

## 香港電影美術及服裝專業文化發展概覽

是次項目讓我們有機會透過六十段訪談管中窺豹，大致梳理了香港電影美術服裝行業的歷史發展，尤其是呈現了自 1970 年代粵語片復甦、直到港產片在上世紀八、九十年代進入鼎盛時期、乃至當下香港電影的轉型，這個漫長過程中電影「美術」職能與工作方式的出現、變化、發展，記錄了設計和製作的珍貴經驗，整理了電影道具、服裝、製作圖、模型等相關實物的資料來源，並探討了從業人員在社會歷史環境演進、電影工業變化、科技革新之下，如何憑藉其得天獨厚的中西文化背景與國際視野，從生活中汲取養分，將技術與創意有機結合，在實踐中靈活應變、突破困境，建立起獨特的香港電影美學風格。

在邵氏、電懋、長鳳新（長城、鳳凰、新聯）的片廠時代，電影製作中已出現署名為「美術」的崗位，但具體職能尚未被落實定義，拍攝中的佈景師、道具師、化妝、梳頭等亦都是大片廠製片體系中的執行人員，尚未真正發展成為嚴格意義上的「美術團隊」，電影美術風格主要取決於導演對美術的認知及藝術欣賞水平。七十年代中期，「美術指導」的職位在香港電影中開始零散出現；至 1981 年張叔平為譚家明執導的電影《愛殺》擔任「美術指導」，開創了較標誌性的風氣，進一步鞏固美指的職銜及權責。

或者可以說，「美術指導」職位的確立，是伴隨著 1970 年代中後期香港電影的蓬勃發展應運而生的。這期間出現了李小龍、許氏兄弟等類型電影熱潮，粵語片的復興，邵氏與嘉禾片廠的競爭白熱化，也湧現了打破舊片廠體制的香港電影「新浪潮」，香港電影繼而逐步進入輝煌時期，而「美術」（美術及服裝造型）這一職務也伴隨著香港電影工業的逐步完善漸趨發展成型。但「美術」這一職位究竟需要哪些專業人才勝任、「美術」到底應該具體做些甚麼、如何分工、如何具體執行每道工序，對於尚不完熟的電影工業，以及加入「美術」工作的所有人而言，卻都沒有甚麼統一指引或準則，皆是一個「瞎子摸象」的過程。

首先在職位門檻上，美術工作早期在吸納人才方面，並沒有肯定的標準，入行途徑五花八門，通常是通過親戚朋友介紹，也有人是毛遂自薦的。

彼時香港本地並無電影科系相關的大專院校，是故很大一部份所謂「學院派」的美術人才，都是來自於電影以外的本地相關設計專業，例如他們在理工學院（後改為理工大學）、城市大學、浸會大學、白英奇日/夜校、大一設計學院等教育機構修讀時裝設計、室內設計、平面設計、產品設計、工業設計、商業設計、實用攝影、服裝紡織設計等；亦有少數人才與「香港新浪潮」導演一般有著海外研讀電影或相關影視藝術設計專業的背景，他們帶著從法國、英國、美國、加拿大、台灣各地的學習經歷及眼界回到香港，加入電影工作行列，為業界注入了不少新

的角度和力量，其中後有成為大師級美術及服裝專才，明顯地影響了香港電影的美學風格發展及下一代從業人員。

也有一群原在邵氏片廠系統中工作多年的美術及服裝人材，在邵氏式微後投入獨立電影製作的市場；另一些人是從基層開始參與，即所謂「紅褲子」出身，他們的教育程度不高，如小學或初中畢業，年紀也很輕，如十六、七歲就開始做場務或製作助理，後有機緣轉型成為美術組成員；又有些人原本於劇組其他部門擔任製片、演員、副導演、劇照、場記、特技製作等職務，因個人興趣志向轉變專業方向，進入了美術組。

除此之外，有些美術人員原本於傳媒業、廣告業、時裝界、雜誌界任職，還有些原本從事裝修、機械、光學、印刷、製版、首飾、製衣等行業，非常多元化。

隨著香港社會的發展，本地不同大學增添了電影電視、視覺傳意設計、創意媒體、流動影像、動畫、插圖、傳理、道具製作等學系，孕育出不少後來加入電影美術行列的新血，連同在英、美高等藝術學府畢業回流的年輕一代的加入，使香港電影美術及服裝人材隊伍更具國際視野活力。

