

Innovation in Defiance of Hollywood’s “Invisible Style”: Jean-Luc Godard’s *À bout de souffle* (*Breathless*, 1960).

Nikos Terzis, PhD

À bout de souffle: semiotic analysis of an innovative sequence as to the handling of montage and the male protagonist/film noir icon

Hollywood’s dominant, classical cinema is based on a set of *generic codes* and conventional *narrative devices* which act as *motifs* and cognitive schemes, such that we as spectators are taught/conditioned through repetition to understand mainly the story and identify with the positive characters in a more or less passive process. This mainstream narrative orthodoxy is channeled through the *cinematic genres* and aims to bring about clarity and unity through goal-oriented protagonists who function in a godly star system that foregrounds individual problems devoid of any critical social context. They follow a storyline that, except for small gaps and clearly cued flashbacks, orders events in a naive linear chain of *cause and effect*, thus obeying the norms of narrative closure and bringing about a reassuring happy end.

Peter Wollen (whose student I was at Columbia University), in his article: *Godard and Counter Cinema: Vent d’Est. Afterimage 4* mapped the *seven deadly sins of Hollywood versus the seven cardinal virtues of counter-cinema*, as follows:

Narrative transitivity (Sequence of events)	Narrative intransitivity (Gaps and interruptions, episodic construction, undigested digression)
Identification (Empathy, emotional involvement with a character)	Estrangement (Direct address, multiple and divided characters, commentary)
Transparency (Language wants to be over-looked)	Foregrounding (Making the mechanics of the film/text visible and explicit)
Single diegesis (A unitary homogenous world)	Multiple diegesis (Heterogeneous worlds. Rupture between different codes and different channels)
Closure (A self-contained object, harmonized within its own bounds)	Aperture (Open-endedness, overspill, intertextuality-allusion, quotations and parody)
Pleasure (Entertainment, aiming to satisfy the spectator)	Unpleasure (Provocation, aiming to dissatisfy and hence change the spectator)
Fiction (Actors wearing make-up, acting a story)	Reality Real life, the breakdown of representation, truth)

In my opinion, Jean-Luc Godard's *Breathless* aligns so radically all seven cardinal virtues of counter-art cinema for the first time in narrative feature films. *Breathless*, a film that managed to reach vast audiences, propels toward an inimitable, innovative spirit of playful *cinematic disobedience* in departing from the tradition of *spatio-temporal continuity* that grounds Hollywood's "invisible style." Although a well-established monumental film for some decades now, *Breathless* still strikes us with its immediacy, existential aura, syncopated rhythm, meta-filmic dimension, its innumerable self-referential elements and finally its inter-textual qualities (before the term inter-textuality was coined). Even though the semiotics of cinema does not exist as a coherent and unified system, we can selectively combine what is illuminative in semiotic film theory in analyzing the phenomenological power of filmic language in order to reveal the psychology and pedagogics of filmic sign-processes, as Anne Dymek prompts us to explore.

My semiotic approach mainly applies the Peirce/Wollen trichotomy, for it is Wollen the theorist who stresses for the first time "the relevance of the Peircean scheme to the study of film and makes some very suggestive remarks about particular examples of iconicity and **indexicality** [my emphasis], but the topic has not been widely pursued by other theoreticians" (Silverman: 1983: 24).¹ This interpretation was sketched out two to three years before Silverman could anticipate Gilles Deleuze's *Cinéma 2, L'Image-temps*, 1985 (transl. as *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* in 1989).²

But out of respect for materiality, let us first carefully examine the film itself. A detailed description of the introductory sequence is mandatory before we close examine the second sequence which will be our main focus. This is something that Deleuze, for example, never does when considering films in the context of his extremely ambitious general grand theory.

Breathless (À bout de souffle, 1960): semiotic analysis of the first and second sequence.

