiations? – between body and dress. Such subject who negotiates its appearances between their body and their dress, is the syncretic subject who meets other syncretic subjects, facing the same forms of relations and acts of communication.

When adding Orientalism to the equation, another layer is included in the problem we presented so far. On the one hand, the exchanges between body and dress continue to play a role in creating meaning in the interaction between clothes and the one who wears them, and, together, body and cloth construct meaningful appearances which determine, to a large extent, the social interactions of bodies. However, such manifestations are no longer determined by the relationship between body and cloth itself, or read within the same system of values producing those manifestations: the intersubjective exchange between Western and Oriental bodies happens, in today's metropolis, in presence and in act, and such "alien" manifestations are apprehended according to opposing systems of values.

A challenge, thus, is posed to the problem of dress as communication: in the Babel Tower of contemporary cities, where different nationalities, languages, and customs are forced to live together, clothing is probably the first place where miscomprehension happens, where codes are no longer able to be read "correctly," but are necessarily apprehended "out of context," outside the systems in which those manifestations were once imagined. Secondly, to speak of contemporary culture is, necessarily, to admit contamination, resignification, and dessemantisation, in a moment when dress tries to go the opposite way, striving to ressemantise meanings long lost: the ultra-femininity of the Victorian Era as the epitome of a "Western way of life," on one side; and the ultra religiosity of the Islamic Revival, as its nemesis.

3. The Corset and the Hijab

More than forms of dress chosen “by chance” from the two cultures we are aiming at comparing and placing into a situation of communication, the corset and the hijab are emblems of dress and other cultural practices born in their respective cultural contexts. Apart from manifesting ideas and techniques of femininity, or “typical appearances” of women in this or that geographical location, corset and hijab also manifest ideas of intersubjective exchange, by prescribing manners in which bodies should be apprehended or inter-acted with. In other words, I chose those two techniques of dress and feminine appearance due to a particular characteristic uniting them both: the manner in which they form the body, through the establishment of a multilayered communicational process comprising the relations between the subject and their dress, but also by deeply affecting the acts of communication the resulting clothed-body will both suffer (as enunciatee) and perform (as enunciator).

Starting with the corset, our extensive work about that form of clothing revealed its imbricated connection with the concept of the procreating female: by altering the proportions of the body, the reduced waistline creates an important visual contrast, which produces the effect of enlarged breasts and hips, a plastic composition associated with the idea of increased fertility, combined with the potential to bear and give birth to children (Jardim, 2014). Throughout the corpus of dresses we analysed then, the most traditional manifestations of the feminine body in Western culture prescribed heterosexual interactions with the clothed-body, aiming at highlighting the places of the body relating to its procreative, sexualised places. Such visual operations happened through relations of topo-hierarchy (Hammad, 1986), a concept borrowed from the scope of semiotics of space, but appropriate to a study framing the body as a topological object: in a nutshell, dress creates operations of thymic valorisation of spaces in the body, signifying its importance over other places, which result in the privileged visibility attributed to them through the acts performed by the dress.

Centuries after, it is possible to perceive the resistance of such forms of topo-hierarchy of the body, when large breasts and hips combined with small waists keep coming back into mainstream culture and Fashion, even if the so-called “high fashion” continues to reject such bodies (Church-Gibson, 2011). A controversial topic, in times of *Slutwalk* and its slogans which claim “my body, my rules,” but it is important to revive Greimas, when he claims: “That the complex isotopy of the discourse is provoked by the conscious intention of the speaker, or that it is installed at its source, it doesn’t change a thing at the very structure of its manifestation” (Greimas, 1986, p. 98, our translation). Therefore, intentionally or not, the meaning created for and by those manifestations, as well as the prescribed relations which accompanied that appearance, survive and continue to replicate themselves. Not by chance, this form of dress was fiercely attacked by the First and Second Waves of Feminism, the 19th century claiming for clothes which didn’t include “differentiations between the sexes” (Tillotson, 1873, cited in Steele, 2001, p.60); and the 1960s focusing their efforts on gender-defining articles, mostly dress which purposed to promote a conformation of the body, and its resulting appearances, in the figure of Miss America (Hanish, 2007).