凡此種種五花八門的背景，從小學畢業生到大學碩士都是香港電影美術服裝的中流砥柱，證明當年或今日，加入電影美術工作並無特定門檻，在人才吸納方面是相當開放且大膽的。

這種現象其實某程度也反映了香港電影彼時的興盛——正因為有著數量龐大且製作費充裕的電影製作，求賢若渴的市場需求方才促成了各式各樣背景的人有機會入行；而即便有些人在相關的美術專業學習或經驗上有所缺失，也能夠在頻密的電影製作訓練中擁有「試錯」的機會，繼而迅速吸收、成長，最後成為獨當一面的美術專才。

除卻在吸納人才方面無統一標準，香港電影美術工作在一開始的分工也相當混沌。一方面因為電影工業尚處於雛形階段，美術分工並無標準可依循；另一方面，美術雖然在電影製作中獨立出了一個部門，但整體上的人員仍受制於製片部門——製片角度只是務求節約預算，便不會在美術組安排太多人手，換言之，香港電影的美術工作彼時其實一直受到來自制度和行政方面的限制。因為這些原因，美術指導有時要一人獨攬美術、置景、陳設及服裝造型等工作；而就算美術指導手下有安排助手，也只是一兩個人而已，即便是大製作也概莫能外。

這種局面同時也培養出香港電影美術團隊「一腳踢」、「一個打七個」的能力。不同於分工細緻、成熟的西方電影工業，香港電影美術人員在限制之內往往需要

一人包攬多樣工作，從概念到執行各方面皆需親力親為；除卻人力和預算的限制，在技術條件和資源上，彼時的香港電影也處處有所掣肘，而輝煌時期的香港電影卻常常需要製作一些需要特技和資源的大型商業類型電影（古裝、動作、奇幻等等）。香港電影美術人就是在如此的各式限制之中身兼多職，甚至用各種「土法煉鋼」的方式，務求在有限資源中淬煉出最佳效果——這其實在某程度上也反映了香港電影工作者非常靈活、應變性強、機動性強的特點，用美術指導梁華生的話來說便是「平、靚、正、快」，令外國同業大為驚訝。

而香港美術團隊的這份靈活性，一定程度上也是被香港電影最高產年代的創作生態所逼迫出來的。譬如很多人都知道香港電影的「飛紙仔」（臨時出劇本）現象，又或是有些香港導演會隨機更改創意，抑或是即興發揮，這些所謂的「爆鑊」（臨時出狀況）便更需要美術團隊們「執生」（隨機應變），在限制之內（時間、資源）提供臨時要求的相關佈景、陳設、道具、服裝等等——這近乎是一種變魔術般「無中生有」的過程。而正因為香港電影盛景年代在資源、預算、創作上的這些生態，才催生和訓練出香港電影美術人「乜都得」（甚麼都可以，沒有不可能）的精神，這無疑也是香港精神的一種鮮明寫照。

除卻上述所論的美術團隊在分工、工作方式上的「香港」特質之外，香港電影中關於「美術」職銜的稱謂也擁有著自己的特色——「美術」的稱謂其實一直有變化，後期甚至在翻譯上出現了一些混亂。

早期香港電影美術指導（Art Director）常常身兼數職，一手包辦美術及服裝造型工作，而後才分化出了服裝指導（Costume Designer）一職。隨著美術與服裝造型的分工、製作經驗的積累、與導演的相互磨合，美術指導（Art Director）在一部電影中的參與也變得更加宏觀和重要，甚至劇本階段已經與導演、編劇一起設計整體的視覺呈現，在「創作」層面無疑更加深入了，是故慢慢完善的香港電影工業也學習了美國的叫法，衍生出更高一級的 Production Designer 稱謂。部門架構通常為一名 Production Designer 之下再設立 Art Director 及 Costume Designer，由 Production Designer 負責涵蓋美術及服裝造型的電影視覺總體呈現，是美術部門最高職位的負責人。但在對 Production Designer 的中文職位名稱翻譯上卻出現了混亂，直至今日仍未達成統一，其中文譯名包括「美術總監」、「美術顧問」、「藝術指導」、「美術統籌」等等。