The first sequence, which precedes the sequence whose semiotic/aesthetic analysis we are to focus on, amounts to 12 shots. The first shot is of the greatest importance for all 12 shots. The action goes as follows: We see the *close up* of the newspaper with the drawing of a young woman dressed in underwear, holding with coquetry a little doll behind her, while we hear Michel off camera exclaim, "After all . . . I'm stupid. After all, yes, it must play that way, it must, it must." The camera, tilting up, reveals a *medium shot*. Michel, lowering the newspaper, appears smoking arrogantly; he lifts his head up looking left, then turns his face abruptly right with a decisive, exaggerated, masculine forcefulness, removes the cigarette, rubs his lips in the style of Bogart as



¹ "This is surprising since the emphasis in Peirce's semiotics on the mediating role of the *icon* would seem to have special pertinence to the analysis of cinematic signification. It would also seem to supplement the recent amalgamation of film study with Lacanian theory, in which the category of the "*imaginary*" figures so centrally" (Silverman: 1983: 24).

² Silverman had no way of anticipating Luc Moulet's idiosyncratic, casually written, occasionally ironic, sardonic article: "*The Green Garbage Bins of Gilles Deleuze*", 2000 (transl. in English in 2005), which claims: "...his philosophic polish masks his real skills. Deleuze can be passionate and invigorating, if you steer away from his stories about movement and time. He is like a Skorecki who thinks he is a Spinoza... The system is as void as his particular insights are often exciting and stimulating" (<http://www.rouge.com.au/6/deleuze.html>).

if he were signaling to someone (duration: 23" + 16 frames).³ We see a woman signaling to Michel with her eyes, while we notice a military officer parking his American car and walking away with his wife. Michel turns on the car's engine with some cables; the woman on the lookout asks him to take her with him. Michel then asks her what time it is; she answers, and he takes off alone.



Let's examine the very first shot. **1a.** The **close up** of the newspaper with the drawing of a young woman dressed in underwear, holding with coquetry a little doll behind her, signals very early in the film, and as an *index* connotes and announces, Godard's search for the *woman's code* that will follow the film's unfolding: the woman is thus conceived as a victim of language⁴ and consumerism, kept in ignorance, a subject that the filmmaker will investigate/expose/present cinematically and more thoroughly in his subsequent films of the 60's. **1b.** Michel with his unnatural, overplayed Brechtian acting, as if he is inside his role and at the same time outside of it, commenting on it (as a *connotative* comment on his role/character) makes clear from the very beginning that he is nothing else but a French actor who impersonates a *petit-gangster* (first degree of displacement/doubling). Michel in turn rubs his lips (an *index* that works *metonymically*), imitates Bogart, the prototype of masculinity in American gangster films (second degree of displacement/doubling). Furthermore, Michel's enigmatic words may function as *symbols/indices* that foreshadow cryptically/*connotatively* the outcome of the story, namely, his upcoming death. Here are a few observations:

With the exception of the first shot, the rest of the shots do not present us something innovative, other than the complete non-existence of a shot that informs us about the *spatial* associations of the action taking place. Furthermore, the first four alternating shots of Michel and the woman on the lookout do not present a clear *eye line direction match* in the order of visual communication, while we get the impression that the two of them are close to each other, which is a false impression as the next shots reveal. All these create an estranging, waking up and alienating effect on the viewer.











To summarize, this controversial film opens with a shot that is very peculiar, enigmatic, self-referential, intertextual and very semiotic, indeed. Instead of having an introductory shot followed by other that would introduce the main characters and progressively initiate the story with an *analytical editing* as in classical American film noir, we have a jump into the middle of a critical action. Furthermore, this shot is full of visual and aural *connotative signs*. First, in the visual/drawing in the newspaper of a young, coquettish woman holding a doll, we get the first visual *connotative sign* about the code of women as somnambulists. Second, the cryptic/enigmatic *connotative* utterance of the male protagonist (whose face is hidden by the newspaper while he speaks), proclaims cryptically of what is yet to come, namely, his doom, as we could expect, since his persona is an amalgam of film noir characters. Third, his post-Brechtian overplayed masculinity, expressed through the *unnatural/unrealistic* visual side of his

³ Michel is only an "acting thug" modeled after the thugs portrayed in 1930s film noir by the likes of Humphrey Bogart. Humphrey Bogart had a natural tick of running his thumb over his lips. This action doesn't come from any particular movie or role, but from Bogart himself. Godard uses the thumb/lip rub as an acknowledgment of the iconography of Bogart and the hard-boiled gangster associated with him.