However, is it possible that to claim the same, when it comes to the hijab? When regarded as objects acting over the body, and producing prescribed formulas of apprehension and interaction, corsets and their variants seems to be closer to veils than us secular Westerns would like to admit. To begin with, both garments are recognised (and recognisable) forms of defining gender, as well as their presupposed roles in society: the corsets preoccupied with the reproductive potential, even if its action over the body can be responsible for the opposite outcome (Kunzle, 2004; Steele, 2001), while the veil, by preaching sexual modesty, manifests a similar concern with procreation – worried, however, with signaling that the woman is *not* available, but reserved to her one legitimate husband, an operation identified by Leila Ahmed with the origins of patriarchal societies in the Middle-East and their concern with passing on states and wealth (Ahmed, 1986). By doing so, both garments impose a certain form of seclusion, which creates an ambivalent value invested in women, signifying simultaneously their superior and inferior status. I will explain myself.

In both societies, Western and Middle-eastern, seclusion is associated with leisure and social privilege, for obvious reasons: if part of a family is kept in the privacy of the home, it can only be because there are

financial means to do so. Therefore, even if the corset became popular among other social classes during the 19th century, and the hijab is widely seen among working women now and then, in its roots, the extremely laced waist (Steele, 2001) and the heavily veiled woman (El Guindi, 1999; Mernissi, 2011) are both associated with a superior social condition, because they are directly connected with a physical impossibility of producing manual labour. However, the mere possibility of seclusion presupposes the “male provider” who is able to keep that woman in seclusion in the first place. In its roots, thus, both garments are invested with contradictory values, which can also be read as a contradictory feminine condition existing in both societies and cultural systems.

As for the prescribed interaction, even if that form of exchange is different, the veil fulfils the same role of determining how a body is supposed to be seen – or, in this case, *not* seen – and interacted with. In opposition to Western society, in which mixed social contact between men and women is encouraged and the space in where potential pairs are to be met, Islamic societies are based on the segregation of the sexes (Ahmed, 1986, 2011; El Guindi, 1999; Mernissi, 2011), and any “mixed” contacts should be limited to a minimum, ideally only between spouses, in the intimacy of the home. The heavily veiled body, thus, prescribes an interdiction of social contact, which explains why it is worn in public only: in private, between members of the same family or husband and wife, the visual contact is permitted and the outer garment is not necessary.

Regarding topo-hierarchy, it can also be argued that in the same manner as the corset, the hijab constructs a body and prescribes a form of gaze. The silhouette created by the veil redirects the gaze, again, to the outside of the body; when fully veiled, the monochrome, mono-material covering the body creates the shape of an arrow, which points outward and to the top, reiterating the religious commandments to preserve modesty, and reminding the one who apprehends that body to look above, to the divine, instead of below, to the profane or carnal aspects. The “contemporary” version of the veil, the commonly seen headscarf, used in combination with regular, Western dress, carries in itself a reduced, but similar prescription: by framing the face and creating a topo-hierarchy of the head, the attention is removed from the body and the reproductive potential of that woman, signifying her unavailability to sexual contact, and is relocated to the head: in both Western and Islamic systems of values, a space signifying the mind, the knowledge and faith.

4. Occident and Orient

As previously mentioned, the intersubjective exchange between those two forms of dress, which emblematises two opposed or contradictory systems of values, doesn’t take place in the space of equality, or free interchangeability between enunciator and enunciatee. The global city has one defined *addresser*, and it is the West: replicating the mentality of imperial days, the centre of the world continues to be Europe and, more recently, the United States, and the positions in the interchange between subjects is fixed, so much so that the West is positioned as a perpetual “us,” and other cultures are objects populating *their* world.

The mere use of the terminology “occident” and “orient,” in a world that is a globe always in movement, is indicative of the crystallisation of narrative positions. Sara Ahmed explores such issues in *Queer Phenomenology*, through the deep examination of both words, describing the relation between *Orient* and *Orientation*: the *Oriental*, thus, is the one who needs to find their way using a reference point, which is fixed – the West (Ahmed, 2006).

Such ideas of the Occident as a reference point surrounded by those who are *orienting* themselves pervades all the layers of cultural interactions: *our* way of life is a reference point, synonyms with the good, healthy, advanced, and civilised, and *others* are judged and measured according to the Western ruler. That is not less true when it comes to the matter of dress, and the cultural meanings it carries: the European idea of how each sex needs to be clothed, from the 19th century onwards, is more or less established as the idea of *correct* – or even *neutral* – form of *contemporary* dress.