與此同時，1993 年第十二屆香港電影金像獎首次設立了「最佳服裝造型設計」獎項，Costume Designer 作為服裝造型部門負責人，隨著其職能的進一步明確，中文譯名由最初的「服裝指導」、「服裝設計」，轉變為更能突顯其特性——需負責服裝、化妝、髮型整體設計和效果掌控的「造型指導」、「造型設計」等稱謂。隨著電影工業發展變化，服裝造型團隊逐步擴大，分工進一步細化，從業人

員更具專業性及獨立性，加上近年來電影製作有時會請一位資深服裝造型師專門負責某幾位主要演員之造型設計，或只負責在電影前期籌備階段定下演員造型，因此服裝造型部門最高負責人的職位名稱，又相繼衍生出「Image Designer」、「Image Director」、「Image Supervisor」、「Image Consultant」、「Styling Supervisor」等。中文譯名除沿用「造型指導」及「造型設計」外，還包括「造型總監」、「造型顧問」、「服裝顧問」、「形象指導」、「形象顧問」等等。

而這種稱謂的混亂其實也帶著一點「香港特色」：一方面美術工種稱謂的增多也反映了香港電影美術職能從「一腳踢」到慢慢分工的過程；另一方面這些混亂恰恰也顯示了香港電影中美術職能的發展特色——香港電影美術就是如此這般從一片混沌之中慢慢摸索出來，從未有一套統一規整的工業邏輯，有時候學習了一些西方的經驗或稱謂，有時候又因地制宜隨時變化，便漸漸衍生出了這樣的局面。

香港電影美術從「瞎子摸象」到變成完整完熟的美術部門，正是同步伴隨了整個香港電影工業黃金年代的飛速發展到成熟的過程。香港電影美術人在這一過程裡，帶著不同的人生背景和經歷而來，懷抱著對電影和創作的熱忱，在一部又一部戲的實戰中學習和積累，在有限的資源和高速變化的壓力中見招拆招、攜手成長，及後而來的大量合拍片及西片製作，又讓他們在更龐雜的電影類型和製作生態中，與各個地區的從業人員互相吸收，取長補短。紮實的職業技能、靈活變通的特性、不屈不撓的態度，讓他們得以在香港電影工業面臨轉型和低潮時，在技術的革新與變化中處變不驚，腳踏實地走出了一條獨具香港電影文化特色的美術之路。

## Overview of the Development of the Film Arts and Costume Profession in Hong Kong

This project provides us with an opportunity to gain a grasp of the historical development of the film arts and costume industry in Hong Kong through sixty interviews. In particular, it presents the emergence, transformation and development of the profession of film art practitioners and their work practices, over the long period from the revival of Cantonese films in the 1970s, the heyday of Hong Kong films during the 1980s and 1990s, to the restructuring of the industry today. It also documents the valuable experiences of film art practitioners in design and production, and collates the information sources of relevant objects such as film props, costumes, production plans and models etc., while exploring the way in which the practitioners took inspiration from life, organically combined technology with creativity, embraced flexibility in practice, overcame difficult situations, and established the distinctive aesthetics of Hong Kong films with their unique East-meets-West cultural background and global perspective when faced with social and historical changes, transformations in the film industry, and technological advancement.

Although there was a position designated as “(film) art” in the production team during the studio era of the Shaw Brothers, Motion Picture & General Investment, Great Wall, Feng Huang (Phoenix), and Sun Luen, its role was not defined. The set designers, props masters, makeup artists and hair stylists were basically operational staff in the studio system, but they had yet to establish themselves as an art team in the strict sense. The artistic style of a film depended largely on the director’s knowledge and artistic attainments. The "art director" title appeared sporadically from the mid-1970s. In 1981, William Chang served as the art director of *Love Massacre* directed by Patrick Tam, initiating art direction as a common practice in filmmaking, which further consolidated the title and responsibility of art directors.

Perhaps it could be said that the establishment of the role of art director came with the boom of Hong Kong films in the mid- to late 1970s, brought about by several factors such as the phenomenal popularity of the genre films by Bruce Lee and the Hui brothers, revival of Cantonese films, the fierce competition between the Shaw Brothers and Golden Harvest, and the rise of directors of the Hong Kong New Wave who broke away from the old studio system. Hong Kong films entered its heyday, and as the industry became increasingly sophisticated, the function of film arts, i.e. art and costume design, also began to take shape. Yet the film industry was still a far cry from maturation; and for those who joined the film arts profession, there were no standard guidelines or

criteria for determining the type of professionals required for the position, their specific duties, the division of labour, and the execution of each procedure. The learning process was very much play by ear, or as the saying goes, “like blind men feeling an elephant”.