⁴ Patricia asks questions inexcusable even for an uneducated woman, such as when she asks Belmondo: "What is a Horoscope?"

performance, reminds us that what we see is a filmic construction (and thus, it functions *connotatively/indexically* as a *self-reference* and an *alienating device*). And last but not least, Michel, rubbing his lips in the style of Bogart, operates as an *intertextual/connotative/indexical sign*, creating a *meta-language* looming above the *storyline* and the *diegetic elements* yet to come.

Now let's examine the second sequence, which presents most of the aesthetic innovations of this remarkable film, warning that our experience seeing it will be like no other.

	<p>End of dissolve. [13]. Long travelling shot of a provincial road through the wind shield of the American car Michel just stole. Michel off is singing: <i>lala lala lala... la la... Buenos notses me amor...</i> (dur: 18" + 3 fr.). [14]. $\frac{3}{4}$ tight medium shot framing Michel (from behind), who has turned to look back. Michel:</p>	
	<p>[15]. Long travelling shot of cars on the road. Michel goes on singing till shot #16. Michel off: <i>Pa...Pa papa...papapa...Paaaaatriicia... Patriiiciaaaa...</i> (dur: 1"). [16]. Long travelling shot of the road. Michel passes by a petrol track. (dur: 1" + 19 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[17]. Long travelling shot of the road. Michel passes by a car. (dur: 1" + 8 fr.). [18]. Long travelling shot of the road. Michel passes by another car. (dur: 1"+1 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[19]. $\frac{3}{4}$ close up shot of Michel smoking while driving. (dur: 3" + 14 fr.). [20]. Long travelling shot of the road. Michel off: <i>I pick up the cash. I ask Patricia yes or no, and then... (singing) Buena's notses me amorrr... Milano, Genova, Rome...</i>(dur: 12" + 15 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[21]. Long 150° pan left to right, frames Michel's car driving away with a long liberating sound of its horn... (dur: 6" + 14 fr.). [22]. $\frac{3}{4}$ tight medium shot of Michel looking outside first left, then right. He turns on the radio (music). Michel off: <i>The countryside's is nice.</i>(dur: 8" + 14 fr.).</p>	

	<p>[23]. Long $\frac{3}{4}$ Michel's p.o.v. diagonal travelling shot of the countryside. Michel off: <i>I really like France.</i> (dur: 6" + 21 fr.). [24]. Medium shot of Michel in profile driving and smoking. He turns four times to the camera,⁵ proclaiming with scoffing voice! Michel: <i>If you don't like the sea, if you don't like the mountains, if you don't like the city, then get stuffed.</i> dur: 14" + 23 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[25]. Jump Cut. Travelling pan right. Medium profile shot of Michel ends to a long shot of the street. 2 girls are standing at the right side of the street. Michel off: <i>Ahaa... little girls trying to hitch a ride!</i> Pan left to a medium shot of Michel. (dur: 9" + 18 fr.). [26]. Jump Cut. Medium shot of Michel in profile. Michel: <i>I'll charge a kiss per kilometer.</i> (dur: 2" + 15 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[27]. Long travelling shot, approaching the girls. Pan right framing them, while Michel slows down and finally passes them, commenting. Michel: <i>The short one is not bad. She has nice thighs. But the other one.</i> (dur: 8" + 3 fr.). [28]. $\frac{3}{4}$ tight medium shot of Michel who is looking at the girls as he moves on. Michel: <i>shit... they are too ugly...</i> Michel turns front, finds a music station on the radio. Pan right. (dur: 9" + 5 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[29]. Jump Cut. Michel with his right hand pulls out a revolver from the car's cabinet. (dur: 2" + 20 fr.). [30]. Jump Cut. He points the gun to the mirror, then at several targets. Michel off: (imitating the bullet's sound) pa... pa...pa... (dur: 12" + 4 fr.).</p>	
	<p>[31]. Jump Cut. Michel looks right. Pan right while he points the gun to the sun. Michel: <i>The sun is beautiful.</i> (dur: 5" + 20 fr.). [32]. High angle, travelling shot of the sun whose beams glitter through the foliage. A gun shot is heard. (dur: 3" + 17 fr.).</p>	

