



Truffaut and new wave

Özden Toprak

Received 10 August, 2016; Accepted 15 September, 2016 © The author(s) 2016. Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

ABSTRACT: “New Wave” (*La Nouvelle Vague*) term first seen in *L’Express* indicates a movement which is prepared by different names collectively. The view of Alexandre Astruc sees cinema almost like a work of literature and his emphasis to cinema’s own language; *Cahiers Du Cinema* –a symbol of new movement-journal published by Andre Bazin and the discussions in this journal about the movement; Truffaut’s approach about director as an “auteur” makes a contribution to prepare the “New Wave”. Truffaut as an important figure of the movement defended that a film has to belong to the director and he insisted on the “personal” relationship between the director and the audience. Auteur theory utters the resemblances and similarities between the relations of “language and style” in literature and “type and auteur” in cinema. *The 400 Blows* of Truffaut is a first example of the cinema of the future and it is also a reflection of the theory to the practical area as Alexandre Astruc says as: “Director writes his film with his camera like an author makes with his pen...” In this article it will be tried to put forth the process of emergence of the “New Wave” with its background and the cinema of Truffaut’s place in this movement will be undertaken in the light of *The 400 Blows*.

I. TRUFFAUT AND NEW WAVE

La Nouvelle Vague (New Wave)

“New Wave” term was first seen in an article published in the journal of *L’Express* by Françoise Giroud. One of the pioneers of New Wave, Truffaut confirms this assertion: “New Wave is neither a movement, nor a school, nor a group, it is a collective motto formed by the press for the inclusion of new fifty names, having appeared in the last two years, in this profession which opens its doors to only three or four directors every year.” (Makal, Fransız Sineması, 1996, p. 97)

He first met Jacques Rivette, Jean-Luc Godard and François Truffaut in 1949-1950. The education they received in Cinematheque brought them close together. This education that they received with the latecomers-Claude Chabrol and Eric Rohmer taught all of them something: “To make films which reveal a fascination with the question of how a story is told in the medium of film.”

Unlike most of the filmmakers who had come before them, they came together with their shared passion for cinema and get imbued with the history of their art. All the films that they have made since the salad days of the Cinematheque in one way or another reveal that shared concern.

In 1948, the novelist, critic and filmmaker Alexandre Astruc had written a landmark essay in which he called filmmakers to realize the full power of their art so that it could become “a means of writing just as flexible and subtle as written language.” He labeled this approach as “Camera-Stylo”. (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 14)

The essay of Astruc became the declaration of independence for “New Wave”. According to Astruc, the cinema completed its success in fixing the images and gradually became a “language”. Astruc explains this idea: “By ‘language’, I mean a form in which and by which an artist could articulate his thoughts however abstract they may be or “translate” his obsessions in the same way he does in his essays or novels. That’s why I would like to call this new age of cinema as Camera-Stylo.” (A. Astruc) (Monaco, New Wave, 2006, p. 13)

Through the cinema, the artists will be able to put forth their abstract or empirical thoughts as in the compilations and novels. Therefore, cinema is a “language”. Camera-Stylo is a useful concept to explain the perspectives of young French intellectuals on cinema. (Reisz and Millar, 1975, p. 322)

Astruc suggests that cinema becomes a means of expression by saying that:

“To come to the point, cinema is quite simply becoming a means of expression, just as all the other arts before it, and in particular painting and the novel. After having been successively a fair-ground attraction, an amusement analogous to boulevard theatre, or a means of preserving the images of an era, it is gradually becoming a language.” (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 12-13)

According to Astruc, cinema was to come out of its narrow space within the boundaries of folk novels of the reality and social fantasy and to run after the deepest meanings. Psychology, metaphysics, thoughts, ambitions were to be the real areas of cinema. In future, we would enter an era in which it would not be possible to mention about only one cinema, but about the “cinemas”, just like the literature. Because he thought that the cinema is a means reflecting every branch of thought. (Makal, Fransız Sineması, 1996, p. 97)

Cahiers Du Cinema and Andre Bazin

The essay of Astruc was written ten years before the filmmakers of the New Wave to fulfill this dream and turn theory into practice. During the fifties they continued their education at the Cinematheque and the film clubs. They took jobs as assistant directors and publicity agents. They all wrote for Cahiers du Cinema, the journal of a new movement in cinema which Andre Bazin had founded in 1950 and which he edited until 1958.