To the enunciative positions, thus, a thymic component is added to the interactions apprehended from the perspective of a dominant culture, in which more Western means more euphoric, and more “other” means

more dysphoric. Which means, at times, that when manifestations of dress with ambivalent meanings are confronted, the euphoric aspects of the dominant will be highlighted, whereas the dysphoric aspects of the non-dominant will also be highlighted, a mechanism (or strategy?) promoting a widening of the opposition of two systems which are not, after all, so different from each other – at least not in which it touches the condition of women and the respective techniques through which femininity is realised – in the semiotic sense of the word (Cf. Greimas & Courtés, 1993, p. 306).

It is possible, from this point, to set foot in the territory of Standard Semiotics, recapping Greimas writings in *Les actants, les acteurs et les figures*, where the narrative relations between subject and anti-subject are presented (Greimas, 1983, p.51-2). In that section of *Du sens II*, Greimas specifies the “positive” and “negative” positions in the semiotic square are not invested with thymic valorisation, however, it is a common effect, especially in “ethnic literature,” the moralising investment of the same positions with values of “good” and “evil” (Greimas, 1983, p. 51-2). It is understood that the fantastic tale will take the point of view of the hero, which will push other subjects in the narrative to positions of *helper* or *opponent*, or even of *anti-subject*, once a polemic contract is established. However, different from the fantastic tale, although polemic relations are common in society, it is imperative to criticise the use of such narrative mechanisms in the social scope, by adopting a structure with fixed actantial roles¹. So why, then, is the position of anti-subject, of Other, and of Oriental always delegated to non-Western nations, whereas the West sits absolute in its dominant position, the *us* in the discourse, perpetual addresser, hero of the tale?

In *Living the end times*, Slavoj Žižek reminds us about the problem of measuring the degree of “civilisation” of a country based on the way they “treat their women” (Žižek, 2011). Now, although Westernisation was imposed during colonial times, with unveiling and adoption of Western dress among women becoming a sign of modernisation of a country (Ahmed, 2011), the naturalisation between Western womenswear and “modernity and civilisation” seems unavoidable, even if what that form of dress means – in plain English, the glorification of the “procreating female” – doesn’t translate into a necessarily civilised “treatment of our women.” To keep up with the dominant position, thus, the need for a myth of a superior status of the Western “liberated” women was imposed, even among the anecdotal references of the way in which women from the Victorian era were perceived among Middle Eastern women, in their queer constrictive underwear and heavy layers of garments covering it (Cf. El Guindi, 1999).

Therefore, it is possible to understand that the perpetuation of a West as the dominant position in a narrative is imbricated with the superior status of women in the West: our unquestionable and unquestioned *freedom* a sign of the civilisation and superiority of our men. Now, zooming out the intersubjective relation between both cultures, when considered from the perspective of dress, the presupposed pair Occident-Orient presupposes a “natural” contrary. If West will be homologated with the euphoric values of advancements, civilisation, and freedom, then everything Oriental will not only be considered from fixed narrative positions in which the role of hero is not available, but will also be designated the dysphoric side of the opposition, meaning everything backward, barbaric, and oppressive. And that includes dress: not only due to the historical facts of unveiling and adoption of Western dress as a sign of “advancement,” but also in the set of myths which accompany the “muslimwoman” and her unquestionable and unquestioned status of an oppressed being without agency.

5. Conclusion

This brief exposition aimed not at completely answering the complex question of the risky interchange between perceptions of Western and Islamic dress today, but purposed, perhaps, to start a debate – or a deconstruction, to follow Jacques Derrida. The choice of objects here not at all “innocent,” but explicitly resorting to discussions surrounding dress which are at the spotlight of our era, when the critique of both veiling (and its banning likewise) shares the stage with the controversy of “feminine empowerment”

¹ a similar problem is posed by Slavoj Žižek when addressing the problem of the Big Other in today’s political conflicts: although the concepts come from different philosophical traditions, it is evident that, as Lacan’s and Greimas’ works are connected, in their roots, so are the possibilities of using such standard theories, Semiotics or Psychoanalysis, in the understanding of contemporary social phenomena.

through sexuality (or its denial). This leads us to yet another aspect uniting corset and hijab, the fact that both are a topic of conversation everyone wants to have a saying, which denounces the belief that it is society's job to have an opinion on what women wear and do, or how their bodies are controlled and surveilled – which is yet another aspect in which Western and Islamic nations go hand in hand.