⁵ **Fourth wall:** Speaking directly to or otherwise acknowledging the audience through a camera in a film or television program, or through this imaginary frontal wall in a play, is referred to as "breaking the fourth wall" and is considered a technique of *metafiction*, as it penetrates the boundaries normally set up by works of fiction.



[33]. **Medium shot** of Michel. **Michel:** *Women are such cowards behind the wheel. Overtake them. Oh, there are road works. Never use the breaks. As old Bugatti said: "Cars are made to run, not to stop".* (dur: 23" + 23 fr.). [34]. **Very short tight shot** of the front part of Michel's car that enters the frame



from left side. (dur: 1" + 1 fr.).



[35]. A **tight shot** frames the right part of Michel's windshield. Two policemen on their motorcycles parked at the right side of the street. **Michel:** *Shit... cops.* (dur: 2" + 2 fr.).



[36]. **Dynamic tight shot** of Michel's car speeding up, passing the track right to left. (dur: 22 fr.).



[37]. Rapid **pan left** from Michel's back to the back of his car framing the track and the cops that come after him on their motorcycles. (dur: 4" + 7 fr.). [38]. **Jump Cut.** Same with shot 37, only the cops are closer. Rapid **pan right** that ends as it reaches Michel's back. (dur: 3" + 17 fr.).



[39]. **Full Shot, 120° pan right** of Michel's car passing by fast another car. (dur: 1" + 13 fr.). [40]. **Full Shot, 120° pan left** with the two policemen on their motorcycles roaring past. (dur: 1"+ 13 fr.).



[41]. **Medium long shot.** Michel's car turns off the main road down the slope of a dirt road. **Pan right to a medium shot** of the car stopping. **Michel:** *Oh, my clamps have come off.* (dur: 5" + 6 fr.). [42]. **Long shot.** A policeman passes along the main road left to right. **Michel off:** *The fools have fallen into*



the trap. (dur: 19 fr.).



[43]. **Medium shot.** Michel goes to the front of the car. He opens bonnet and begins to fiddle the engine. He hears the noise of the motorcycle and looks to the main road upfront. (dur: 5" + 1 fr.). [44]. **Medium long shot.** The second motorcyclist policeman passes along the main road left to right. (dur: 1" + 4 fr.).





[45]. **As in 43.** Michel continues to fiddle with some car cables; hearing motorbike noise getting louder he looks up front. (dur: 4" + 22 fr.). [46]. **Medium long shot** like 42. The second policeman motor-cyclist rides down the slope of the dirt road towards Michel's car. We hear the squeal of his brakes that runs over the beginning of the next shot. (dur: 3" + 12 fr.).



[47]. **Wide medium shot.** Michel runs back to the passenger's door and leans in through the open window. A shadow gets in the frame and casts on him few tenths of a second before the shot ends. (dur: 3" + 12 fr.). [48]. **Close up** Michel's face. **The camera tilts down** first over his hat and then on to his face.



Policeman off: (the voice doesn't sound like Michel's, whose lips are not moving, anyway): *Don't move or I'll shoot.* (dur: 1" + 20 fr.).