The “godfather” of the New Wave was Henri Langlois, the founder of the Cinematheque. It was him who provided the materials with which young critics of Cahiers du Cinema were to fashion a new esthetic. But the father of the New Wave was Andre Bazin. As the editor of Cahiers he exerted a kind of moral force that existed separately from his own writings. For Truffaut, in particular, he became a surrogate father. (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 13) Truffaut explains his thoughts about Bazin in the foreword of his work “What is Cinema?”:

“Andre Bazin is the best among European filmmakers. In 1948 when I met him, I became his adopted son. Every pleasant thing that I could realize in my life I owed to him. He taught me how “to write about cinema”. He edited my first essays and helped me to become a director. He passed away just after a few hours I finished my first shootings.” (Bazin, Sinema Nedir, 2007, p. 5) Stating that the principles of montage had been the same until the film “Citizen Kane” (1941) of Orson Welles, Bazin attaches great importance to this film due to the fact that although the film camera was still, the scenes were processed “in single shooting” from beginning to end with the help of the depth of field. According to him, “fast montage” in silent films makes time and space “tricky”.

Welles’s montage did not try to cheat the spectator. Orson Welles offered the verbal cinema a chance to reuse the fast montage, montage of attraction and superimpositions that he had used for ten years. This was a language revolution. (Makal, Fransız Sineması, 1996, p. 100)

Bazin’s theoretical influence on the filmmakers-critics was significant. Like the critics in any field, Bazin studied his subject, namely cinema, in rather broad contexts. Cinema was never for him an “art” or a “language”, no matter how beautiful or flexible, existing in splendid isolation, but always an active factor in political, philosophical, even religious equations.

The breadth and relevance of Bazin’s approach would later be mirrored in the films of the New Wave.

Bazin’s commentaries on the language of the film were unmatched for their deep comprehension of the technology of cinema and the psychology which stems from it. Then these approaches enlightened the semiologists like Christian Metz. They paved the way for the more acutely philosophical study of Metz’s phenomenon of film.

Alexandre Astruc noted: “The fundamental problem of cinema is how to express thought. The creation of this language has preoccupied all the theoreticians and writers in the history of cinema.” (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 13)

For Bazin, the evaluation of the language of cinema was a progression away from the tricks of expressionism and montage and towards realism, *mise-en-scene*, and deep focus (which he saw in opposition to montage).

Bazin is, then, a realist. But the word “realist” must be understood in the special way Bazin meant it (as more a matter of ethics and psychology than of esthetics). Like all of his criticism, his ‘theory of *mise-en-scene*’ was grounded in an eloquent concern for the human relationship between artist and spectator. (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 14)

For him, ‘*mise-en-scene*’ and ‘deep focus’ are a dialectical step forward in the history of film language. Because depth of focus brings the spectator in closer relation with the image. This brings to mind: depth of focus provides both a more active mental attitude on the part of the spectator and a more positive contribution to the action in progress.

It is the vitality and honesty of the commitment between artist and the spectator that concerns Andre Bazin, not vague, abstract esthetic dicta.

Bazin’s approach towards catching the actual continuity of the reality and not using montage had an impact on his students Truffaut and Godard in particular. Truffaut’s films, shootings are pretty long. Cuttings were applied only when it was inevitable (for example; when a character walked out of a room or went down the stairs and disappeared). In the 400 Blows in particular, influence of Bazin is often seen. (Reisz and Millar, p.331, 1975)

“Auteur” and “Genre”

Astruc sounded the call in his aforementioned essay, Langlois provided the material and established a foundation, Bazin supplied the basic architectonics. Even if Truffaut is usually given credit for the Auteur theory, this critical system was nevertheless truly a collective work. In Cahiers du Cinema in 1950s, Truffaut, Godard, Chabrol, Rohmer and Rivette argued out a new theory of cinema. It centered on the concepts of “the politique des auteurs” and its accompanying “genre theory”. “The politique des auteurs” and “genre theory” are simple principles, but with complex reverberations.

