



**University of
Sunderland**

Cannon, Steve (1996) 'Not a mere question of form': The Hybrid Realism of Godard's *Vivre sa vie*. *French Cultural Studies*, 7 (21). pp. 283-294. ISSN 0957-1558

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/4985/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

'Not a mere question of form':
The Hybrid Realism of Godard's *Vivre sa vie*.

Steve Cannon

(published in *French Cultural Studies* vii, 1996, pp283-294
For this version I have translated any quotes that were in French into English)

'Not a mere question of form (1): The Hybrid Realism of Godard's *Vivre sa vie*.

'Anyone who saw me at work would think I was only interested in questions of form..(2)'.

The celebration of a century of cinema has seen a variety of bodies in France, from *Studio* magazine to the Gaumont studios (3), seeking out Jean-Luc Godard to gain some curatorial wisdom from a film maker who, though only 66 himself, has nonetheless frequently identified himself with the cinema or self-consciously displayed his awareness of its history (4).

In Britain the picture is rather different: few of Godard's recent films have been distributed and despite, or perhaps because of, his being championed in the 1970s as an exemplary exponent of a particular kind of radical aesthetics, he receives comparatively little critical attention.

It is the legacy of that declining critical trend, which might be neatly summed up as 'political modernism' (5), a theoretical edifice constructed in particular around the journal *Screen* (6), which leads me to return to Godard here. For while the proponents of political modernism drastically over-estimated the 'revolutionary' potential of Godard's post-1968 film making (7), their form-driven view of his work also, in attempting to set up an equivalence between artistic and political radicalism, involved a rather narrow reading of the films which made his reputation in the 1960s, like *Vivre sa vie*, seeking to trace back from Godard's committed post-'68 films a supposedly ever-present tendency toward radical aesthetic critique.

The German dramatist Bertholt Brecht has figured highly in discussions of Godard's work, in some cases being presented as an earlier paragon of political modernism, an

idealised model of the revolutionary artist, against which Godard's work could be measured (8) but this was accompanied by a much wider privileging of Brecht's formal concerns and a one-dimensional view of his contribution to discussions of realism within Marxist aesthetics (9).

I will begin my discussion of *Vivre sa vie* by outlining the influence of Brecht's dramatic ideas on the film and as we shall see the concerns Godard shared with Brecht are not necessarily those that formalist-inclined critics have emphasised.

The eclectic Godard picked up on the 'buzz' around Brecht in France which began in 1960 and mobilized some aspects of Brecht's dramatic ideas in *Vivre sa vie*. This was Godard's fourth feature film, very rapidly made and released in 1962, but was actually his *third* release due to Gaullist censorship affecting *le Petit soldat* (*The Little Soldier*, 1961), which had committed the sin of representing, however confusedly and schematically, the Algerian War. It was also his third film featuring Anna Karina, the Danish actress who was at that time his wife. She plays Nana a young would-be actress who ends up in prostitution.

Godard described the film as being constructed in 'tableaux'- 'in tableaux, yes: to accentuate the theatrical, Brecht side of things' (10). There are twelve chronologically-numbered sections in the film, separated from one another by a slow fade to black and a title-card bearing the number and a brief indication of what the subsequent tableau contains. Godard has no direct didactic, political purpose in distancing us from the narrative in this way (11), but, inspired by the silent cinema, whose visual impact he

sees as enhanced by 'sub-titles [which] had the status of a shot...the following shot could start all over again ' (12), Godard was seeking to create a space between the images, a resting point, a point of reflection which is where this technique does meet up with its Brechtian roots.

This creates a discontinuous structure, a series of self-contained episodes emphasised by the sharp swings of mood from one to the next which perhaps reduce cause-and-effect logic to a minimum. Indeed within those tableaux which contain more than one event or action, or which take place in more than one location, the individual segments are themselves separated by fades to black: these almost ponderous transitions, like the inter-titles between the tableaux, create visual, and for the most part aural, gaps or spaces between episodes, a 'stopping-starting rhythm' (13) which is repeated in the use to which Godard puts Michel Legrand's lyrical music, chopped into short fragments.