[49]. **Extreme close up, pan right** along Michel's arm holding a gun. He cocks the gun. (dur: 1" + 19 fr.). [50]. **Extreme close up, pan right.** The pan continues to the right along the revolver's barrel. We hear the sound of the gun being cocked. (dur: 1" + 5 fr.).



[51]. **Plan Americain.** The sound of the gun firing. The policeman barely glimpsed, falls comically backwards into the trees, clutching a branch which he breaks off. (dur: 2" + 9 fr.). [52]. **Long shot, pan left.** Michel is running across a bare country field. A dramatic music score overtakes the soundtrack and climaxes bridging the next scene. Fade out. (dur: 16" + 12 fr.).



Let us now first consider the stylistic techniques that this sequence shares in common with Hollywood's industrious, conventional mode of narration, before we examine how it specifically transforms cinematic language:

- 1) The use of short duration shots (42, 44) and their alteration with shots of longer duration, as with shots 41, 43, 45, creates pace, and then shot 46 allows a break in rhythm, with the policeman turning to the dirt road following Michel's trails, climaxing in the intensity that the previous 5 shots had already developed.⁶
- 2) The sound of the guns being cocked produces as an *audible cut* between shots 49 and 50, and heightens the intensity of the action. 3) The final loosening of intensity with shot 52, bringing the dramatic musical bridge at the end of the sequence—at least ten times longer than the average duration of the short shots (48, 49, 50, 51) that it supersedes.

⁶ Let's notice the progressive increase in duration of the short shots (42 and 44), while a decrease happens to the longer shots (41, 43 and 45).

In sum, the *montage* of this film seems to take serious liberties in deviating⁷ from the rules of editing which the classical narrative paradigm strives to attain: hence, we are witness to Godard's challenge to the *spatio-temporal verisimilitude* of Hollywood's *invisible style*.

But it seems that we are jumping unnaturally from one part of the action to another. The shots often do not seem to connect with each other in accordance with mainstream Hollywood conventions. Let us remember, however, that the mere idea of *cinematic verisimilitude* is itself a convention, and certainly a manipulative one. What is, after all, the cinematic convention according to which cutting to a short shot of the pursuer permits the pursued to travel a distance incredibly long for the time that intervened, or again, the convention where the participants in a chase must be seen moving in the same *territorial grounds*? In general, cinematic conventions aim to sustain the omnipotent, narrative economy and the efficiency, clear cut, unambiguous, *denotative* semantic demands. Godard for certain does not aim to simply demolish those useful narrative mechanisms/devices, but to create more open and drastic ones, while pushing the existing ones to their limits.

Godard not only defies the never-ending repetition of classical narrative as it unfolds in commercial films. He also aims to employ *alienation effects*, on the level of acting and editing techniques that cause estrangement, thus pushing the viewer's logic to extremes. Due to the overall impression of an elliptic, unexpected, narrative structure, we get only what is necessary; just as we, as oblivious observers, perceive things unfold in the midst of real life, having to decipher the meaning by putting bits and pieces together, with no indication or any hints about what is going to happen; finally, without the comfortable, hypnotizing aid of an omnipotent, self-effacing, *invisible* director.

Godard's cinema does not offer us any kind of mystical insight, since it is enunciated and structured on the *antipodes* of the reassuring omnipotence of dominant classical narration. Hence, we must accept without any explanation that the policemen have tracked down Michel and that he suddenly decides to get off the main road without any clue of having to repair his car engine, and that he finds it proper—if not necessary—to kill the policeman! With this *elliptical montage*, Godard lures us to accept this sequence of events with the same ease that we accepted that Michel steals cars (exclusively American), that he refuses to take with him the woman on the lookout, although she was the accomplice who helped him steal the car, as well the two young women hitchhikers (shots 25, 26, 27, 28), not out of misogyny but simply because he found them ugly. All of this unfolds without any sociological or psychological explanation whatsoever.