In 1957, Bazin stated the broad aims of the auteur theory this way: “This theory consists, in short, of choosing the personal factor in artistic creation as a standard of reference and then of assuming that it continues and even progresses from one film to the next.” (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 14-15)

This thought has a special value differently from the literary theory. Because the art is still in its infancy. It is most often considered a social rather than personal expression.

Bazin and his colleagues on Cahiers Du Cinema were obsessed with American film till then. By the early 1930s, American Cinema had achieved a position of dominance on the world screens. Hollywood films made their marks in 1930s and 1940s and were made in studio factories. That’s why the “expressionism” was impossible. The theory that a film always has one “prime author” and “that that author should be the director” seemed quite unacceptable.

Between 1932 and 1946, the history of film is, with two exceptions, the history of Hollywood. The exceptions of the era are the group of directors in France for some time linked together under the rubric “poetic realism” and the beginning of the British documentary tradition with John Grierson and his group in England. (Monaco, Bir Film Nasıl Okunur?, 2001, p. 279)

In order to judge the “personal factor”, then it was necessary to discuss the work of the auteur in context, and this was the film’s genre. The set of conventions and expectations which it shared with other films of its kind (western, gangster, films noirs)... ‘The auteur theory’ “standard of reference” was the vertical axis against which a film was plotted; the horizontal axis was the genre.

François Truffaut’s article titled “A Certain Tendency in French Cinema” (1954), printed on page 31 in Cahiers Du Cinema magazine was regarded as the manifestation of a new perception of cinema:

Truffaut, in this article, criticized the tradition of quality by attacking on French Cinema which was under the influence of “psychological reality”. In this era, the author criticizing that the scenery, dialogues, genres came to the forefront in French films and the quality was given extra-importance underlined that these films contributed nothing, except for being commercially successful.

This article, providing that the perception of auteur came to the fore and was discussed, also contributed to the birth of New Wave. Truffaut, in his article, separated the French Cinema into two: “auteur cinema” and “cinema of tradition of quality.” He defended that the film had to belong to the director, not to the producer. The authors of Cahiers Du Cinema adopted this perception and supported Truffaut. (İri, 2010, p. 69)

Auteur Theory and Films

This theory insists on a “personal” relationship between filmmaker and film viewer. Movies must no longer be alienated products which are consumed by mass audiences.

Films are intimate conversations between the people behind the camera and the people in front of the screen. Second, auterism leads to a dialectical view of the film process: a movie becomes the sum of a whole set of oppositions between “auteur and genre”, “director and audience”, “critic and film”, “theory and practice” or “method and sentiment” (Godard). It is no longer a product to be consumed but a process to become engaged in. The directors having raised some questions in their early critical essays answered them, in part, in their films: how do we use film, how does it change us, how does it relate to the life, how does it help to explain our existence, how does it function as a language? ... (Monaco, Yeni Dalga, 2006, p. 16)

The New Wave filmmakers were all involved in working out the relationship between the historical dimension and the personal dimension. It is this fascination with the forms and structures of the film medium that sets their films apart from those that preceded them and marks a turning point in film history.

Ecriture- Language and Style

At the same time when Alexandre Astruc wrote his essay on “Camera-Stylo”, Roland Barthes, France’s most brilliant contemporary literary critic, was beginning to work out a theory of literature which is not dissimilar to the New Wave vision of cinema.

Barthes suggested a literary theory that placed emphasis not on the historical dimension of literature (what he calls its language), nor on the personal dimension (the style), but on a third dimension, the product of the two: “Ecriture”. “The language and style are blind forces; ecriture is an act of historical solidarity. The language and style are objects; the ecriture is a function. It is the relationship between creation and society.” (R. Barthes)

“Genre” and “auteur” theory for Bazin is the dialectical relationship between “language” and “style” for Barthes in the literature. These two forces interact to create a third force, “écriture”.

French intellectuals had a common experience with the New Wave- a cinematic écriture that combines “language” and “style” and is written with a “Camera-Stylo”, fulfilling Alexandre Astruc’s wishes and solving Barthes’s theorem.

The common characteristic of the critics of Cahiers Du Cinema is that they were so steeped in literary and philosophical culture of their time. So the New Wave filmmakers brought a varied cultural background to their arts, as well as sophisticated theories of cinema.