In the famous conversation between Nana and the philosopher Brice Parain, the latter makes a statement which seems emblematic of Godard's approach in the film: 'On ne peut bien parler que quand on regarde la vie avec détachement'.

This distance, in more directly Brechtian terminology, is linked to Godard's desire to 'remain outside' (14) of the subject of the film. This refers obviously to the potentially salacious issue of prostitution which Godard treats very matter-of-factly for the most part in the film, especially in the 'question-and-answer session' between Nana and Raoul on the conditions of the prostitute's life-style where the latter's replies are, apparently, taken from a contemporary sociological study of prostitution (15).

This 'exterior approach to things which might permit me better to communicate the feelings inside' (16) applies equally to the character of Nana, treated throughout as an object to whom things happen rather than as a conscious subject, making ironic both the title of the film (especially as it is usually translated - *Living My Own Life!*) and Nana's speech to her friend Yvette that 'I raise my hand: I'm responsible – I'm unhappy: I'm responsible.'

'Realism...is an old concept, much used by many people and for many ends (17).'

The central character's name is a reference back to Zola's 19th century courtesan and this is certainly Godard's most 'Naturalist' film in the sense of seeing Nana's fate as determined by her circumstances and also in its use of documentation, but the presence of Naturalist influences alongside those of Brechtian theatre are indicative of the fact that Godard's relationship to 'the real' is characterised by a complex and peculiar hybridity, drawing explicitly or implicitly from such further disparate sources as Bazin, *cinéma-vérité* and Italian Neo-Realism. It is important to emphasise that Brecht too was a realist, an artist interested in representing reality, in 'showing things as they really are.' As Terry Lovell points out, with reference to the four essays he wrote in the late 1930s, only published thirty years later, where, as a contribution to a wider debate about realism they were misread as uncritically championing modernism: 'Brecht's critique was mounted from within an epistemological realism which he shared with Lukács' (18).

In common with other directors of the *Nouvelle Vague* in the early 1960s, Godard

attempted to boldly take the cinema where no scriptwriter had gone before: 'we need to abandon the places where it is at the moment, and go where it hasn't been' (19). This involved the process of liberation of the cinema from its studio- and script- bound conventional constraints, a freer and more flexible approach to filming and also more urban-based, 'younger' subject matter and locations. In Godard's case it was also driven by a Bazinian desire to 'confront myself with true reality...' (20). Without Bazin's moral zeal for 'the truth', Godard nevertheless felt a responsibility in most of his early films to use only the given physical characteristics of the situation he was attempting to film, in order to 'capture the moment' (21): his films have turned out the way they have due to unforeseen circumstances or fortuitous encounters and Godard's methods of scripting and shooting, with no written scenario, merely some basic plot ideas which are filled out each day, allow him in a sense to 'capture the definitive by chance' (22).

This confrontation with reality is part of an interest in the confrontation or dialectical opposition between fictional and documentary elements, often taking place at the level of conflicting genres: Godard described *Une Femme est une femme* (1961), for example, as a 'neo-realist musical' and the conflict in *Vivre sa vie* is described as 'théâtre-vérité' (23).

But when Godard talks, for example, about interviewing 'real' people in his films (Brice Parain, Roger Leenhardt, Samuel Fuller, Francis Jeanson etc.) he couches it in similar terms, stressing that he uses them as objects, as a starting point for himself, not in a way oriented towards the spectator, a pole of 'the real' around which he can create 'the imaginary' so that he can 'oscillate from documentary to fiction - from Brice Parain to Anna Karina' (24).

In creating a fictional film, which follows the dramatic adventures of a fictional character through a series of events some 'unrealistic' (Nana's melodramatic and somewhat unmotivated end), some dealt with rather 'unrealistically' in cinematic terms (e.g. some of the café conversations - see below), Godard nonetheless starts from an almost naïve faith in respecting real locations (the cafés, streets and hotels of suburban Paris), using only the available light and the real sound from a single microphone which picks up dialogue, background conversations, clattering coffee cups, the jukebox and all (25).

It has rightly been suggested, however, that in seeking a 'return to simplicity' (26): the simplicity of the single microphone, of daylight and of non-studio settings:

Godard isn't so much positioning himself in an historical line with cinema-verite (*sic*) as he is *locating the film in the present tense*. This is a document about how things are now - in 1962 - these are contemporary images (27) (My emphasis).