The internal logic, the information and the insight that the omnipotent creator shares with his spectators in a classically constructed film is replaced for better or worse—by the spontaneous, discontinuous, and unguarded perception of a passerby who has much less knowledge about the action than we do. In a way, Godard seems to acknowledge that he knows his protagonist as much as we do and that it is impossible and inappropriate for anyone to pretend that he has the ability to predict the behavior of a character [whose nature is to be unpredictable even for himself] who invents himself moment by moment.

These remarks are the outcome of my detailed close analysis of this remarkable revolutionary *montage sequence*. We see the first *innovative jump-cuts*⁸ in the history of world cinema in shots

⁷ The critical deviations from the *invisible style* Godard uses are: severe ellipsis, breaking the axis, breaking the 4th wall, jump cuts.

⁸ There are two kinds of jump-cuts. The *forced logic jump-cuts* that Kreidl (1980) claims that Godard does not use, and the *internal jump cuts* that the ever daring Godard was forced to invent due to the fact that the first montage

25, 26 and 29, 30, 31, which, in becoming more extreme in shots 37, 38, demolish one of the most basic classical cinematic conventions, namely, spatio-temporal continuity. In shot 38, which has an identical point of view with shot 37, the truck that the patrolmen had appeared behind it pursuing Michel now disappears abruptly in the depths of the frame.

In shot 39, Michel's car passes by a car with scenic direction left→ right, while last time as viewed in shot 36, it was heading the opposite way: right→ left. Then, in shot 40, the cops who are chasing him on their motorcycles appear to drive after him in the opposite direction, breaking the 180° rule. Then again, in shot 41, Michel turns left on a dirt road, stops and off camera soliloquies undisturbed, justifying his stop *that the cables he had connected to start the car in the first place have been disconnected*. The previous shots of the chase *connote* that the distance between Michel and his pursuers is very little, thus justifying the unsuspected passing of the first patrolman in shot 42, at the point where Michel had turned off the main road, additionally creating the impression that the patrolman comes from the opposite direction.

All of these deviations seem like anomalies when set against the smooth flow and conventional, narrative logic of Hollywood's classical paradigm, as in a film like *Casablanca* (1942). But just as these deviations can at first be seen as defects, they acutely convey a sense of confusion because of the unexpected chase, the flight, fear, and underlying violence, while remaining within the borders of the potential configurations of real life. The use of montage in these shots presents the real visual experience of a passerby much better than would the style of a lesser director, who would bring to classical editing a conventional *spatio-temporal continuity* audiovisual scheme. Considering things on the plane of *montage*, Godard seems to wink at us, *connoting* that our usual perception of *spatio-temporal continuity* in cinema is simply an illusion, a *subsidiary crutch* in the mental process through which the spectator produces the meaning of a scene in a film.

Thus, by bringing to our awareness the essentially unrealistic nature of these classical conventions, Godard substitutes them with a fresher, raw, elliptic and direct recreation of the action. The action becomes even more elliptic, from the moment the second policeman turns back to follow Michel's trails on the dirt road. We see Michel rushing to the car and bending inside through the open window, and with 2 jump cuts, we see his face, his arm and a pistol at the end of his extended forearm; we hear a gunshot and glimpse the policeman falling down, unsuccessfully trying to hold a frail branch from a tree in shot 51. Shot 52 shows Michel running away in the country fields. What we have is shorthand coverage of the action that is raw, direct and functional with lyrical overtones and a sharp sense of parody.

A conventional American thriller would have treated the same scene with a *classical decoupage*, conveying every detail and even expanding time to intensify dramatically the action with the policeman, who after all is going to die. Instead of Godard's connotative treatment, we would at least have a shot of the policeman uttering the warning before the gunshot: "Don't move or I'll shoot" (that starts at shot 47—where if we are alert we can catch a glimpse of a shadow getting inside the frame—and ends at the beginning of shot 48). But due to the short duration of shot 51, we just see him the moment he falls from being hit by the bullet, as if we are catching an instance with the corner of our eyes, as if we were eyewitnesses, and glimpse the

edit of his film summed up to 150 min., while his contract with Beaugard, obliged him to deliver a 90 minute film! The jump-cut was actually first employed by Georges Méliès', *La Tentation de Saint Antoine* (1898) to magically evoke appearances and disappearances. Contemporary use of the jump cut stems from Godard's groundbreaking *Breathless* (1960).

funny composition of a body falling back, trying in vain to hold himself from a branch that brakes.