All five directors also know the traditions of the visual arts well. It was the technical facility with the “Camera-Stylo”, the instrument of the artists, that made it possible for them to turn from the practice of theory in the fifties to theory in practice in the sixties and seventies. Fast filmstocks, light-weight cameras, new lighting equipment and the liberation from the Hollywood set that all this implied, made the Camera-Stylo a reality in the late fifties and early sixties not only in France but elsewhere as well.

Initiating a certain era of film through either its commercial success or its artistic power or cooperation of the directors with each other, “New Wave” began to lose its importance towards the end of 1960s.

“Compared to New Realist Movement, the New Wave never became a remarkable cinema school, but it proved itself to be a driving force in the other countries’ cinemas. For example; benefiting from the features of the New Wave appropriately to their situations, Cinema Novo, New York School in USA, Free Cinema, Central European Cinema Movements (Czechoslovakia) and New German Cinema reflected this to their works.” (Prof.O.Makal, Biryıldız, 2009, p. 94)

Les Quatre Cents Coups (The 400 Blows)

Shot in 1959, Truffaut’s first feature film the 400 Blows begins with long travelling shootings of Paris streets. Shot with camcorder, these motions continue through the whole credits. Apartments, churches, shops...

Truffaut, with the 400 Blows, gave the first example for the cinema of future (with his concept “politique des auteurs), shot in the houses and on the streets where the life of an ordinary person can be seen. The 400 Blows was the first example in which the theory of Alexandre Astruc was reflected as he stated in his “camera-stylo”: “The filmmaker writes his film with his camera just like the author writes with his pen...”

This film is, above all, about childhood. The 400 Blows is one of the examples of a cinema which narrates the daily lives of ordinary people instead of the stories of important persons and which has problematic characters rather than strong and perfect characters.

The story of the 400 Blows is quite simple. The protagonist of the film, Antoine Doinel is a thirteen year old boy who lives together with an indifferent mother and a stepfather and experiences a tough adolescence. He goes to a routine, strict-disciplined school. Often playing hooky (as the name of the film “Les Quatre Cents Coups” also means playing hooky), and hanging together with his close friend Rene, Antoine becomes a problem for his family.

He does not do his homework with which he is punished and “plays hooky” next day. While walking with his friend, he sees his mother with another man. When he goes to school next day, his teacher calls him to account. Antoine tells as an excuse that “his mother died”. But his lies expose soon. He decides to escape from his stepfather and his mother’s indifference. He will “take care of himself”. He resorts to his friend after leaving a letter.

Their only aim is to live by the sea which is the place they dream of. To realize this aim they need some money and Antoine decides to steal and sell his father’s typewriter but nothing works out.

Antoine is caught and he is sent to the detention center with the consent of his family. After a while, he achieves to escape from there and he reaches an uncertain freedom. The director Truffaut leaves the film open-ended.

The New Wave films rarely end with a “clear-cut closing”; they just end. In classic Hollywood cinema, all the element of the story should be analyzed together at the end of the film. The most famous example of the New Wave uncertainty is, maybe, seen in the 400 Blows. Antoine Doniel runs till he reaches the sea. He stops and Truffaut freezes the scene in which the child seems confused. The film ends in this way; the audience never finds out what happens to him. There is no clue about where he will go. (Biryıldız, 2009, p.97)



Acting as Antoine, Jean Pierre L aud often continued to take roles in Truffaut's films in 1962 (*Antoine et Collette*), 1968, 1970, 1971, 1973. The character in these films is no one else, but Truffaut. He is a detective looking for love and coziness in *Stolen Kisses* (*Baisers Voles*, 1968). He gets married, learns to take some responsibility and to sacrifice in *Bed and Board* (*Domicile Conjugal*, 1970). In *Love on the Run* (*L'amour en Fuite*, 1970), Antoine is 30 years old but still evades responsibility and devotion.