First of all, in terms of entry requirements, there were no standard criteria for recruiting film art talents in the early days. They entered the profession through various channels, such as referrals of relatives or friends, or by checking job opportunities and recommending oneself for the position.

At the time, there were no tertiary institutions offering courses related to filmography in Hong Kong, so the majority of film art talents of the so-called “academic school” came from local design institutions other than filmography, including fashion design, interior design, graphic design, product design, industrial design, commercial design, practical photography, as well as clothing and textile design at educational institutions such as the Hong Kong Polytechnic (later renamed the Hong Kong Polytechnic University), the City University, the Baptist University, the Caritas Bianchi College of Careers (Day and Night School), and the First Institute of Design. A few pursued film studies or disciplines related to art and design for film and television overseas, much like the film directors from the Hong Kong New Wave. They returned to Hong Kong from France, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada and Taiwan with new knowledge and insights, and joined the film industry, bringing in new perspectives and vigour. Some have become acclaimed art and costume specialists, and unmistakably influenced the development of the aesthetics of Hong Kong films and the next generation of practitioners.

There were also art and costume professionals who worked in the studio system at the Shaw Brothers for many years and entered the market of independent film production after the company’s decline. Others started out from the bottom ranks of the industry. They had a lower level of education, completing only primary or junior secondary education, and were at a young age, starting work as grips or production assistants at the age of 16 or 17 before having the opportunity to join the art team. Some originally worked as producers, actors, assistant directors, film stills photographers, script supervisors and special effect specialists in other departments of the crew, but changed career paths to join the art team owing to personal interests.

Furthermore, some art practitioners originally worked in the media, advertising, fashion and magazine industries, while others came from a diverse range of industries such as interior decoration, mechanics, optics, printing, platemaking, jewellery, and

garment, etc.

With social development came new trends: various Hong Kong universities added departments such as film and television, visual communication design, creative media, moving image, animation, illustration, communications, props production, etc., thus nurturing new blood who would later join the film arts profession. Together with the younger generation who returned to Hong Kong after graduating from higher art institutions in the United Kingdom and the United States, they brought a more international perspective and new vigour to Hong Kong's film art and costume workforce.

Whether they have completed primary education or are Master's degree holders, these practitioners with diverse backgrounds form the mainstay of Hong Kong's film art and costume industry. It proves that, whether in the past or present, there are no prerequisites for entering the field. The door is always open, and talents are accepted without reservation.

This phenomenon reflects, on a certain level, the prosperity of Hong Kong films at the time. It was due to the sheer number of productions with abundant budgets that there was an urgent demand for talents from the market, and people from all kinds of backgrounds had the opportunity to join the industry. Even if some lacked relevant professional art education or experience, they had opportunities for trials and errors from frequent production training, so they can quickly assimilate practical knowledge and come into their own.

Besides having no standard recruitment prerequisite, the division of labour in the early days was almost non-existent. On one hand, the film industry was still in its infancy, and there was no guideline for the division of art-related work; on the other hand, although the art team was established as a separate department in film production, its personnel on the whole was still under the authority of the production department – producers were only concerned with cutting down budgets and were unlikely to assign much manpower to the art team. In other words, work in film arts at the time was hampered by institutional and administrative constraints. For these reasons, art directors sometimes had to take on the art direction, set construction, set dressing and costume design all on their own. Even if they had assistants, it would only be one or two people; large-scale film productions were of no exception.

At the same time, the situation has fostered Hong Kong film art practitioners'

ability to function as a one-man band capable of taking up the work of several persons. Unlike the mature Western film industry with detailed division of labour, Hong Kong film art practitioners often had to take on a diverse range of tasks all on their own, handling everything from conception to execution themselves. Besides limited manpower and budget constraints, Hong Kong films at the time were also held back in terms of technological conditions and resources. In its heyday, the Hong Kong film industry often had to produce large-scale commercial films (period, action, fantasy, etc.) that required special effects and resources. Hong Kong film art practitioners took on multiple roles under these constraints, and even used a variety of untaught methods in order to achieve the best results with limited resources. This reflects, in some ways, the flexibility, adaptability and mobility that are characteristic of Hong Kong filmmakers. In the words of art director James Leung Wah-Sing, their work is “inexpensive, aesthetic, of high quality, and efficient” – much to the amazement of their counterparts overseas.