This contrasts markedly with a fairly broad consensus on the film which holds that it is 'not about prostitution', that answers to questions about the social roots of prostitution must be sought elsewhere or that 'Godard does not even consider...social problems' (28). While clearly, despite the quotes from Sacotte, *Vivre sa vie* is not a document about prostitution, it would be nonsense to suggest that Godard is merely using such material for formal, improvisational purposes, or that the film provides us with no insight whatsoever into the motivations for prostituting oneself, the horrors involved or the day-to-day conditions within which it occurs.

Unlike many of Godard's protagonists Nana is working class and the film

demonstrates, however obliquely, that her options as a single woman (having left her husband) are few. Her desire to break into the theatre or the cinema is doomed to fail and she finds herself stuck in a low-paid job as a 'salesgirl with Pathé-Marconi'. Her inability to borrow the 2000F she needs to settle her rent leads to her eviction and in each of the first four tableaux this lack of money is emphasised in her downward spiral into homelessness, police arrest and finally prostitution.

The tableau featuring Nana at work in the shop is therefore extremely important. The title-card refers to it as 'Nana lives her life' emphasising her economic function and also establishing a parallel with the life she lives in the rest of the film, prostitution. This parallel is made even more explicit in the construction of the shots of her at work, suggesting that Nana is performing the same function for 'Philips-Kodak-Decca' (the owners of the merchandise in the shop, indicated on a sign above the door) as for Raoul her pimp i.e. providing a service aimed at creating profit, accepting 'anyone as long as they pay'.

Nana is behind the counter facing the 'client' whose back is always to the camera, retaining his anonymity; she is respectfully serving him in exactly the same position in the image as the later clients and, as in later encounters with men, her face is occasionally obscured, her identity obliterated, behind his head, or behind the pillars of the shop, as the camera tracks along the counter.

The film treats prostitution as if it were a job like any other, not only in the 'hours and conditions' dialogue between Raoul and Nana, but also in brief exchanges between prostitutes, complaining about the facilities in the hotel rooms or in Nana's letter to a provincial brothel-keeper which outlines her qualifications like any job application

would.

More self-consciously, Godard also draws parallels between prostitution and the cinema. They are casually linked throughout the film: in Yvette's description of how she ended up in prostitution; in the shots of 'actual' prostitutes lining the walls outside the *Maillot-Palace* cinema; Nana's being picked up in the cinema watching *Jeanne d'Arc*, her sleeping with the photographer in order to get a composite-sheet to send to film makers and her ultimate demise outside the 'Restaurant des Studios'.

Certainly there is also a problem here to some extent, in that Godard is extending prostitution into metaphorical terrain, suggesting, not for the last time (29), that it represents the basic condition of labour under capitalism. This is balanced however by the strong sense of enclosure and imprisonment which is created in the visual surface of the film and in the use of the camera. Fieschi (30) talks of Nana's 'imprisonment in the mise-en-scene' which, above and beyond any narrative motivation, conveys most clearly the severe limitations of Nana's social horizons.

The greyness and austerity of the interior images; the framing of Nana in the cramped corners of the record shop, against walls and against windows which are more barrier than opening are matched by the limitations even in exterior space, the Paris streets representing slightly larger prisons, with their barred railings and grey pockmarked walls, but prisons nonetheless: 'escaping-that's a joke' says Nana to Yvette.

The effacement, or even obliteration, of Nana's identity is also expressed visually as was pointed out above; now in a film which is concerned with identity, and indeed which seeks to understand that 'inside' from without, those shots which represent the

point of view of Nana are clearly significant. The most important of those occurs during Nana's dance after she has met the young man who momentarily offers her some kind of escape, the promise of love. This is one of the sharp shifts in mood of the film, a brief, almost ecstatic moment of liberation as she dances round the room to the jukebox, half enticing the young man but also openly rebelling against Raoul.