While it is true that our main interest in the *400 Blows* and the succeeding *Doniel* films has to do with their value as spiritual autobiography, they also bear considerable factual resemblance to Truffaut's life, at least through the middle of *Baisers voles*. Born in Paris on 6 January 1932, Truffaut was immediately handed over to a wet nurse and then sent to live with his grandmother until he was 8. When she died, his parents took him back reluctantly. "They weren't bad people", Truffaut says for his mother and father, "just nervous and busy." His experiences at school closely paralleled those of Antoine Doinel. He played hooky often, with his friend Robert Lachenay (now a film critic) who offers excuses as outlandish as Antoine's. At the age of eleven he ran away from home and slept in bomb shelters, stealing brass doorknobs and selling them to survive. (Monaco, 2006, p. 21)

Truffaut told about those days: "My father found me, put me back in school. He told the school authorities everything I'd done. I was a black sheep. Everything I did was frowned upon, so I didn't go back. I used to go to the municipal library and devour Balzac." (Monaco, 2006, p. 21)

Antoine Doinel was an imaginary character, but he was, partly, Truffaut. He was his alter ego. Jean-Pierre Leaud acted out this personality successfully.

The *400 Blows* was not shot as a sound film due to the characteristics of the era. The secret of the film with a simple story is hidden in its cinematic narration. As a critic, what Truffaut placed too much stress on with his essays was the realism, Bazinist realism. Bazin established a film tradition which is based on the belief in the pure power of the mechanically recorded image other than on the learned power of the artistic control on the image.

He devoted this film to Bazin, anyway. Truffaut gets his materials from the real world and processes them in a realistic way just like Italian new realists before him: Actually, Antoine goes through adolescence that most of us experience and Truffaut makes us feel it near Antoine- neither from his point of view, nor the point of view of the ones who lord over him. The settings where the film was shot are the real settings and the camera movements are real.

As in most New Wave films -or as it heralds that it will happen so- in this film there is no room for perfection(ism) that we see in "cinema du papa" films or Hollywood films. The montage rules are ignored (jump cut), real settings are used, very little artificial lighting is used, there are 'imperfections' in the dialogues and scripts, camera is on the shoulder or in the hands and moving... All these "imperfections" are a rebellion against "tradition of quality" which came to power with its perfection and completeness. (In 1954, Truffaut, in his article titled "A Certain Tendency of French Cinema" published on page 31 in *Cahiers Du Cinema*, criticized the tradition of quality by attacking on French Cinema which was under the influence of "psychological reality".) Because this system is in a vicious circle continuously telling artificial lives under radiant lights and

colors with proper camera movements. The directors are the technicians spending their years in the studios after they graduate from cinema schools.

It is rather ironic that Truffaut displayed his rebellion with a film having autographic (as Antoine resembles to Truffaut's childhood) characteristics and with the rebellion of the child in this film. The rebellious boy, Antoine- just like Truffaut- plays hooky and goes to the cinema with Rene and watches a film. This is an "alternative education" to the cinema education of academy.

The ability to catch the poem of daily life (*la vie quotidienne*) is one of things that Truffaut likes most. For example, in a scene of the 400 Blows, Antoine runs away from home and gets very hungry. He realizes the milk crates and steals a bottle of milk. He drinks the milk fast for fear that he gets caught. He drops the empty bottle into the loopholes on the ground and enjoys listening to the sound of crash.

After the success of *The 400 Blows*, Truffaut did not shoot the rest of the film lest the audience should misuse this subject. In 1962, Truffaut was offered to make a 30 minute-segment of an anthology film on "young love". This proposal presented him the opportunity to continue the story of Antoine.

This was "Antoine et Colette" from *Love at Twenty (L'Amour a Vingt)*. The Doinel tetralogy was completed with *Stolen Kisses* and *Bed and Board (1970)*.

Although some critics say that Truffaut's later works are far under the quality of his early works, Joseph Mc Bride says: "If Truffaut's extraordinary camera movements, breathtaking montage and sense of pleasure are less visible in his later films, it is because conscious approach and emotional prosperity increased in narration and genre."

Truffaut explains in an interview which includes explanations about his technique and method in *The 400 Blows* and which we find it meaningful to note the long citation below:

In the period we were critics on "Cahiers du Cinema", we defended CinemaScope against the older critics and some French directors. We were surprised with the technical equipment we would use in *The 400 Blows*, the first film of the New Wave. We had only a noisy camera. We could not record the sounds directly, this was only a faint sound test. In real settings, we shot with a cheap crane. Our equipment was so limited that it was not a real film in the end as we thought.