The recognition of the matter, thus, as a feminine issue, and not an issue of interchange between cultures, works against the goal of the present research, which is to explore how similarity is re-manifested into difference, creating and feedbacking into a system of presupposed relations: the Western techniques of dress means “freedom” because the West is a dominant culture, but the dominance of Western culture also depends on the Western techniques of dress meaning “freedom.” Another presupposed relation is created from that, in which, so that Western techniques of dress can mean “freedom,” Oriental techniques of dress must mean “oppression,” otherwise, the formation of a dominant Western identity is compromised.

Such chain of presupposed relations is not limited to those established by dress, but, as Sara Ahmed reminds us, starts in the very use of the words “Occident” and “Orient.” To be Oriental, according to her writings, is to be forced to have an *orientation*, which means being queer, in the sense of not coinciding with the given lines (Ahmed, 2006). In socio-semiotics, however, to co-incide is not a regime we choose: the realm of the accident (Landowski, 2005), the co-incidence of narrative programmes is not controlled at the individual level, but regulated by mythical or mathematical addressers (Landowski, 2005, p. 72). One could use this notion to simply conclude we cannot choose where we are born and the colour of our skin, but this concept can be employed into questioning the very events leading to Western culture, out of all the others, becoming dominant, and our manifestation of feminine oppression being elected to be the one twisted to mean freedom instead.

When addressed outside the scope of fixed narrative roles between Occident and Orient, the reversal of this opposition results in a large number of Western women converting to Islam, a phenomenon that could be interpreted as the roots of France's obsession with the niqab: as noted by Žižek, most of the women among the few thousands wearing full body veils in France are, as a matter of fact, European converts (Žižek, 2011). But is the reversal of the opposition the solution to this problem, to recognise the superiority of our “enemies” and Others? Or is the West in need of a deeper interrogation of the very structures it created, in which presupposed positions are necessarily invested with thymic values, and in which systems are necessarily binary?

References

- Ahmed, L. “Women and the Advent of Islam” in *Signs*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Summer, 1986). The University of Chicago Press, pp. 665-691.
- Ahmed, L., 2011. *A Quiet Revolution. The Veil's Resurgence, from the Middle East to America*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ahmed, S., 2006. *Queer Phenomenology. Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Church-Gibson, P., 2011. *Fashion and celebrity culture*. Oxford: Berg.
- El Guindi, F., 1999. *Veil: modesty, privacy and resistance*. Oxford: Berg.
- Greimas, A.J., 1986. *Semantique Structurale*. Paris: PUF.
- Greimas, A.J., 1983. *Du sens II. Essais Sémiotiques*. Paris: Seuil.
- Greimas, A.J.; Courtés, J., 1993 *Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette.
- Hammad, M. “Expression Spatiale De L'Énonciation” in: *Cruzeiro Semiótico*, n 5, 1986.
- Hanisch, C. “Two Letters from the Women's Liberation Movement” in: Duplessis, R. B.; Snitow, A., 2007. *The Feminist Memoir Project. Voices from Women's Liberation*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Jardim, M., 2014. *O Corset na Moda Ocidental*. São Paulo: PUC-SP.
- Kunzle, D., 2004. *Fashion and Fetishism: corsets, tight-lacing & other forms of body-sculpture*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Landowski, E., 2005. *Les interactions risquées*. Limoges: PULIM.
- Marsciani, F. “Soggettività e intersoggettività tra semiotica e fenomenologia” in: Leone, M.; Pezzini, I (a cura), 2013. *Semiotica delle Soggettività. Per Omar*. Roma: Aracne editrice.

- Mernissi, F., 2011. *Beyond the veil: male-female dynamics in Muslim society*. London: Saqi.
- Oliveira, A.C. "Visualidade Processual da Aparência" in: Oliveira, A.C., Castilho, K. (2011). *Corpo e Moda. Por uma compreensão do contemporâneo*. São Paulo: Estação das Letras e Cores.
- Steele, V., 2001. *The Corset. A Cultural History*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Žižek, S., 2011. *Living in the end times*. London: Verso.