Within that liberating moment, however, we are offered a glimpse of the situation from Nana's point of view which ultimately undercuts her pleasure: indicating the limits, the enclosure of her situation as the camera passes around the walls and pillars of the room, swinging round to a window, black with the night sky and to the faces of Luigi (another pimp) and Raoul who gaze blankly at her, in the end still in control, because of their ownership.

The other point-of-view shots merely confirm this: shots of the posters, the streets, the walls and the prostitutes who line them. There is one further shot, repeated twice in the film which is arguably from Nana's point-of-view: the medium close-up of the groin of her first customer, his hand in his pocket ready to withdraw the money to pay her (which 'he' does in the second version of the shot, during the illustrative montage of images accompanying Raoul and Nana's conversation drawn from Sacotte) perhaps expressing her anxiety about the realities of earning money this way and, at a metaphorical level, brilliantly linking sex and money in one frame and illustrating the alienated sexuality of capitalist society.

That the dance occurs in a café is significant since the tableaux set in cafés appear to offer Nana's only access to some kind of collective, social life; it is only there where there is communication. Godard's exploration of that communication, in the café

conversations which feature in half of the twelve tableaux (and there are other forms of conversation in all of the remaining tableaux) provides a dazzling display of improvisation on 'how to film a conversation'.

Godard spoke of trying to capture the definitive by chance in the film, linking up with Parain's assertion that truth is found partly through error, and despite the fairly widespread but basically ridiculous assumption that the different methods employed in each conversation could be interchanged without altering the meaning of the film (31), it is clear that in each specific instance there is an interaction between our perception of Nana's situation and our reading of the camera angles or movements which creates a 'truth', which speaks meaningfully about her situation, about isolation and divisions between people, about communication across those divisions and about the ability of film to communicate about all of those things.

'I make these models because I wish to represent reality (32).'

One example will suffice to refute the suggestion that the forms of conversation are interchangeable: Nana's conversation with the photographer at the counter of a café is in mid-shot with the two side-on to the camera. While they talk, going through the preliminaries that will end with her accepting to sleep with him for the price of the photographs, the camera continually shifts its perspective, framing and reframing from only slightly different angles. While this is in one sense a direct contrast with the previous café scene, between Nana and her husband Paul positioned in a similar way at a bar but shot from behind with their words only just audible, it serves more importantly to express the edgy hesitation on Nana's part about the situation she is about to enter, a nervousness the unsettling camera movements lead us to share as she pauses on the edge of a precipice (it also sets up a parallel with the composite sheet he shows her, featuring

photos of an actress from all angles, thus implicating Godard in the predatory behaviour of the photographer). The static shot from behind in the first conversation, which indicates the separation taking place between Paul and Nana and also distances us from immediate identification with such emotion, would do neither of those things.

Equally ridiculous, and evidence of the kind of overestimation of the 'revolutionary' potential of formal experiment which has dogged work on Godard, is Michel Cieutat's view that in exploring these different means of filming conversation Godard is 'annihilating classic shot/reverse-shot' (33). The fact that Godard *uses* shot/reverse-shot as one of the many variations (in the Parain conversation) appears to have escaped him.

Godard *is* implicated in the sexist exploitation of women in the cinema. Not because, as Laura Mulvey suggests, 'the film offers an exotic perception of a woman selling her sexuality' (34) but rather because Anna Karina, like Nana, is objectified in the film, becomes merely another image to be juxtaposed with others, posed and explored from all angles (like the profile 'mugshots' of the credit sequence) and submitted to Godard's inquiring gaze. The fact that he self-consciously points to that personal aspect of the film in dubbing his own voice over 'le jeune homme's' reading of Poe's *Oval Portrait*, about an artist who creates such a detailed and life-like portrait of his wife that she dies when he completes it, by no means excuses or avoids it.

Apart from the remark on this film Mulvey's analysis of Godard's treatment of sexuality and his representation of women is extremely useful and perceptive, pointing out that even in his most 'progressive' films about women (which, on the whole, should include *Vivre sa vie*) he cannot avoid the contradiction of reproducing exploitative and

voyeuristic images in the act of interrogating such representations (35).

The tableau construction gives the film a very organised and controlled feel but this is in contrast to the expressive and experimental use of the camera, not only in the variations on constructing a conversation but also in the streets, where the camera often moves restlessly in one direction before doubling back to pick up some other object of interest.