I was very surprised when *The 400 Blows* was chosen to the Cannes Film Festival. Because I thought that they would not display a film in which the sounds were not recorded directly. (Besides, if we go back to 1946, *La Bataille Du Raille* of René Clément was displayed in the first Cannes Film Festival under the same conditions.) It still sounds weird that three French films which were mute shootings and shot out of studios-*Breathless*, *The 400 Blows* and *Hiroshimo Mon Amour* were displayed in the Cannes in 1959.

Despite the fact that the films were appreciated, Jean Renoir reproached us because we did not defend the sound shooting and he was not satisfied with our post synchronization. He worked really hard in *The 400 Blows*, as the guys montaged easily and Jean Pierre Léaud montaged better than usual. They did not get on well with their families. They stood with the sound shooting. For example, a nondubbed dialogue with psychiatrist. I had used this mute shooting system with post synchronization till *Jules and Jim*. After that, we turned back to the sound shooting.

While shooting *The 400 Blows* in CinemaScope, I had the naive feeling that it would make the film look more professional, more stylized, and less naturalistic. CinemaScope has this strange quality of being an oblong window that hides many details. When a character moves through a room, if you have a square window (1.33:1), you have all the details like what is on the table or on the wall and at the same time you have an opinion about the decoration. However, in CinemaScope the character moves almost abstractly in the room as if he were in an aquarium. This deficit is pretty clear, for example, in *Shoot The Pianist* during the whole scenery in which Theresa confesses her sins. You are on the left side with a face moving towards a grey back ground. It becomes more abstract. And I liked that. I realized that we provided ridiculous motivations to the actors in the film to define their acts, like "Go there and put your cigarette on the ashtray." And I did not like these motivations. I believed that we could ask the actors to move without any reason. That's why I love CinemaScope. Later, however, I left the CinemaScope for *The 400 Blows* and *Jule and Jim* when I found out that it was possible to make 16 mm productions by simplifying the film on a flat screen.

And so the CinemaScope, invented against the television, was completely inserted in the system; it was even damaged. In the end, we saw our favorite films being cropped from the top and bottom frameworks and murdered in the cinema halls. At first, I planned to shoot a film in CinemaScope in order to protect this. Now my films are displayed as cropped from right and left, we know that there is no solution other than 1.75:1 screen, the format used in many American films." (Davis, Hélène Laroche, *Reminiscing About Shoot the Piano Player*, Cineaste, ABD, 1993, Translator Battal Odabaş)

The New Wave constitutes one of the most important breaking points in cinema. The New Wave, responding the accepted cinema perspective of those days with a new language, grew with original perspectives of the artists like Alexandre Astruc, Andre Bazin and with the discussions put forth by the intellectuals around

Cahiers Du Cinema and gave its significant examples with Truffaut's works, the ones of the most outstanding figures.

Reflecting a situation, similar to the relationship between "language and style" in literature-language theory of Roland Barthes, on the screen by reminding the relationship between "genre and auteur", Truffaut sees the director as an auteur. He particularly drew attention to the link between the director and his audience. One of the important examples of Truffaut's cinema getting its materials from the real world and partly having autographic characteristics, The 400 Blows also attained a place in the history of cinema as one of the director's most impressive films which bear the characteristics of the New Wave cinema.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Bazin, Andre, Sinema Nedir? Istanbul, İzdüşüm Publications, 2007.
- [2]. Biryıldız, Esra, Sinemada Akımlar, Istanbul, Beta Publishing, 2009.
- [3]. Dorsay, Atilla, Sinemayı Sanat Yapanlar, Varlık Publications, Istanbul, 1986.
- [4]. Dorsay, Atilla, 100 Yıllın 100 Yönetmeni, Istanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 1995.
- [5]. İri, Murat, Sinema Araştırmaları: Kuramlar, Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar, Derin Publications, Istanbul, 2010.
- [6]. Makal, Oğuz, Fransız Sineması, Ankara, Kitle Publications, 1996.
- [7]. Monaco, James, Bir Film Nasıl Okunur? Istanbul, Oğlak Publishing, 2001.
- [8]. Monaco, James, Yeni Dalga, Istanbul, PM Publishing, 2006.
- [9]. Reisz, Karel, Gavin Millar, The Technique of Film Editing, NY, Focal Press, 1975.
- [10]. Interview, Davis, Hélène Laroche, Reminiscing About Shoot the Piano Player, Cineaste, Translator Battal Odbaşı, ABD, 1993.
- [11]. <http://www.fandango.com/fran%C3%A7oistruuffaut/awards/p114620> (Date Accessed: 06.01.2012)

