

lapping; in her case, between film theory and anthropology, which follows from an encounter between film and so-called primitive culture. There is no need to go over quite an extensive discussion concerning a comparison between language and film. The semiotic trend in film theory quite clearly proved that such a comparison, which gave way to an idea that film could be treated as a language system or even as a grammar, was quite a bit misguided. However, this does not mean that there is not a very complex structural relationship between language and film; also, it does not mean that film could not be analysed as a discourse. Still, there is a comparison between language and film on the level of their functions as representations. In elaborating her own consequences from Jean Epstein, Moore asserts that “film is a more primitive form of language than words” and therefore the effect of magic is greater in cinema than in naming things with words. This “primitive language”, prelogical speech, was called “inner speech” by another inventive film maker and theoretician of cinema, Sergey Eisenstein. Further, we are reminded by Moore of Eisenstein’s liking of James Joyce for his idea of “inner monologues”. Hence, what Rachel Moore reveals quite clearly in her reading of filmmakers and writers, is the fact that from the viewpoint of cinema some functions of language became more obvious. On the other hand, cinema caused a development of a mode of perception, which is very well expressed in a quotation from Boris Eikhenbaum, whom she quoted from Paul Willemen’s book *Looks and Frictions*: “The film spectator must perform a complicated mental task in linking together the shots (the construction of cine-phrases and cine-periods), a task virtually absent in everyday usage where the word forms a covering and excludes other means of expression” (Moore, 2000: p. 31).

Are we not yet again reminded of Bergson’s and Deleuze’s conceptualisation of the image and its inner movement, which prevents it from being torn out from the movements that it makes itself a part of. Willemen himself then described inner speech as “the discourse that binds the psychoanalytic subject and the subject in history, functioning as a locus of condensation” (Ibid.). Whatever relevance the psychoanalytic theory may have in deciphering what sociologists Thomas Luckman and Peter Berger called “the social construction of reality”, it is obvious that the age of photography and film had a big impact on history as a science and as a collective memory. Just try to make a parallel between the Willemen’s statements and with what could be described as an everyday experience of anybody, who owns a television set. Although history as a science is prevalently written,