There is no sign of premeditation in Michel's deadly action. Moreover, from the very start of the sequence, Michel resembles an impulsive anarchist who risks everything and lives dangerously in pursuing his freedom. In order for Michel's actions to look unexpected, his deadly deed is presented indirectly and discontinuously by the additional intervention of 2 *jump cuts* between shots (48, 49 and 50). "Don't move or I'll shoot," threatens the cop *off camera* one tenth of a second before the gun shot is heard. Although we don't see the person who speaks, we attribute this warning to the policeman. We never see the surprise in the face of the policeman or even find out if he had a chance to defend himself. The director already, either at the stage of writing the script or at the cutting table, gave him no chance to do so. Nor does this kind of *elliptical montage* leave us spectators any chance to project our usually irrelevant or misleading thoughts. Instead of a threatening *close up* and a *two shot* focused on the victim at a safe distance, we have a *tilt down* from Michel's hat to his face with shot 48 (providing a lyrical treatment of Michel's profile), while we hear the warning without seeing the moving lips of the person who utters it.

And with shots 48, 49, 50, we finally have a studied and lyrical treatment of Michel's status as a *film noir icon*, face in profile, the extended arm, the gun, the ritual of his fingers while he cocks the gun, the superb click of the gun's mill, the deafening gunshot. And instead of having 5¾ of the total duration of shots (48, 49 and 50) to conclude in a fetishistic, elegiac treatment of Michel's persona as a gangster, the scene is saved by the comic nature of the cop's irrevocable downfall in shot 51. But the released humor is mainly the outcome of this specific *montage* arrangement: in frames 8 and 11. We can enjoy an intentional demonstration of heterogeneity, incompatibility and disharmony in the directorial treatment of the action, which, while opposing the classical portrayal of such an event, warns us not to rush into conclusions about any cinematic event or character, based solely on a previous experience of *our* surrounding world—in this case, the conventional, stereotypical mode of presenting things on the screen to which Hollywood has addicted us, in a Pavlovian manner, for long decades.

Selected Bibliography

- Andrew, Dudley. *Breathless*: Jean-Luc Godard, Director. Rutgers Un. Press, 1988.
- Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics for Beginners: Signs*. Un. of Wales, Aberystwyth.
- Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Indiana Un. Press, 1979.
- Articulations of the Cinematic Code*, in *Movies and Methods*. Ed. Bill Nichols. Berkeley: Un. of California Press, 1976, pp. 590-607.
- Metz, Cristian. *Essais sur la signification au cinéma* (1968-1972). Vol. II. Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1972.
- Film Language. A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Transl. Michael Taylor. The Un. of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Moulet, Luc. *The Green Garbage Bins of Gilles Deleuze*, 2000. (<http://www.rouge.com.au/6/deleuze.html>).
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. *The Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Harvard Un. Press, 1974.
- Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. Oxford Un. Press, 1983.
- Stam, Robert, Burgoyne, Robert, Flitteman-Lewis, Sandy. *New Vocabularies in Film Semiotics*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Terzis, Nikos. Chap. 3. *Nouvelle Vague-Cinema plays with Itself-Narrative Structure & Form in Cinema*), Athens, Editions Ion, 2013.

Wollen, Peter. *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. Bloomington, London: Indiana Un. Press, 1972, pp. 116-54.

-----*Godard and Counter Cinema: Vent d'Est. Afterimage 4* (Autumn 1972): pp. 6-17.