To a certain extent, the Hong Kong art team’s flexibility was adopted out of necessity as a response to the creative ecology during the period when the Hong Kong film industry was at its most prolific. For example, many are aware of the phenomenon of ad hoc changes made to the scripts in Hong Kong films, or that some Hong Kong directors would change their ideas or improvise on the spot. These impromptu incidents require the art team to play things by ear and provide the relevant last-minute requests of sets, set dressings, props, and costumes within the constraints of time and resources. It is almost like a magical process of creating something out of thin air. These ecologies of resources, budgets and creativity during the heyday of Hong Kong films are what nurtured the spirit of anything-is-possible in Hong Kong film art practitioners. Undoubtedly, this is also a vivid reflection of the can-do attitude that defines the city.

Besides the above-mentioned division of labour and work practices that are characteristic of art teams in Hong Kong, the film-art-related titles in Hong Kong films also have their own distinctive characteristics. In fact, the titles have kept changing, and there was even some confusion over the translation later on.

In the early days, the art director often took on multiple duties, handling both art and costume design. Only later was there a split in duties and the position of costume designer came about. With the division of labour between art and costume design, the accumulation of production experience, and the establishment of a smooth working relationship with the director, the art director’s involvement in a film became more macro-oriented and significant, to the extent that they would design the overall visual

presentation of the film with the director and screenwriter during the screenplay-writing stage, which undoubtedly spoke to a deeper level of creativity. For this reason, as the industry became increasingly sophisticated, the industry adopted the American terminology, leading to the creation of the higher-level title of production designer. The art director and costume designer would usually work under the production designer, with the latter being the highest person in charge of the art department, responsible for the overall visual presentation of the film, including art and costume design. However, there was much confusion over the Chinese translation of production designer, including “art director”, “art consultant” and “art coordinator”; there remains no standard translation of the title.

Meanwhile, the “Best Costume & Make Up Design” award was introduced at the 12<sup>th</sup> Hong Kong Film Awards in 1993. The Chinese translation of the title of costume director – the person in charge of the costume department – was changed from “costume director” and “costume designer” to “image director” and “image designer” to better emphasise the nature of the position – they are responsible for the overall design and effect of the costumes, make-up and hairstyles. As the film industry developed and transformed, the costume team gradually expanded, the division of labour became even more distinct, and the practitioners became more professional and independent. Furthermore, film productions in recent years would sometimes hire an experienced costume designer to design the image of several leading actors and actresses, or to decide on the actors or actresses’ images only during the pre-production stage of the film, spawning titles such as “image designer”, “image director”, “image supervisor”, “image consultant” and “styling supervisor” for the highest person in charge of the costume design department. Besides continuing the use of “image director” and “image designer”, the title is also translated as “image director”, “image consultant”, “costume consultant”, “styling supervisor” and “styling consultant” in Chinese.

In fact, this confusion over the title is somewhat a characteristic of Hong Kong. On the one hand, the increase in the number of titles reflects the Hong Kong film arts profession’s move from a one-man band approach to a gradual division of labour; on the other hand, the confusion is also indicative of the characteristics of the profession’s development. This is how Hong Kong film arts gradually found a way out from the chaos. The industry never had a uniform set of logic; at times, it borrowed the experiences and adopted titles from Western films; at other times, it adapted to local conditions by making adjustments whenever necessary, gradually forming the scenario we see today.

The transition of Hong Kong film arts from being in a “blind-men-feeling-an-elephant” situation to becoming a fully-fledged art department happened hand-in-hand with the Hong Kong film industry’s rapid development and maturation at its golden age. During this process, Hong Kong film art practitioners with different backgrounds and experiences upheld their passion for film and creative production; they accumulated knowledge and experience while working on one film after another, solving problems as they appear and growing under the stress of limited resources and rapid changes. Thanks to the large number of co-productions and Western productions that came after, they were also able to work in a more diverse range of genres and environments, absorb knowledge from practitioners from all around the world, and learn from each other’s strengths and weaknesses. With their solid vocational skills, flexibility and unyielding attitude, they were able to remain unfazed by technological innovations and changes as the Hong Kong film industry faced restructuring and headed into a downturn, forging an artistic path imbued with the unique cultural characteristics of Hong Kong films in a down-to-earth manner.