This free-spirited exploration of screen space becomes at another level, and with markedly different effect, an exploration of social space: the space, the divisions between people and the space, or lack of it, around people and between people and the objects in their lives.

Thus in the inter-relation of Godard's restless and searching aesthetic sensibilities and the elements of contemporary social reality which make up one of the 'poles' of that search, he creates a film which is complex, fragmentary and ambiguous but which manages to 'bien parler', to speak meaningfully about certain aspects of France in 1962.

It has become fashionable, after the decline of political modernism to see Godard as part of, or as a precursor of, 'post-modernism' (36). However his film-making practice of the 1960s and its development in an avant-garde, political direction clearly place him alongside Modernist movements of the early twentieth century.

Eugene Lunn (37) provides an excellent definition of the distinctive features common to most Modernist art:

- 1 Aesthetic Self-Consciousness or Self-Reflexiveness
- 2 Simultaneity, Juxtaposition, or "Montage"
- 3 Paradox, Ambiguity and Uncertainty

4 "Dehumanization" and the Demise of the Integrated Individual Subject or Personality.

Vivre sa vie demonstrates all of these elements (though clearly it would not be necessary to find evidence of all four aesthetic categories in order to describe a particular work of art as Modernist). Self-conscious due to Godard's acute awareness of its place in film history (the extract from Dreyer's *Jeanne d'Arc* only the most obvious example), *Vivre sa vie* is also self-conscious, or self-reflexive, in the sense that Lunn directly describes, of the process of creating the work of art becoming the focus of the work of art itself, à la Proust, in, for example, Godard's interrogation of his own, or the cinema's objectification of women, made explicit in his reading of Poe's *Oval Portrait*.

Godard juxtaposes the different moods, the different kinds of conversation and camera styles of the twelve tableaux, but also ultimately creates a collage of fragments of other 'texts' and images (Dreyer's, Poe's, Parain's, Sacotte's, juke box songs etc.) which could be compared to Lunn's example of surrealist and Cubist collages.

The film explores the gradual effacement of Nana's identity, her transformation into a commodity, which begins with her name, the slang word for any young woman, and which is clearly expressed in her own statement to the police interrogator that (after Rimbaud) 'Je...est une autre', which links it to Lunn's examples of Joyce and the Surrealists' exploration of the unconscious.

Finally, the world of *Vivre sa vie* is certainly not one with a coherent, rational structure or set of values, leading to the ambiguities of Nana's experience of prostitution, the absurdity of her death and so on.

Most notably as a result of Lukács' work, there has always been a great deal of debate

around these kinds of Modernist aesthetic practices within Marxism. Brecht produced a devastating critique of that rejection (38) which serves as the perfect counterweight, since clearly while there is despair at the heart of many Modernist works there is also critique, rejection and, even if only negatively, the affirmation of the possibility of other imagined realities.

As in the best of Modernist art, the innovation and experimentation, the rebellion against the existing cultural forms and ideas, are not ends in themselves but channel an image of the world, a response to the world, which is able to communicate even without achieving the 'total' view of Lukács' desires.

Even while dealing with their subjects in a fragmentary, ambiguous, *breathless* way, Godard's films such as *Vivre sa vie*, *Une Femme mariée*, *masculin-féminin*, *Alphaville* employ the developing, increasingly more flexible technologies of film-making (hand-held cameras, faster film stock, portable sound equipment etc.) to explore Paris and its suburbs and the place within it of marginal sections of society, half in awe and half in disgust.

While his protagonists are marginals, isolated and alienated individuals, his films also chart the changing expectations of, for example, women and youth in the rapidly-changing society of the time, whose shifting surface of advertisements, cars, music, café culture etc. the films document; so well that Freddy Buache suggests young French people now watch old Godard films to see how their parents spent their youth (39). The tension between the expectations of Godard's generation and the limitations they encountered is cogently expressed by Perry Anderson's comment, which offers some indications as to why this extraordinary burst of cinematic creativity should arise in

France at that particular time:

As the Fourth Republic belatedly passed into the Fifth, and rural and provincial France was suddenly transformed by a Gaullist industrialization appropriating the newest technologies, something like a brief afterglow of the earlier conjuncture that produced the classical innovatory art of the century flared into life again. Godard's cinema was marked in its way by all three of the coordinates described earlier. Suffused with quotation and allusion to a high cultural past, Eliot-style; equivocal celebrant of the automobile and the airport, the camera and the carbine, Leger-style; expectant of revolutionary tempests from the East, Nizan-style (40).

