

Its Shadow) of his book *Aisthesis* he comes up with the notion of *immediacy* linked to the notion of cinema: “Immediacy is what the art of projected moving shadows demands. Since this art is deprived of living flesh, of the stage’s depth and theatre’s words, its instant performance must be identified with the tracing of a writing of forms” (2013⁴). Rancière discovers “immediacy” when he is trying to point out how cinema organises within its capacities a “distribution of the sensible” and he takes Chaplin not just as an example, but also as a decisive figure in the time, when film was becoming art form and defining itself as such. Of course, as a philosopher, who cannot but draw on texts – in this instance on Shklovsky, Meyerhold and, maybe more prominently, on Jean Epstein, Rancière did not miss the question of language in cinema. Therefore, it looks like as if there is an inherent link between thinking through cinema and his notion of *immediacy*.

Let me go back to Rachel Moore’s stance on “film as more primitive form of language than words”. Of course, her discourse is already imbued by postcolonial anthropology and the “notion” of “primitive” derived from Epstein has more or less just a “technical meaning”. Therefore, I am risking a hypotheses that – although both authors do not cite each other – her conception corresponds to Rancière’s reflection on a reciprocal relationship between language and cinema in his book *Intervals of Cinema*: “It is a practice of language that also carries a particular idea of ‘imageness’ (*imagéité*) and of mobility. It invented for itself a sort of *cinematographism*” (Rancière, 2014, ch. 2). Although Epstein-Moore’s concept of “primitive language” cannot just be simply equated to the notion of immediacy, I think that it is inscribed into it. As such, it touches upon Rancière’s original and far-reaching conception of the distribution of the sensual.

Immediacy, which becomes apparent as a suitable answer to the demand of the art of “projected moving shadows”, in the case of Chaplin it has to do with movement; what *Charlot* does, makes him and his art not only just comprehensible through Meyerhold’s formula of theatrical art, but it makes him part of the same aesthetic process that generates art and its inventions of “glitches” in the work of machine. This Chaplin’s involvement of pantomime along with the fairground theatre (*théâtre de la foire*) in his films is what instigates Epstein’s partial repudiation of Chaplin’s cinema as an art. However, one should take into account that this was actual-

4 The accessibility of texts in different formats sometimes causes problems with quoting. The English translations of some of Rancière’s books, which I received as the Kindle editions, do not have pagination corresponding to the printed edition. Therefore, my quotes are marked with the number of the chapter, where they can be found.