ANNEX 1- Truffaut's Filmography (Dorsay, 1995, p. 433)

- [12]. The 400 Blows - *Les 400 coups* (1959): Jean-Pierre Léaud
- [13]. Shoot the Piano Player - (*Tirez sur le pianiste*) (1960): Charles Aznavour
- [14]. Antoine and Colette (1962): Jean-Pierre Léaud
- [15]. Jules and Jim - (*Jules et Jim*) (1962): Jeanne Moreau, Oskar Werner
- [16]. The Soft Skin - (*La Peau douce*) (1964): Jean Desailly, Françoise Dorléac
- [17]. Fahrenheit 451 - (*Fahrenheit 451*) (1966): Oskar Werner, Julie Christie
- [18]. The Bride Wore Black - (*La mariée était en noir*) (1968): Jeanne Moreau, Charles Denner
- [19]. Stolen Kisses - (*Baisers volés*) (1968): Jean-Pierre Léaud, Claude Jade
- [20]. Mississippi Mermaid - (*La Sirène du Mississippi*) (1969): Jean-Paul Belmondo, Catherine Deneuve
- [21]. The Wild Child (*L'Enfant sauvage*) (1969): Jean-Pierre Cargol, François Truffaut
- [22]. Domicile conjugal (1970): Jean-Pierre Léaud, Claude Jade
- [23]. Les deux anglaises et le continent (1971): Jean-Pierre Léaud
- [24]. Two English Girls - *Une belle fille comme moi* (1972): Bernadette Lafont, Claude Brasseur, Charles Denner
- [25]. Day for Night - (*La nuit Américaine*) (1973): Jean-Pierre Léaud, Jacqueline Bisset
- [26]. The Story of Adele H. - (*L'Histoire d'Adèle H.*) (1975): Isabelle Adjani, Bruce Robinson
- [27]. L'Argent de poche (1976): enfants
- [28]. L'Homme qui aimait les femmes (1977): Charles Denner, Brigitte Fossey
- [29]. The Green Room - (*La Chambre verte*) (1978): François Truffaut, Nathalie Baye
- [30]. L'amour en fuite (1979): Jean-Pierre Léaud, Claude Jade
- [31]. The Last Metro - (*Le dernier métro*) (1980): Catherine Deneuve, Gérard Depardieu
- [32]. The Woman Next Door - (*La Femme d'à côté*) (1981): Gérard Depardieu, Fanny Ardant
- [33]. Confidentially Yours - (*Vivement dimanche!*) (1983): Fanny Ardant, Jean-Louis Trintignant

Annex 2- Truffaut's Awards

French Academy of Cinema	The Last Metro	Best Director	1980
French Academy of Cinema	The Last Metro	Best Original Screenplay	1980
French Academy of Cinema	The Last Metro	Best Picture	1980
New York Film Critics Circle	The Story of Adele H.	Best Screenplay	1975
New York Film Critics Circle	Day for Night	Best Director	1973
Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences	Day for Night	Best Foreign Language Film	1973
British Academy of Film and Television Arts	Day for Night	Best Picture	1973
British Academy of Film and Television Arts	Day for Night	Best Director	1973
National Society of Film Critics	Day for Night	Best Director	1973
National Board of Review	The Wild Child	Best Director	1970
National Society of Film Critics	Stolen Kisses	Best Director	1969
French Film Critics Circle	Stolen Kisses	Prix Louis-Delluc	1968
Cannes Film Festival	The 400 Blows	Best Director	1959

Source: <http://www.fandango.com/fran%C3%A7oistruuffaut/awards/p114620> (Date Accessed: 06.01.2012)