In setting off in pursuit of those winds from the East after 1968 Godard seems to have cut himself off from his artistic moorings. 10 years after *Vivre sa vie* he wanted to say more, to say *everything* about his subject and his film and had adopted conceptual tools which he thought could give him those answers. However, the placing of political theory in command of the process in the end deprives him of his greatest resource, his eclectic, enquiring mind, irritating though it often was, which perhaps communicated more about 1962 than the work [*Tout va bien*] which consciously, too consciously, tried to 'think itself historically' in 1972.

- (1) 'Realism is not a mere question of form.' B. Brecht, 'Popularity and Realism', in E. Bloch et al, *Aesthetics and Politics* (London: New Left Books, 1977), 82.
- (2) B. Brecht, 'On the Formalistic Character of the Theory of Realism', *op. cit.*, 71.
- (3) J.-L. Godard, 'Le Cinéma n'a pas su remplir son rôle (entretien)', *Studio: Cent ans de cinéma*, hors série (Mars 1995), 155-158; Gaumont commissioned a film in six parts entitled *Histoire(s) du cinéma*.
- (4) Examples range from giving himself the title 'Jean-Luc cinéma Godard' in the credits of *Bande à part* to producing a book: J.-L. Godard, *Introduction à une véritable histoire du cinéma* tome 1, (Paris: Albatros, 1980), which is largely about his own film making. There will be evidence to follow of self-conscious reference to cinema and its history in discussing *Vivre sa vie*.
- (5) This term was used by S. Harvey, 'Whose Brecht? Memories for the '80s: a Critical Recovery', *Screen*, vol. 23 no. 1 (1982), 45-59, and served in the title of a later American study of radical film theory: D. N. Rodowick, *The Crisis of Political Modernism: Criticism and Ideology in Contemporary Film Theory* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988).
- (6) Under the influence of work in French journals like *Cahiers du cinéma* and *Cinéthique* whose Althusserian 'Structural Marxism' encouraged British writers such as C. MacCabe (1983) and P. Wollen, 'Counter-cinema: *Vent d'Est*, *Afterimage* 4 , (1972), 6-16, to develop rigorous 'materialist' theories around the work of a restrictive canon of radical film makers chief among whom was Godard. These would-be materialist views always privileged formal work, however, over questions of, for example audience or economic and historical context.
- (7) I have discussed one particularly significant example of that overestimation elsewhere: S. Cannon, 'Godard, the *Groupe Dziga Vertov* and the Myth of "Counter Cinema" ', *Nottingham French Studies*, vol. 32 no. 1 (1993), 74-83.
- (8) Particularly true of C. MacCabe, 'Realism and the Cinema: Notes on Some Brechtian Theses', *Screen*, vol. 15 no. 2 (1974), 7-27 and 'The Politics of Separation', *Screen*, vol. 16 no. 4, (1975/6), 46-61.
- (9) For example: J. Lesage, *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard and Their Use of Brechtian Dramatic Theory* (Indiana University PhD thesis, 1976); R. Stam, *Reflexivity in Film and Literature From Don Quixote to Jean-Luc Godard* (Ann Arbor: UMI press, 1985); M. Walsh, *The Brechtian Aspect of Radical Cinema* (London: BFI, 1981).
- (10) J.-L. Godard (introduction and notes by J. Narboni), *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Belfond, 1968), 309.
- (11) Which would seem to prove that such techniques have no inherent political or 'revolutionary' significance, other than that which might be attached to Brecht's own name and he has now clearly been accepted into the theatrical canon. *Vivre sa vie*, perhaps ironically, is more classically Brechtian than later didactic political films like *Tout va bien* (1972) in its use of certain key techniques.
- (12) J.-L. Godard, *Introduction à une véritable histoire du cinéma* tome 1, (Paris: Albatros, 1980), 106.
- (13) S. Sontag, 'Vivre sa vie' in T. Mussman, (ed.) *Jean-Luc Godard: a Critical Anthology* (New York: Dutton, 1968), 200. M. Campbell 'Life Itself: *Vivre sa vie* and the Language of Film', *Wide Angle*, vol. 1 No.3 (1976), 32-37, points out that in the last two tableaux, these fades to black occur *within* particular segments, 'in one setting without a significant lapse of time' *ibid.*, 36, referring to Nana with 'le jeune homme' and the car journey which ends in her murder.
- (14) J.-L. Godard, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Belfond, 1968), *ibid.*
- (15) Marcel Sacotte, *Où en est la prostitution?* according to J. Monaco, *The New Wave* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 122.
- (16) J.-L. Godard, *ibid.*

- (17) B. Brecht, 'Popularity and Realism', *op. cit.*, 81.
- (18) T. Lovell, *Pictures of Reality* (London: BFI, 1980), 76.
- (19) J.-L. Godard, *ibid.*
- (20) J.-L. Godard *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Editions de l'Etoile, 1985 2nd ed.), 288.
- (21) *Le Monde* interview, 20 December 1963, 18.
- (22) J.-L. Godard, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Belfond, 1968), 306.
- (23) Quoted in *Le Monde*, 21 September 1962, 13.
- (24) J.-L. Godard *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Editions de l'Etoile, 1985 2nd ed.), 185.
- (25) According to J. Collet, 'An Audacious Experiment: the Soundtrack of *Vivre sa vie*' in R. S. Brown (ed.), *Focus on Godard* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1972), 160-162, this had never been carried through in an entire film before.
- (26) J.-L. Godard, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Paris: Belfond, 1968), 306.
- (27) T. Braun, 'The Helplessness of Immersion: Melodrama, *Vivre sa vie* and *Veronika Voss*', *Spectator*, vol. 8 no.2 (1988), 79.
- (28) S. Sontag, *op. cit.*, 199; P. Sorlin "'Décrire la vie, la vie toute seule." Questions pour les sociologues', *Cinémaction*, 52 (1989), 201; M. Campbell, *op. cit.*, 36.
- (29) *2 ou 3 Choses que je sais d'elle* (1967) and *Sauve qui peut...(la vie)* (1980) are later examples.
- (30) Fieschi 'La Difficulté d'être de Jean-Luc Godard', *Cahiers du cinéma*, 137 (1962), translated in T. Mussman, *op. cit.*, 64-76.
- (31) Particularly keen on this notion are V. Perkins, 'Vivre sa vie' in I. Cameron (ed.), *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard* (London: Studio Vista, 1977 Revised ed.), 33, and D. Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film* (London: Methuen, 1985).
- (32) B. Brecht, 'On the Formalistic Character of the Theory of Realism', *op. cit.*, 71.
- (33) M. Cieutat, 'Godard made in USA', *Cinémaction*, 52 (1989), 173.
- (34) C. MacCabe, L. Mulvey, and M. Eaton, *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1980), 93.
- (35) *Ibid.*, 79-101; also anthologised in L. Mulvey, *Visual and Other Pleasures* (London: Routledge, 1989).
- (36) Most recent work in French on Godard does this and even where 'post-modernism' *per se* is not openly discussed or espoused, it has become common to impressionistically 'quote' from a seamless and ever-playful Godard *oeuvre*. See *Art Press* 'Spécial Godard', Hors Série No.4 (1984/1985); *Cinémaction* 'Le Cinéma selon Godard', 52 (1989); J.-L. Douin, *Godard* (Paris: Rivages, 1989).
- (37) E. Lunn, *Marxism and Modernism* (London: Verso, 1982), 34-37.
- (38) Bloch et al, *op. cit.*, also contains contributions from Lukács expressing his opposition to Modernism.
- (39) F. Buache, *Le cinéma des années 60* (Paris: Hatier, 1987), 47.

(40) P. Anderson, 'Modernity and Revolution' in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (New York: Houndmills, 1988), 328-9.